



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

# World Heritage

# 39 COM

**WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add**

**Paris, 29 May 2015**

**Original: English / French**

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC  
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

**CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF  
THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE**

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Thirty-ninth session**

**Bonn, Germany  
28 June – 8 July 2015**

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

## **SUMMARY**

This document contains information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. The World Heritage Committee is requested to review the reports on the state of conservation of properties contained in this document. The full reports of reactive monitoring missions requested by the World Heritage Committee are available at the following Web address in their original language: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/39COM/documents>

All previous state of conservation reports are available through the World Heritage State of conservation Information System at the following Web address:

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

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

## Table of content

<b>I. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>NATURAL PROPERTIES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>AFRICA.....</b>	<b>3</b>
4. Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis) .....	3
<b>ARAB STATES .....</b>	<b>7</b>
6. Socotra Archipelago (Yemen) (N 1263) .....	7
<b>ASIA-PACIFIC .....</b>	<b>10</b>
7. Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154) .....	10
10. Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area (China) (N 640) .....	13
12. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955) .....	16
15. Chitwan National Park (Nepal) (N 284).....	19
<b>EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA .....</b>	<b>22</b>
18. Wood Buffalo National Park (Canada) (N 256).....	22
20. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765bis).....	25
21. Golden Mountains of Altaï (Russian Federation) (N 768rev) .....	27
22. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754).....	29
23. Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719).....	31
24. Lena Pillars Nature Park (Russian Federation) (N 1299) .....	34
25. Natural System of Wrangel Island Reserve (Russian Federation) (N 1023rev) .....	35
<b>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.....</b>	<b>39</b>
27. Cerrado Protected areas : Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1035) .....	39
29. Area de Conservación Guanacaste (Costa Rica) (N 928bis) .....	41
30. Morne Trois Pitons National Park (Dominica) (N 814).....	43
31. Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve (Mexico) (N 1290) .....	44
<b>MIXED PROPERTIES .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>AFRICA.....</b>	<b>47</b>
34. Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Tanzania, United Republic of) (C/N 39bis).....	47
<b>ASIA-PACIFIC .....</b>	<b>52</b>
35. Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181quinquies) .....	52
<b>CULTURAL PROPERTIES .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>AFRICA.....</b>	<b>56</b>
40. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055) .....	56
41. Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev) .....	60
42. Le Morne Cultural Landscape (Mauritius) (C 1259bis).....	62
45. Stone Town of Zanzibar (Tanzania, United Republic of) (C 173rev).....	64

<b>ARAB STATES .....</b>	<b>68</b>
48. Qal'at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun (Barhain) (C 1192ter) .....	68
51. Hatra (Iraq) (C 277rev) .....	70
52. Petra (Jordan) (C 326) .....	72
54. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299) .....	75
56. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libya) (C 190) .....	78
57. Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libya) (C 287) .....	80
<b>ASIA-PACIFIC .....</b>	<b>82</b>
62. Historic Monuments and Sites in Kaesong (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) (C 1278rev) .....	82
66. Cultural Landscape of Bali Province: the <i>Subak</i> System as a Manifestation of the <i>Tri Hita Karana</i> Philosophy (Indonesia) (C 1194rev) .....	83
68. Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 481) .....	87
69. Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C121bis) .....	90
70. Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143) .....	92
<b>EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA .....</b>	<b>95</b>
83. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356) .....	95
94. Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033) .....	99
<b>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....</b>	<b>102</b>
90. Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso (Chile) (C 959rev) .....	102
<b>II. OMNIBUS .....</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>CULTURAL PROPERTIES .....</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>ASIA-PACIFIC .....</b>	<b>105</b>
Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Iran, Islamic Republic of) (C 1208 bis) .....	105
<b>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....</b>	<b>106</b>
Rio de Janeiro, Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea (Brazil) (C 1100rev) .	106

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

### NATURAL PROPERTIES

#### AFRICA

#### 4. Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1997, extension in 2001

Criteria (viii) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/801/documents/>

#### International Assistance

Requests approved: 2 (from 2000-2001)

Total amount approved: USD 35,300

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/801/assistance/>

#### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

#### Previous monitoring missions

March 2012, April 2015: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring missions

#### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Impacts of the Gibe III dam
- Other planned hydro-electric developments and associated large-scale irrigation projects in the Omo region
- Oil exploration
- Wildlife populations and pressure from poaching and livestock grazing
- Impacts of the larger development vision for Northern Kenya
- Management capacity of KWS and NMK
- Design of the World Heritage site

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/801/>

#### Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2015, the State Party of Kenya submitted a joint report on Kenya-Ethiopia bilateral talks (a summary of which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/801/documents/>), but did not submit a report addressing the requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session (Doha, 2014). The report presents the following:

- Impounding of the Gibe III dam reservoir in Ethiopia began on 19 January 2015, abstracting water at a rate of 10m<sup>3</sup>/sec and retaining 15.6% of the water;
- 6,000 hectares of land are currently being irrigated for the Kuraz Sugar Scheme in Ethiopia. 4-6% of water will be abstracted for irrigation during the four months of the dry season;

- The Kenya-Ethiopia bilateral mission team observed that, at the moment, there is no adverse impact from either project on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property.
- A joint Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and a detailed hydrological baseline study will be conducted and completed by December 2015;
- A joint expert panel for monitoring basin-wide natural resource management which will work under the existing Ethiopia-Kenya Joint Ministerial Commission will be established to develop mitigation measures in order to ensure that potential negative impacts on the OUV of the property are avoided.

From 3 to 7 April 2015, a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission visited the Gibe III dam and the Kuraz Sugar Scheme projects in Ethiopia, and IUCN met in Nairobi with the Kenyan authorities on 15 and 16 May 2015. The main findings of the mission are presented below, but at the time of writing this report, the final mission report was not yet available.

- 90% of the Gibe III dam project is completed and the impounding of the reservoir is expected to take three years, during which there will be an expected 2m drop in water level in Lake Turkana. In addition, the Gibe III dam is predicted to significantly and permanently dampen the magnitude of natural flow variations from 1.2m to 0.8m;
- The Kuraz Sugar Scheme has seen slow development since the 2012 World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission, and has limited impact on the OUV of the property at present;
- No evidence of progress in undertaking the SEA was observed;
- The States Parties of Ethiopia and Kenya recently signed a joint project with UNEP on Sustainable Development of Lake Turkana and its River Basins. Implementation of this project had not yet commenced at the time of writing this report.

#### Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

No detailed update is available on the implementation by the State Party of Kenya of the recommendations of the 2012 mission to the property. However, in the mission's meeting with the State Party of Kenya on 15-16 May 2015, a number of outstanding actions was identified. Recalling the 2012 mission findings that the OUV of the property, as recognized under criterion (x), had been significantly affected due to considerable decline in species, such as reticulated giraffe and Grevy's zebra, it is noted with significant concern that no baseline data of wildlife species is yet available while wildlife populations continue to be under pressure from over-grazing, overfishing and poaching. It is recommended that the Committee request the State Party of Kenya to urgently implement the 2012 mission recommendations and to report on progress achieved.

It is recommended that the Committee welcome the increased bilateral talks between the States Parties of Kenya and Ethiopia, which led to the meeting in January 2015, and the signing of the joint UNEP project on sustainable development. The States Parties' intention to establish a joint expert panel for monitoring basin-wide natural resource management should also be welcomed.

However, despite the improved dialogue it is noted with concern that the mission found no evidence of progress on the SEA, which was initially requested by the Committee in Decision **36 COM 7B.3**. Furthermore, despite the Committee's strong request not to start filling the dam until a SEA had been completed and reviewed by IUCN, impounding of the Gibe III reservoir has commenced in January 2015.

It is noted with significant concern that the dam is predicted to permanently dampen the magnitude of natural flow variations. This is likely to have impacts on fish stocks and wildlife species that depend on the floodplains of the Omo River and wetlands along the lake's shore, thereby posing a serious potential danger to the OUV of the property. The additional 2m drop in lake levels during impounding is likely to affect the hydrology and ecology of the lake and threaten the OUV of the property further.

It should also be emphasized that further development of sugar and other plantations in the Omo Valley may have significant long-term impacts on the OUV of the property, which have not been adequately assessed to date. With regards to the Kuraz Sugar Scheme, the full potential impact of the planned 111,650 ha of irrigation once complete requires detailed assessment. It is recommended therefore, that the Committee request the State Party of Ethiopia to delay further expansion until a

detailed EIA is undertaken, including a specific assessment of impacts from the development of irrigated agriculture in the Lower Omo on the OUV of the property, using best available hydrological data of the Lower Omo, including its tributaries downstream of the Kuraz Sugar Scheme, and accurate rainfall data.

Furthermore, cumulative impacts from development in Kenya, such as oil exploration and the existing Turkwel dam, and other planned developments in Ethiopia, such as the previously proposed Gibe IV and V dams, also need to be considered. In order to fully assess these potential threats to the OUV of the property, it is therefore of utmost importance that the SEA is completed as a matter of priority as originally requested by the Committee in Decision **36 COM 7B.3**, which should include an assessment of cumulative impacts from all ongoing and planned developments in the Turkana Basin on the OUV of the property, in line with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment.

The below draft Decision may be revised when the final mission report is available.

#### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.4**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **38 COM 7B.90**, adopted at its 38th session (Doha, 2014),*
3. *Regrets that the report submitted by the State Party of Kenya did not address the requests made by the Committee in Paragraph 10 of its Decision **38 COM 7B.90**;*
4. *Recalls the significant impacts of poaching, fishing and livestock grazing on the property reported by the 2012 mission, and requests the State Party of Kenya to urgently implement the outstanding 2012 mission recommendations;*
5. *Welcomes the increased and constructive bilateral discussions between the States Parties of Kenya and Ethiopia, which led to a joint meeting in January 2015 to discuss the impact of Gibe III dam and the Kuraz Sugar Scheme on Lake Turkana World Heritage property, and notes with appreciation the intention of the States Parties of Kenya and Ethiopia to establish a joint expert panel for monitoring basin-wide natural resource management under the existing Ethiopia-Kenya Joint Ministerial Commission;*
6. *Also regrets that impounding of the Gibe III hydroelectric dam began in January 2015 despite the Committee's request to the State Party of Ethiopia not to start filling until a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was completed;*
7. *Notes with utmost concern that no progress in undertaking a SEA has been made by the States Parties as initially requested by the Committee in Decision **36 COM 7B.3** and strongly urges the States Parties of Kenya and Ethiopia to ensure that the SEA is completed as a matter of priority, including an assessment of cumulative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property from all existing, ongoing and planned developments in the Turkana Basin in line with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment, and also requests the States Parties to submit, by **1 February 2016**, the completed SEA to the World Heritage Centre for review by IUCN;*
8. *Also notes with concern that the Gibe III dam is predicted to permanently dampen the magnitude of flow variations of the Omo River and that there will be an additional 2m drop in lake levels during the three years impounding period, which may have impacts on fish stocks and wildlife species, and therefore would represent a clear potential danger to the OUV of the property, in accordance with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines;*

9. *Notes that the current 6,000 ha of Kuraz Sugar Scheme project has limited impact on the property's OUV at present, but that the full potential impact of the final proposed project and additional developments require detailed assessment, and also urges the State Party of Ethiopia to delay further expansion of the Kuraz Sugar Scheme project until a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), using best available hydrological data of the Lower Omo, including its tributaries downstream of the Kuraz Sugar Scheme, and accurate rainfall data, is undertaken and submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by IUCN;*
10. *Further requests the States Parties of Kenya and Ethiopia to inform the World Heritage Centre of any further proposed development plans that may negatively impact the OUV of the property, including the previously proposed Gibe IV and V dams, before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
11. *Requests furthermore the States Parties of Kenya and Ethiopia to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, a joint updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.*

## ARAB STATES

### 6. Socotra Archipelago (Yemen) (N 1263)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2008

Criteria (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1263/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1263/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

December 2012: IUCN mission; June 2014: IUCN/Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-WH) mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Legal frameworks, governance and management systems
- Ground transport infrastructure: roading
- Livestock grazing: sheep, goat and cattle
- Invasive species
- Fishing and collection of marine resources
- Solid waste: primarily in and around main settlements

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1263/>

Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property, as was requested in Decision **37 COM 7B.9**.

On 7 January 2015, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party to verify media reports about an energy crisis on the island that forced local residents to cut wood for fuel, posing a threat to the unique flora that justifies the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property.

The State Party replied on 2 February 2015, confirming the energy crisis but noting that residents only collected fallen wood without cutting down or damaging trees and that the Governor of Socotra has confirmed that the situation is back under control and that all necessary measures will be taken to ensure the preservation of the property's rare flora and fauna.

An IUCN/Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-WH) mission visited the property in June 2014, in the framework of the 2014-2016 Partnership Agreement between IUCN and ARC-WH for the development and implementation of the Tabe'a Programme for Natural World Heritage in the Arab Region.

Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

The 2014 IUCN/ARC-WH mission noted that fire wood collection by local residents is limited to the collection of dead wood. In 2012, a charcoal workshop was established on the island by a foreign



investor, which produced 265,000 kg of charcoal in 2014. There is a concern that this type of foreign investment induces change to the sustainable wood collection techniques traditionally practiced on the island. It is recommended that the Committee welcome the information provided by the State Party in response to the World Heritage Centre's letter raising concerns about wood cutting in the property and that the situation is reported to be back under control. It is also recommended that the Committee express its concern about the recent energy shortages on Socotra. Given that there is a high risk of recurrence of such events, these are likely to lead to increasing pressure on the property's natural resources.

In the absence of a report from the State Party, little up to date information is available on the current state of conservation of the property and on progress achieved by the State Party in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2012 IUCN mission. It should be recalled that the 2012 mission identified road building, grazing, invasive species and extraction of marine resources as the main conservation issues affecting the property. The 2014 IUCN/ARC-WH mission confirmed that infrastructure development, grazing and fishing remain priority conservation issues and also noted that tourism is creating additional pressure on fish.

Owing to the unstable situation in Yemen, the representatives of the national responsible authorities may face difficulties in addressing the abovementioned issues and ensuring the protection of the property. It is therefore essential that temporary measures be foreseen in order to ensure the continued protection of the property.

It is recommended that the Committee reiterate its requests to the State Party (Decision **37 COM 7B.9**), and that it request the State Party to submit a report on the state of conservation of the property and on progress achieved in the implementation of the 2012 IUCN mission recommendations, for examination by the Committee at its 40th session in 2016.

#### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.6**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **37 COM 7B.9**, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit its report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by its Decision **37 COM 7B.9**;*
4. *Notes with concern that the Socotra Archipelago has become vulnerable owing to the deteriorating security situation in Yemen;*
5. *Welcomes the information provided by the State Party that the energy crisis that forced local residents to collect fire wood has been resolved and the assurances given by the Governor of Socotra that all necessary measures will be taken to ensure the preservation of the property's rare flora and fauna, but expresses its concern that recent energy shortages are reported on Socotra, which given the risk of recurrence are likely to lead to increasing pressure on the property's natural resources;*
6. *Reiterates its requests to the State Party to:*
  - a) *immediately devise and adopt an action plan for the full activation and implementation the 2008 Cabinet Decrees,*
  - b) *commence the establishment of an independent management authority mandated for the management and long term sustainable development of the property,*

- c) *ensure that the road network in the property is not expanded and that the road master plan is revised in line with the property's zoning plan, with a particular focus on mitigating impacts from existing roads,*
  - d) *implement all other recommendations of the 2012 IUCN mission;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.*

## ASIA-PACIFIC

### 7. Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1981

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/154/documents>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/154/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2012: joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Coastal development, including development of ports and Liquefied Natural Gas export facilities
- Extreme weather events
- Grounding of ships
- Water quality

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/154>

Current conservation issues

On 30 January 2015, the State Party submitted the state of conservation report for the property, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/154/documents/>. The Great Barrier Reef Outlook Report 2014 (2014 GBR Outlook Report) and the Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan (2050 LTSP) were submitted on 29 September 2014 and 10 March 2015 respectively. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also received information from a wide range of other sources, including a range of Australian and international NGOs, scientists, community organizations and research institutions. In addition, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN were invited to a series of consultation meetings with the State Party and one meeting of the plan's Partnership Group.

The 2014 GBR Outlook Report concludes that climate change, poor water quality from land-based runoff, impacts from coastal development and some remaining impacts of fishing are the major threats to the property's future health. As a result of these cumulative impacts, further exacerbated by recent major storms and floods that are expected to become more frequent, key habitats, species and ecosystem processes in the central and southern inshore areas have deteriorated. Analysis confirms that biodiversity and ecosystem health in the northern third of the property is in good condition. The report further concludes that the overall outlook for the Great Barrier Reef is "poor, has worsened since 2009 and is expected to further deteriorate in the future" and that substantial reductions of pressures are required to prevent the projected declines and improve the property's capacity to recover from the effects of climate change.

The subsequent 2050 LTSP aims to address key threats to the property. It defines a comprehensive vision for the conservation of the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) over the next 35 years. The plan proposes 7 major outcomes for the property to be delivered by 2050 and sets out

concrete actions that are linked to defined targets by 2020 and medium-term objectives by 2035. The plan was subject to public consultation, including a multi-stakeholder partnership group. The plan states that adequate finance will be provided and outlines proposals for an investment framework that will be established in 2015-16 to determine investment priorities and optimization of resource allocation across all partners to ensure effective implementation. Implementation will be overseen by the Great Barrier Reef Ministerial Forum, supported by an intergovernmental operational committee, and will be guided by a Reef Advisory Committee and an independent expert panel. The plan's performance will be subject to a 5-yearly evaluation and adaptation based on the findings of the Great Barrier Reef Outlook Reports.

The State Party further reports progress towards the Reef Plan targets based on the latest water quality Report Card and a reduction in the scale of proposed Abbot Point port development.

#### Analysis and conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

The 2014 GBR Outlook report confirms the scale of major challenges facing the property, and underlines the need for a significant response to be put in place by the State Party. It is recommended that the World Heritage Committee welcome the progress achieved by the State Party towards such a response through the 2050 LTSP, including the overarching strategy for the management of the property. The establishment of such a plan through a multi-stakeholder process at the scale of the property is in itself a major technical and policy achievement. Measures that represent significant progress in responding to key World Heritage Committee requests include:

- The commitments toward restoring water quality, including the objective of an 80% reduction in pollution run-off in the property by 2025, supported by an initial additional investment of AUS 200 million dollars to accelerate progress, in anticipation of a more detailed investment strategy to reach the 2050 LTSP targets, objectives and outcomes;
- The confirmed commitment by the State Party to protect greenfield areas by restricting major new port development in and adjoining the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area, by limiting capital dredging for the development of new or expansion of existing port facilities to within the regulated port limits of the four major ports of Gladstone, Hay Point/Mackay, Abbott Point and Townsville, thereby ensuring consistency with the 2003 Great Barrier Reef zoning legislation and excluding Fitzroy Delta, North Curtis Island and Keppel Bay from future port development;
- The decision by the State Party to reverse its original decision to dump capital dredge material from Abbot Point inside the property, , and the commitments for a permanent ban on dumping of dredged material from all capital dredging projects within the property;
- Confirmation that the scientific findings of the 5-yearly GBR Outlook Report are expected to provide the basis for evaluating the plans performance, the results achieved toward the restoration of degraded areas, the protection of the property's OUV and its resilience to the effects of climate change.

The next phase of work needs to deliver the effective inception of the plan, and build the momentum for sustained implementation. A number of issues are still to be completed. A number of commitments within the 2050 LTSP require translation into legislation including, among others, restrictions on port development and its associated activities such as the disposal of dredged material. Sustained, adequate financing is central to the plan's performance. The proposed investment framework should be established as a matter of priority and should provide a convincing demonstration that the necessary investment to achieve the plan is being made and will be sustained.

Considering the fundamental importance of successful implementation of the 2050 LTSP and the work to be completed, it is recommended that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to submit an update on its progress for review by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, and taking note that if the anticipated progress is not being made this should also be reviewed by the Committee at its session in 2017.

Considering that the first set of targets of the 2050 LTSP are expected to be reached by 2020, it is recommended that the World Heritage Committee requests a report on the state of conservation of the property for review at its 44th session in 2020. The report should detail the results achieved for each target and link progress to the scientific findings of the anticipated 2019 GBR Outlook. It is essential that the 2050 LTSP delivers its anticipated results in order to confirm that the property does not face ascertained or potential danger to its OUV.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.7**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decisions **36 COM 7B.8**, **37 COM 7B.10**, and **38 COM 7B.63**, adopted at its 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012), 37th (Phnom Penh, 2013) and 38th (Doha, 2014) sessions respectively,
3. Notes with concern the conclusion of the 2014 Great Barrier Reef Outlook Report that the overall Outlook for the property is poor, and that climate change, poor water quality and impacts from coastal development are major threats to the property's health and regrets that key habitats, species and ecosystem processes in the central and southern inshore areas have continued to deteriorate from the cumulative effects of these impacts;
4. Welcomes the State Party's efforts, in consultation and partnership with stakeholders, to establish the Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan (2050 LTSP) that outlines an overarching vision for the future conservation of the property over the next 35 years and, in particular:
  - a) The establishment of an 80% reduction in pollution run-off in the property by 2025 and the commitment of an initial additional investment of AUS 200 million dollars to accelerate progress in water quality improvements,
  - b) The confirmation of protection of greenfield areas by restricting major new port development in and adjoining the property, thereby limiting capital dredging for the development of new or expansion of existing port facilities to within the regulated port limits of the major ports of Gladstone, Hay Point/Mackay, Abbott Point and Townsville, excluding Fitzroy Delta, North Curtis Island and Keppel Bay from future port development and ensuring consistency with the 2003 Great Barrier Reef Zoning Plan,
  - c) The commitment toward a 5-yearly evaluation of the plan performance and adaptation of its actions and targets on the basis of the results of future Great Barrier Reef Outlook reports;
5. Also welcomes the State Party's decision to reconsider the approval to dispose capital dredge material inside the property from the proposed Abbot Point development and the commitment to establish a permanent ban on dumping of dredged material from all capital dredging projects within the property;
6. Considers that the effective implementation of the 2050 LTSP, supported by clear oversight and accountability, research, monitoring and adequate and sustained financing, is essential to respond to the current and potential threats to the property's Outstanding Universal Value, and requests the State Party to rigorously implement all of its commitments of the 2050 LTSP, including where necessary through their inclusion in legislation, in order to halt the current documented declines in the property, create the conditions for sustained recovery and to enhance the property's resilience;
7. Takes note of the State Party commitment to establish an investment framework in 2015 and also considers that this is an essential requirement for the effective implementation of the 2050 LTSP, that should be established as a matter of priority;

8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2016**, an update on progress with implementation of the 2050 LTSP to confirm that the inception of the plan has been effective, and the Investment Strategy has been established, for examination by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, and if in their assessment the anticipated progress is not being made, for consideration at the subsequent session of the World Heritage Committee in 2017;
9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2019**, an overall state of conservation report, including a 1-page summary, on the state of conservation of the property demonstrating effective and sustained protection of the property's Outstanding Universal Value and effective performance in meeting the targets established under the 2050 LTSP, linked to the findings of the 2014 and anticipated 2019 Great Barrier Reef Outlook Reports, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020.

## 10. Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area (China) (N 640)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1992

Criteria (vii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/640/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 1 (from 1998-1998)

Total amount approved: USD 60,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/640/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

September 1998: World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Site to be overrun with tourist facilities (issue resolved)
- Several parts of the site severely impacted by floods in 1998 (issue resolved)
- Plan for rehabilitation of damaged areas required (issue resolved)

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/640/>

Current conservation issues

The 2014 IUCN World Heritage Outlook noted that the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) is threatened by uncontrolled development of tourism facilities, roads, and increased visitation. Concerns regarding air and water pollution were also noted. On 11 February 2015, the World Heritage Centre wrote to the State Party to request further information on these matters.

On 20 March 2015, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/640/documents/> and reports as follows:

- The maintenance of existing roads and construction of new roads are well designed to prevent any damage to the property. Two new roads have been constructed since 1998, of which a 6 km section lies inside the property, and a 2.09 km section in its buffer zone;
- Any construction and commercial activities that may damage the authenticity and integrity of the sandstone peaks and biodiversity within the property are forbidden. Illegally constructed tourist facilities were demolished between 1999 and 2003 and again, between 2006 and 2009, and a third phase of the demolition project will be conducted between 2015 and 2018. It is reported that at present, no hotel, restaurant or guest house exist within the property;
- Three cable cars, one elevator and an electric railway for tourists that currently exist within the property underwent a strict site selection process and were subject to Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA). These developments are causing a visual impact on 5.34 km<sup>2</sup> (2.02%) of the total area of the property;
- The property's tourist carrying capacity is stated to be 5.56 million visitors per year, and there were 3.5 million visitors in 2012. Tourist numbers to the property are strictly controlled via an automated system, which stops selling tickets when it reaches a threshold. However, during specific days of the year the daily limit on visitor numbers is exceeded. The Overall Plan on the Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area (2005-2020) had been revised and includes provisions for tourism management;
- Measures to limit air, water and noise pollution are being implemented;
- Recalling the Committee's recommendation at the time of inscription to consider nomination under criteria (x), the State Party is increasing its efforts on biodiversity research, and an animal catalogue for the property will be formulated in 2015.

The State Party also considers that although the OUV of the property has been partly affected by the cable cars and a glass elevator, it is generally well preserved, and restoration of areas where illegal developments were demolished has progressed well.

#### Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

It is recommended that the Committee welcome the State Party's ongoing efforts to manage impacts from pollution and to remove illegal tourist facilities and buildings within the property and its buffer zone. It is noted that the third phase of the demolition project will be conducted from 2015 to 2018, and it is recommended that the Committee request the State Party to ensure engagement of affected local communities in the demolition project, to report on the outcomes of this project, and to also provide further information on any remaining illegal developments, the activities foreseen to remove them, and the progress achieved with the ecological restoration of affected areas, for possible examination by the Committee at its 43rd session in 2019.

It is noted with concern that cable cars, an elevator and an electric railway, which were built with the intention to enhance visitor experience and reduce environmental pressure by alleviating crowding, are having a negative impact on the property's OUV as recognized under criterion (vii). It is therefore recommended that the Committee request the State Party to not permit any further such developments within the property, in order to avoid additional impacts on its OUV.

It is also recommended that the Committee request the State Party to ensure that no further road development is permitted within the property, and that any road development outside the property does not negatively impact on its OUV. Furthermore, it is recommended that the Committee request the State Party to ensure that any proposed developments that could impact the property are reported to the World Heritage Centre, prior to any decisions being taken that would be difficult to reverse, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

It is noted that measures are in place to manage the number of tourists that visit the property, although during specific days of the year the maximum number of visitors is exceeded. The number of tourists remains high and appears to be increasing. Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee request the State Party to submit a copy of the revised 2005-2020 Overall Plan on Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN. It is also recommended that the Committee encourage the State Party to consider further enhancing its tourism strategy, as required, on the basis of new online learning module developed by the World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Programme.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.10**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **22 COM VII.27**, adopted at its 22nd session (Kyoto, 1998),
3. Welcomes the ongoing efforts by the State Party to manage impacts from pollution and remove illegal tourist facilities and buildings within the property and its buffer zone, and requests the State Party to ensure the engagement of affected local communities in the third phase of the demolition project;
4. Notes with concern that three cable cars, an elevator and an electric railway for tourists inside the property are having a negative visual impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, and also requests the State Party to ensure that no further such developments are permitted within the property;
5. Urges the State Party to ensure that no new road developments are permitted within the property, and to also ensure that any road development outside the property does not negatively impact on its OUV;
6. Further requests the State Party to notify the World Heritage Centre and IUCN of any future developments that could impact the property, before any decision is taken that would be difficult to reverse, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
7. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, three printed and one electronic copy of the revised 2005-2020 Overall Plan on Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area, for review by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN;
8. Notes the high and increasing numbers of tourists that visit the property, and encourages the State Party to consider further enhancing its tourism strategy, as required, on the basis of new online learning module developed by the World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Programme;
9. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2018**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property, as well as on the outcomes of the demolition project, and further information on any remaining illegal developments and planned activities to remove them, and on progress achieved with the ecological restoration of the affected areas, for possible examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019.



## 12. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1999

Criteria (viii)(ix)(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/955/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 2 (from 1996-2001)

Total amount approved: USD 41,400

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/955/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2004: IUCN mission; March-April 2008: Joint UNESCO/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission; January-February 2011: Joint UNESCO/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission; March 2014: IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Mining
- Security limitations
- Development threats
- Exploitation of marine resources
- Absence of a co-ordinating agency
- Absence of a finalized strategic management plan
- Park boundaries not physically demarcated
- Inadequate financing

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/955/>

Current conservation issues

On 23 January 2015, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/955/documents>. On 20 April 2015, the State Party submitted a copy of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) undertaken for the Habema-Nduga-Kenyam road. The State Party reports the following progress on the implementation of Committee Decision **38 COM 7B.67** (Doha, 2014) and the recommendations of the March 2014 IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission:

- All construction activities on the Habema-Nduga-Kenyam road have been suspended until the completion of the EIA and until effective monitoring and strict control of the impacts of the road can be implemented. Regular site visits are being conducted to monitor compliance with this decision;
- Identification of measures required to rehabilitate areas affected by road construction is ongoing. Additional budget is being allocated to the Lorentz National Park Authority (LNPA) to enable rehabilitation;
- Resort-based management, which is the standard approach to monitoring and patrolling protected areas in Indonesia, is considered an effective means to ensure strategic monitoring of priority areas and response to management needs. A Forest Ranger Partnership scheme ensures the participation of local people in monitoring and patrolling activities;
- The management plan and zonation scheme of the property are being revised to integrate the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). The current zoning scheme of the National Park was defined in consultation with indigenous communities, taking into account their traditional

use areas as “core zones” where hunting and felling trees are forbidden, and there may be scope to expand these “core zones” to include areas that are currently categorized differently;

- No progress is reported on efforts to assess the level of poaching in the property, but it was reported that the indigenous people of Papua preserve the environment of their own living space as the source of their livelihood and respect the inviolability of the territory of other tribes;
- Further research has been undertaken on the *Nothofagus* dieback, which appears to be mainly caused by drastic climatic fluctuations. The road is not considered to be the main cause of dieback. Further research is planned in 2015;
- A number of measures to improve the management capacity of the LNPA are reported, including 38 percent increase of the budget for the Lorentz National Park in 2015 from the previous year, and the proposed elevation of its status to a higher government level, which would enable it to have higher ranking officers and a higher number of staff.

#### Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

It is recommended that the Committee welcome the State Party's decision to suspend further construction of the Habema-Nduga-Kenyam road until the completion of the EIA and until effective monitoring and strict control of the impacts of the road can be implemented. The EIA that was submitted in April 2015 is currently being reviewed by IUCN. Preliminary review suggests that, although the State Party states that the EIA integrates the property's OUV, an assessment of impacts on the OUV is not clearly made in a dedicated chapter. It appears that attributes bearing the OUV are considered as part of a more general assessment of impacts on geological, ecological and biological values. A definition of the property's OUV also appears to be lacking. It is recommended that the Committee urge the State Party to ensure that the EIA is revised to include a specific assessment of impacts on the attributes bearing the OUV, which should be clearly identified.

The ongoing revision of the management and zonation plan of the property to incorporate its OUV is noted with appreciation. While the current zonation of the property takes into account traditional use zones and areas that are traditionally considered by indigenous communities to be inviolable, the 2014 mission noted that the zonation is very patchy and difficult to monitor. It is recommended that the Committee urge the State Party to ensure that the revision of the zonation plan results in a simplified zonation that is based on a clear definition of the OUV and its associated conditions of integrity. The State Party is encouraged to refer to the methodology developed by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority in Australia to support World Heritage site managers in breaking down OUV according to its clearly defined and manageable attributes. It is recommended that the Committee encourage the State Party to consider this methodology both for the revision of the management and zonation plans and for the review of the EIA.

Some progress is also being made with the implementation of a number of other recommendations from the March 2014 mission, including further research on the causes of *Nothofagus* dieback, and various measures that are being taken to improve the management capacity of the LNPA, including a 38% increase in budget allocation and the proposed elevation of the LNPA's government level, which the mission considered a crucial step to increase the LNPA's capacity to coordinate and negotiate with other government agencies. However, the implementation of most mission recommendations is still in an early stage, therefore it is recommended that the Committee urge the State Party to continue its efforts to implement all recommendations of the March 2014 mission. In particular, it should be recalled that both the 2011 and 2014 missions identified poaching as a significant threat that may be affecting the property, partly due to the difficulty to detect and monitor poaching in such a large and difficult to access property. Both missions noted that significant trade in protected and endangered species from Papua exists, although it is currently impossible to define whether the species marketed originate from the property. It is therefore crucial that additional resources are invested in anti-poaching activities, and that cooperation with provincial level authorities is increased. Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee reiterate its request to the State Party to conduct an assessment of the level of poaching in the property, and to also request the State Party to develop an adequately resourced anti-poaching strategy on the basis of that assessment. Meanwhile, the Committee may wish to commend the State Party for its commitment to allocate significant budget for Lorentz National Park in 2015, an increase of 38 percent compared to that of 2014.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.12**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **38 COM 7B.67**, adopted at its 38th session (Doha, 2014),
3. Welcomes the State Party's decision to suspend further construction of the Habema-Nduga-Kenyam road until the completion of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and until effective monitoring and strict control of the impacts of the road can be implemented;
4. Notes that a preliminary review of the EIA suggests that the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property is not clearly defined therein, and urges the State Party to submit a revised EIA, as a matter of priority, in order to include a specific assessment of impacts on the attributes bearing the OUV clearly defined;
5. Notes with appreciation that the State Party is undertaking a review of the management and zonation plans of the property and increased allocation of budget for the Lorentz National Park in 2015, and also urges the State Party to ensure that this revision results in a simplified zonation scheme that is based on a clear definition of the OUV and its associated conditions of integrity, and to submit to the World Heritage Centre, one electronic and three printed copies of the revised management and zonation plans, as soon as they are available;
6. Encourages the State Party to consider the methodology breaking down OUV in clearly defined and manageable attributes, to support both the revision of the EIA and for the revision of the management and zonation plans;
7. Also notes the reported progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the March 2014 mission, in particular the research undertaken to identify the causes of the Nothofagus dieback, and ongoing measures to improve the management capacity of the Lorentz National Park Authority, and further urges the State Party to continue its efforts to implement all the recommendations of the 2014 mission;
8. Reiterates its request to the State Party to undertake an assessment of the level of poaching in the property, and requests the State Party to develop an adequately resourced anti-poaching strategy for the property on the basis of this assessment, including increased cooperation with provincial level authorities, as required;
9. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017.

## 15. Chitwan National Park (Nepal) (N 284)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1984

Criteria (vii)(ix)(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/284/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 2 (from 1988-1989)

Total amount approved: USD 80,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/284/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

December 2002: IUCN monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Plans to construct a road and railway through the property
- Proposed infrastructures projects
- Proposed irrigation project to divert the Rapti River (issue resolved)
- Increase in the natural rate of mortality of the rhinoceros (issue resolved)
- Pollution of the Narayani River (issue resolved)
- 33kV transmission line project (issue resolved)

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/284/>

Current conservation issues

On 14 September 2014, the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation sent a letter to UNESCO Kathmandu Office, stating that permission had been granted to the Department of Railways to conduct a feasibility study for the proposed East-West Electric Railway, on the basis that alternative options to the original proposal that crosses the property are considered. However, the letter reported that the Department of Railways appeared not to be assessing alternative options.

On 18 December 2014, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/284/documents/>. The State Party reports as follows:

- The Government of India has agreed to provide financial and technical support for the construction of the Terai Hulaki Highway and bridges;
- Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the East-West Electric Railway is ongoing, however, permission to conduct an EIA for the section crossing the property has not yet been granted;
- The construction of the East-West Electric Railway and the Terai Hulaki Highway would result in the fragmentation of the property in four places, all of which provide important habitat for key species, such as elephant, rhino, tiger, and gaur. On the other hand, construction of this infrastructure in these areas is not considered by the State Party to provide significant benefits to human populations.

The State Party also reports that a scoping study and Terms of Reference for an EIA of a proposed optical fibre project along the electric line inside the property are being prepared.

On 31 March 2015, the State Party also submitted the Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) Final Report of proposed Suspension Bridge (Balmikiashram-Trivenidham) construction at the property, which reports the following key points:

- One side of the proposed bridge will be located within the property;

- In one area adjacent to the property, 15 individual trees including sal (*Shorea robusta*) will be felled;
- Significant adverse impact on the property has not been identified but mitigation measures have been recommended, which also incorporate those requested by the Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation of Nepal;
- No alternative location was identified to be suitable for the project.

In response to the State Party's invitation for an IUCN Advisory mission to the property, the UNESCO Kathmandu and IUCN Nepal offices agreed to undertake a fact finding mission. However, due to the tragic earthquake that hit Nepal on 25 April 2015, the mission has been postponed.

*Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN*

The State Party report provided limited information on the progress in the conservation issues addressed by the Committee at its 38th session. It is noted that an EIA for the railway is underway, and that an EIA will be conducted for the optical fibre project crossing the property. For the proposed suspension bridge, it is noted that its IEE concludes the construction process will have minimal environmental impact on the property. However, considering that the property contains the largest and least disturbed example of sal forest, and is the home to the second largest population of greater one-horned rhino (*Rhinoceros unicornis*) in the world and the endangered Bengal tiger (*Panthera tigris tigris*), it is noted with concern that the bridge may facilitate access to the property for illegal logging and poaching. It is recommended that the Committee request the State Party to undertake an EIA for the suspension bridge that considers all criteria for which it was inscribed on the World Heritage List, and reiterate its request to the State Party to assess the cumulative impact of these developments and the highway development, including a specific assessment of impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, in accordance with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment. It is also recommended that the Committee request the State Party to submit the EIAs to the World Heritage Centre for review by IUCN, and to ensure that no construction of infrastructure takes place if it would negatively impact the OUV of the property.

It should be recalled that the successful anti-poaching operations in the property have recently resulted in two years of zero poaching of rhino (2011 and 2013). It is noted with concern that the proposed infrastructure developments could negatively impact on rhino and other key species through the fragmentation of habitat and the increased risk of poaching. It is recommended that the Committee request the State Party to provide an update on poaching of rhino and other wildlife in the property, in order to demonstrate that these successes are being maintained.

Considering that the proposed developments of the East-West Electric Railway, the Terai-Hulaki Highway and bridges, and the optical fibre project continue to be considered, despite opposition from the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation of Nepal, it is recommended that the Committee request the State Party to invite a Reactive Monitoring mission to the property, in order to review potential impacts from these developments on its OUV, and to provide advice on alternative options for infrastructure development that would not have a negative impact on OUV.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.15**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision 38 COM 7B.69, adopted at its 38th session (Doha, 2014),*
3. *Notes with significant concern that the proposed East-West Electric Railway and Terai-Hulaki Highway, if constructed, would result in the fragmentation of the property in four locations, all of which contain important habitat for key species, including elephant, rhino, tiger and gaur, and increase the risk of poaching;*

4. Requests the State Party to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed Suspension Bridge (Balmikiashram-Trivenidham), and submit the EIAs for the East-West Electric Railway, the Tarai Hulaki Highway and the optical fibre project crossing the property to the World Heritage Centre, for review by IUCN, ensuring that the EIAs include a specific assessment of the impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, as well as an assessment of cumulative impacts and alternative alignments that do not cross the property, as recognised under all its inscription criteria in conformity with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment;
5. Also requests the State Party to submit these EIAs and further details on the proposed projects to the World Heritage Centre, for review by IUCN, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and to ensure that no construction of infrastructure will be permitted if it could negatively impact on the OUV of the property;
6. Recalling the two recent years of zero rhino poaching in the property (2011 and 2013), further requests the State Party to provide an update on the status of poaching of rhino and other wildlife inside the property, in order to demonstrate the continued success of anti-poaching operations;
7. Requests furthermore the State Party to invite an IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to the property, in order to review potential impacts from the abovementioned developments on its OUV, and to provide advice on alternative options for infrastructure development that would not have a negative impact on OUV;
8. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017.

## EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

### 18. Wood Buffalo National Park (Canada) (N 256)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1983

Criteria (vii)(ix)(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/256/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/256/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Urban Pressure (issue resolved)
- Road construction (issue resolved)

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/256/>

Current conservation issues

In December 2014, Mikisew Cree First Nation, an indigenous community of the property, sent a petition to the World Heritage Centre (available online <http://cpawsnwt.org/news/mikisew-first-nations-petitions-unesco-to-list-wood-buffalo-np-as-world-her>), requesting to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger for the following reasons:

- Hydroelectric dams on the Peace River outside of the property are affecting its hydrology and biodiversity, and a third dam on the river, Site C Hydroelectric Dam, has now been approved at regional and federal levels;
- Large industrial development of Alberta's oil sands region, located upstream of the Park, is releasing contaminants, extracting significant volumes of water from the Athabasca River system, and disrupting migratory bird movements;
- A proposal has been submitted for an open-pit mine, which falls partially within a watershed sub-basin that flows directly within the property into Lake Claire, the largest lake within the Peace-Athabasca Delta (PAD);
- Threats from climate change are not being adequately taken into account in the management of the property;
- Indigenous communities are not taking part in the federal government's monitoring programme, and the environmental management tools that are critical to address upstream threats have been omitted from the monitoring programme.

In response to the World Heritage Centre's letter of 11 December 2014 requesting comments on the above, the State Party reported on 13 March 2015 (available online at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/256/documents/>) that:

- Site C Hydroelectric Dam underwent a thorough federal-provincial environmental assessment by an independent panel in consultation with the Canadian public and Aboriginal groups, and the project is legally required to fulfil over 80 conditions set out by the government besides to obtaining additional federal and provincial authorizations in order to proceed;
- The governments of Canada and Alberta are committed to develop oil sands with an environmentally responsible approach;
- PAD Ecological Monitoring Program was established in 2008 to address concerns about the cumulative impacts of regional developments and climate change on the delta.

Furthermore, the State Party reports that the Minister of Environment of Canada corresponded with the Chief of the Mikisew Cree First Nation regarding the issues raised in the petition, which has led to three key commitments by the federal government:

- Continue monitoring water levels and stream flow of the Peace River and in the PAD, as well as ecological integrity monitoring in the PAD;
- In collaboration with the relevant stakeholders, enhance the monitoring and research of the regional hydro-climatology and ecology of the PAD, and the effects of flow regulation, water withdrawals, and climate change on its productivity and biodiversity;
- Participate in discussions with stakeholders on best management practices for restoring and preserving the aquatic resources in the PAD.

#### *Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN*

It is noted that Site C Hydroelectric Dam on the Peace River, which will be located outside the property, was approved by the government of British Columbia in December 2014, and that the construction work is expected to start in summer 2015. However, the Mikisew have reported that First Nations have expressed significant concern about its impacts on their hunting, fishing and agricultural areas. The IUCN World Heritage Outlook 2014 identified the existing dams to have significantly altered the hydrological regime of PAD and hence, any further activities should be evaluated prior to commencement of constructions, including an assessment of potential (cumulative) impacts on Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

A Joint Alberta-Canada Implementation Plan for Oil Sands Monitoring (JOSM) was created to support decision-making by governments and stakeholders; however the Mikisew have reported that all indigenous groups in the region have withdrawn from JOSM, due to concerns about the engagement process, limited incorporation of traditional ecological knowledge, and lack of transparency. Furthermore, Alberta's Auditor General's 2014 report concluded that further work is required to understand cumulative environmental impacts for oil sands development.

It is recommended that the Committee urge the State Party to review the cumulative impacts of all of the hydroelectric dam projects, oil sands development and open pit mining on the property's OUV, taking the effect of climate change into full consideration, and to complete a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), in line with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment. Furthermore, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, it is recommended that the Committee request the State Party not to take any decision related to any of the development projects that would be difficult to reverse, and to submit the SEA to the World Heritage Centre for review by IUCN.

It is finally recommended that the Committee request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to the property to review the impact of the developments on the property, evaluate its state of conservation and exchange in more depth with the State Party, petitioning First Nation, and other stakeholders as appropriate.



**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.18**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Notes that the World Heritage Centre has received a petition submitted by the Mikisew Cree First Nation expressing their concern about the state of conservation of the property, as well as a response from the State Party;
3. Notes with concern the environmental impacts on the Peace-Athabasca Delta from hydro-electric dams, oil sands development, and proposed open-pit mining in the vicinity of the property, which could negatively impact its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV);
4. Also notes with concern the lack of engagement with indigenous communities in monitoring activities, as well as insufficient consideration of traditional ecological knowledge, and takes note of the State Party's three commitments to strengthen monitoring and management with a wide participatory approach in order to address the concerns raised by the Mikisew Cree First Nation;
5. Requests the State Party to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to assess the potential cumulative impacts of all developments on the OUV of the property, including hydroelectric dams, oil sands development, and mining, in line with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment;
6. Also requests the State Party not to take any decision related to any of these development projects that would be difficult to reverse, and to submit the SEA to the World Heritage Centre, for review by IUCN, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
7. Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to review the impact of the developments on the property, to evaluate its state of conservation, and to exchange in more depth with the State Party, petitioning First Nation, and other stakeholders as appropriate;
8. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017.

## 20. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1996

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/765/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/765/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1997: IUCN fact-finding mission; May 2004, August 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN Reactive Monitoring missions.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Illegal salmon fishing
- Gold mining
- Gas pipeline
- Development of a geothermal power station
- Forest fires
- Boundary changes
- Construction of the Esso-Palana road
- Need for the development of a comprehensive national legal framework for the protection and management of natural properties
- Decline in populations of wild reindeer and snow sheep
- Lack of management structure and coordination system

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/765/>

Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by the Committee at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013).

The State Party did not provide detailed information on the plans for hydropower development on the Zhupanova River, nor the Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), which were also requested by the Committee in its Decision **37 COM 7B.21**.

Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

It is regrettable that the State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property. The current situation with the hydropower projects on the Zhupanova River remains unclear. It is recommended that the Committee reiterate its request to the State Party to provide detailed information on any plans to construct hydropower stations on the Zhupanova River and EIAs for these projects, including an assessment of potential impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), in accordance with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment.

Uncertainty regarding the overall area of the four regional nature parks that form part of the property remains unresolved. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that Decision **36 COM 7B.21** refers to a discrepancy between two documents with information from the State Party, namely the Retrospective Inventory (2011) and the report submitted by the State Party in preparation of the 36th session of the Committee (Saint-Petersburg, 2012), which explicitly states that the borders of the Nature Parks were revised in 2010. They note that the State Party did not submit a map showing the current boundaries of the property, as has been requested by the Committee. It is recommended that

the Committee urge the State Party to clearly confirm the overall area of the four regional nature parks that form part of the property, and submit to the World Heritage Centre a detailed map showing the boundaries of all components of the property as inscribed, to ensure that all contradictions regarding the boundaries of the property are permanently resolved.

Given that no detailed information has been provided on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 Reactive Monitoring mission, it is recommended that the Committee reiterate its request to the State Party to fully implement these recommendations, particularly regarding the development and implementation of one integrated management plan and coordination structure, a comprehensive tourism management plan, and the strengthening of the institutional capacity of the administrations of the property, both in terms of human and financial resources.

Concerns regarding the decline in populations of wild reindeer and snow sheep raised by the Committee in its Decision **37 COM 7B.21** remain. As no detailed information has been provided on the current status and trends of key wildlife populations within the property, it is recommended that the Committee request the State Party to develop a comprehensive monitoring system for the entire property in order to obtain data on the populations of key species, which are crucial to the OUV of the property.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.20**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **37 COM 7B.21**, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by Decision **37 COM 7B.21**, and did not provide detailed information on the plans for hydropower projects on the Zhupanova River, nor copies of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) for these projects, and reiterates its request to the State Party to provide this information, as a matter of priority, including a detailed assessment of potential impacts of these projects on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property;*
4. *Notes with concern that apparent contradictions regarding the overall area of the four regional nature parks that form part of the property remain unresolved, and urges the State Party to clarify the overall area of the property, and submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2015**, a detailed map showing the boundaries of all components of the property as inscribed;*
5. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to fully implement the recommendations of the 2007 Reactive Monitoring mission, particularly regarding the development and implementation of one integrated management plan and coordination structure, a comprehensive tourism management plan, and the strengthening of the institutional capacity of the administrations of the property, both in terms of human and financial resources;*
6. *Requests the State Party to develop a comprehensive monitoring system for the entire property in order to monitor the status and trends of the populations of key species;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.*

## 21. Golden Mountains of Altaï (Russian Federation) (N 768rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1998

Criteria (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/768/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/768/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2001: UNESCO/UNDP mission; 2007, 2012: World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Impacts of a road project across the property
- Gas pipeline construction plans

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/768/>

Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property, which was requested by the Committee at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013). The World Heritage Centre received detailed third party information on 13 February and on 6 March 2015 on the state of conservation of the property, and in particular on the plans for the construction of a gas pipeline through the property. This information was shared with the State Party, with a request for verification and comments, on 18 February 2015 and on 10 March 2015, but at the time of preparation of this report, no reply was received. According to the information provided, the Altai pipeline was included in the scheme of future pipeline development until 2030, which was approved in August 2013 by Government Order N° 1416-r, which is available on a government website (<http://government.ru/media/files/41d48491818d6eb9f890.pdf>). It further informs about the signature, in November 2014, of a Framework Agreement between the Governments of the Russian Federation and China on gas delivery via the western route, which includes the Altai pipeline, as well as of a Memorandum for cooperation in the oil and gaz sector. Also, there have been numerous articles in the specialized press, including statements by the CEO of the pipeline development company Gazprom, that a contract between China and the Russian Federation on the provision of gas via the western route and the Altai gas pipeline could be signed this year.

Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

It should be recalled that on 30 April 2013, the State Party reported that “the design works on the Altai pipeline project have been suspended and that no further funding for the design will be provided in the period 2012-2015”. Taking note of the information referred to in the preceding paragraph, it is recommended that the Committee express its concern about the fact that shortly after, the Government of the Russian Federation included the Altai pipeline in its future pipeline development programme.

At the 37th session, the Committee also expressed concern about a decree adopted in 2012 by the Republic of Altaï to change the protection regime of the property by allowing the “construction and exploitation of linear objects as well as structures that are an integral part of the process” on the territory of the Ukok Quiet Zone. The decree weakens the legal provisions protecting the property and as such affects its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) (the legal protection being one of the three pillars of OUV).

It is therefore recommended that the Committee reiterate its position that the pipeline crossing the property would compromise its OUV, and a decision to go forward with the project would represent a clear case for inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It is recommended that the Committee reiterate its request to the State Party to make an unequivocal decision to abandon the construction of the Altai gas pipeline through the property. It is further recommended that the Committee request the States Parties of the Russian Federation and China to consider alternative solutions for gas supply projects that would not pose a threat to the property.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.21**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **37 COM 7B.25**, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit a report, as requested by its Decision **37 COM 7B.25**, as well as information requested by the World Heritage Centre on activities and signed agreements between the Governments of the Russian Federation and China on gas delivery via the western route, which includes the Altai pipeline;*
4. *Expresses its utmost concern about Government Order N° 1416-r of August 2013, which includes the Altai pipeline in its future pipeline development programme, in spite of the State Party's assurance given to the Committee at the 37th session that the design works on the Altai pipeline project had been suspended and that no further funding for the design would be provided in the period 2012-2014;*
5. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to take an unequivocal decision to abandon the construction of the Altai gas pipeline through the property and urges the States Parties of the Russian Federation and China to consider alternative routes for gas supply projects;*
6. *Reiterates its position that any decision to go forward with the gas pipeline through the property would represent an ascertained danger to its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) in line with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines, and would represent a clear case for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
7. *Also reiterates its request to ensure that Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for any infrastructure development in or around the property, including the gas pipeline and hydropower projects, which could affect its OUV, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
8. *Reiterates its concern about Decree 212 N 202 dated 2 August 2012 of the Republic of Altai, which allows the "construction and exploitation of linear objects as well as structures that are an integral part of the process" and therefore, weakens the legal provisions protecting the property, stresses that, in accordance with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines, the modification of legal protection status of an area included in a property is considered as a potential danger to its OUV and a reason for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and urges the State Party to revoke the decree;*
9. *Requests the State Party to continue its efforts to implement the recommendations of the 2012 Reactive Monitoring mission;*

10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property in particular the status of the Altai pipeline project, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016, **with a view to considering, in case of the confirmation of ascertained or potential danger to Outstanding Universal Value, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1996

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/754/documents/>

### International Assistance

Requests approved: 2 (from 1990-2000)

Total amount approved: USD 33,200

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/754/assistance/>

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

1998: World Heritage Centre monitoring mission; 2001: UNESCO/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission; 2005: World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission; 2011: UNESCO/IUCN Mission; 2015: IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Lack of adequate management system
- Uncertain legal protection
- Pollution
- Illegal timber harvesting
- Gas and oil pipeline project across the world heritage property (issue resolved)
- Illegal construction on the lake shore
- Illegal sale of land
- Tourism development
- Lack of mechanism to control waste water discharge

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/754/>

### Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a report on the progress in implementing the recommendations adopted in Decision **38 COM 7B.76**, which was requested by the Committee at its 38th session (Doha, 2014), and therefore, no updated information is available on most of the issues previously raised by the Committee, including actions following the closure of the Baikal Paper and Pulp Mill (BPPM), the developments in the Special Economic Zone “Baikal Harbour” and ore mining at Kholodninskoye deposit.

As a response to the concerns raised by the Committee at its 38th session, the State Party of Mongolia provided information regarding plans to build hydroelectric power plants on the Selenge and

Orkhon Rivers, concluding that it was premature to draw conclusions on any potential impacts on the property.

The State Party of Mongolia invited an IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to Mongolia, from 14 to 17 April 2015, to review the scope, scale and status of dam projects and to discuss about their potential impacts on the property. The invitation was also extended to the authorities of the Russian Federation, as requested by the Committee. However, the State Party of the Russian Federation did not take part in this mission.

The mission visited two of the three planned project site locations, Shuren Hydro on the Selenge River and Egiin Gol on the Eg River. The mission received the table of contents of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), chapter 8 on Lake Baikal and a brief conclusion. At the time of the preparation of this report the preliminary conclusions of the Reactive Monitoring mission have been considered by IUCN, but the full mission report was not yet available.

#### *Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN*

The Committee may note with regret that the State Party of the Russian Federation did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property.

The Committee may wish to thank the State Party of Mongolia for inviting an IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to Mongolia. The information provided by the State Party of Mongolia to the mission that according to the conclusions of the study carried out in 2014, the Egiin Gol project will not impact significantly the hydrology of the Selenge River and will not affect alone the hydrological features of the property is noted. However, the cumulative impacts of the construction of the three planned dams and reservoirs, namely Egiin Gol and Shuren hydropower plants and Orkhon river reservoir complex, may have negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property and therefore need further careful analysis. It is recommended that the Committee request the State Party of Mongolia, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, to provide all information and reports available on potential impacts of the Egiin Gol project on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and integrity of the property.

For the Shuren hydropower plant and Orkhon River project, no EIAs are available yet; however, Terms of Reference (ToRs) have been developed for the preparation of these EIAs. It is recommended that the Committee request the State Party of Mongolia to ensure that the ToRs include development of a specific assessment of potential impacts on the OUV of the property, in conformity with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment, and to provide the World Heritage Centre with copies of the EIAs, when available, and not to approve any of the projects until the EIAs and other relevant documentation have been reviewed by IUCN.

The mission noted that, according to the provided ToRs, the funding for the development of feasibility studies and EIAs for Shuren Hydropower Plant and Orkhon river project has been provided by the World Bank, as part of the Mining Infrastructure Investment Support Project (MINIS) "to facilitate investments in infrastructure to support mining related activities" which raises serious concerns about the purpose of the proposed projects.

In the absence of updated information on the other issues raised at the 38th session of the Committee, it is not possible to conclude whether the Committee's requests on these issues have been addressed by the State Party of the Russian Federation and it is therefore recommended that the Committee reiterate its requests regarding the developments of the "Baikal Harbour" and "Gate of Baikal" Special Economic Zones, mining at the Kholodninskoye deposit and the necessary actions following the closure of the BPPM.

The below draft Decision may be revised when the final mission report is available.

#### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.22**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision 38 COM 7B.76, adopted at its 38th session (Doha, 2014),*

3. Regrets that the State Party of the Russian Federation did not submit the state of conservation report, as requested by its Decision **38 COM 7B.76**;
4. Reiterates its requests, expressed in Decision **38 COM 7B.76**, to the State Party of the Russian Federation:
  - a) To develop a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) on the future use of the Baikal Paper and Pulp Mill site and its impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property,
  - b) To ensure that mining at the Kholodninskoye deposit remains prohibited beyond 31 December 2014,
  - c) To undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Special Economic Zones (SEZs), in particular concerning tourism development within the property and its vicinity, in order to identify alternatives that will not have a negative impact on the OUV of the property,
  - d) To expedite the development of management plans for the protected areas which constitute the property as well as an integrated management plan for the property as a whole, in line with Paragraph 112 of the Operational Guidelines;
5. Thanks the State Party of Mongolia for having invited and hosted an IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission further to the Committee request made at its 38th session;
6. Invites the States Parties of the Russian Federation and Mongolia to continue their cooperation under the Intergovernmental Agreement and to jointly develop a SEA for any future hydropower and water management projects which could potentially affect the property, taking into account any existing and planned projects on the territory of both countries;
7. Requests the State Party of the Russian Federation to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.

### **23. Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1995

Criteria (vii)(ix)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/719/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/719/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A



### Previous monitoring missions

2010: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Changes to the boundaries of Yugyd Va National Park
- Gold mining inside the property

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/719/>

### Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by the Committee in Decision **38 COM 7B.78**.

In January 2015, the State Party re-submitted a nomination for a significant boundary modification for the property, after its submission in 2014 had been considered incomplete.

The World Heritage Centre received detailed third party information on 6 March 2015 on the state of conservation of the property, and in particular on the court decisions on the issue of the change in the boundaries to Yugyd Va National Park (YVNP). This information was sent to the State Party for verification on 15 March 2015, but at the time of preparation of this report, no reply was received.

It is noted, in the third party information, that the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation confirmed in October 2014 its decision of August 2013 that the original boundaries of YVNP remain unchanged, and that the area of the Chudnoe deposit is included in YVNP. An appeal against this decision by the Ministry of Natural Resources was rejected in January 2015 by the Board of Appeal of the Supreme Court. -

The third party information further notes that in the southern component of the property, the Pechoro-Ilychskiy Strict Nature Reserve, a geological survey was conducted in 2011 and that tourism pressure has been increasing significantly on the Manpupunur plateau, where spectacular rock formations are found, resulting in trampling by visitors and off-road vehicle tracks causing severe damage to the vegetation.

### Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

The question of the boundary of the northern component of the property, the YVNP, has been a serious reason for concern of the Committee for several years now. The 2010 Reactive Monitoring mission to the property found that different areas were excised from YVNP in 2008, including a 19.9 square km proposed gold mining concession at Chudnoe. However, as no boundary modification had been submitted to or approved by the Committee, these areas continued to be part of the World Heritage property and the boundary change to YVNP effectively took away the protection status of this part of the property. The mission further found that the State Party had already given a license to the Russian company Gold Minerals for mining the Chudnoe deposit. Works on the mine started in 2011 and continued in 2012. As a result, active mining was on-going inside the property, in contradiction with the position of the Committee that mining is incompatible with World Heritage status. The Committee, in different decisions, urged the State Party to reverse the boundary changes and immediately halt all activities associated with gold mining in the property. However, the State Party informed that it would submit a proposal for a boundary modification to confirm the changes made to the boundary of YVNP and to add other valuable forest land. The proposal for a significant boundary modification was submitted in January 2015 and is currently being evaluated by IUCN, for consideration by the Committee at its 40th session in 2016.

Since the 2008 change of the boundary of YVNP, several stakeholders have contested its lawfulness under national law and the question has been subject to several court decisions. The latest decisions of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation and its Board of Appeal have clarified this legal issue and supported the fact that the boundary changes made to YVNP were effectively not in conformity with the law. Given that the Supreme Court invalidated the change in the boundary, it can therefore be concluded that the boundary changes have effectively been reversed as was requested by the Committee. It is recommended that the Committee welcome this decision and reiterate its previous requests to revoke the exploration and exploitation licenses already granted inside YVNP and restore the areas damaged by the mining activities, which were undertaken in 2011 and 2012. It is further recommended that the Committee request the State Party to consider making the necessary changes to the submitted proposal for a significant boundary modification in order to take into account the

decision of the Supreme Court. It is also recommended that the Committee recall its position on the incompatibility of mining with World Heritage status, and request the State Party to ensure that no mining exploration or exploitation will be permitted inside the property.

It is further recommended that the Committee request the State Party to implement the other recommendations of the 2010 Reactive Monitoring mission and to ensure that tourism activities in the property do not impact on its Outstanding Universal Value.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.23**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **38 COM 7B.78**, adopted at its 38th session (Doha, 2014),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit the state of conservation report, as requested by its Decision **38 COM 7B.78**;*
4. *Welcomes the latest decisions of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation and its Board of Appeal which invalidated the boundary changes made to Yugyd Va National Park and confirmed that the Chudnoe deposit area forms part of the national park and therefore effectively reversed the boundary changes, as was repeatedly requested by the Committee;*
5. *Reiterates its requests to the State Party to revoke the mining exploration and exploitation licenses granted for the Chudnoe gold mine and urges the State Party to restore the areas damaged by the mining activities, which were undertaken in 2011 and 2012;*
6. *Reiterates its position that mining exploration or exploitation are incompatible with World Heritage status, and requests the State Party to ensure that no mining exploration or exploitation will be permitted inside the property;*
7. *Notes that the State Party has submitted a proposal for a significant boundary modification of the property for examination by the Committee at its 40th session and also requests the State Party to consider making the necessary changes to the submitted proposal in order to take into account the decision of the Supreme Court;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to implement all the recommendations of the 2010 Reactive Monitoring mission and to take measures to ensure that tourism activities in the property do not impact on its Outstanding Universal Value;*
9. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.*

## 24. Lena Pillars Nature Park (Russian Federation) (N 1299)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2012

Criteria (viii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1299/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1299/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Threats identified at the time of the inscription in 2012:

- Necessity to strengthen the integrity within the property
- Lack of clear demonstration that the legal regime supporting the property is effective
- Lack of revised long-term management plan

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1299/>

Current conservation issues

The State Party did not provide a report on the progress in implementing the recommendations adopted in Decision **36 COM 8B.11**, which was requested by the Committee at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012).

However, the State Party submitted a proposal for a minor boundary modification that foresees inclusion of the Sinyaya component of the Lena Pillars Nature Park into the property, as requested by the Committee in Decision **36 COM 8B.11**. IUCN's Evaluation of the proposed boundary modification will be examined by the Committee at its 39th session in 2015, under item 8 of the Agenda (Document *WHC-15/39.COM/8B.Add*).

Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

The submission of the proposal for boundary modification to include the Sinyaya component is welcome. The documents contained in the proposal also include a copy of the medium-term 2012-2016 Management Plan for the Lena Pillars Nature Park. Although a number of environmental education programmes are foreseen in the medium-term plan, the plan is still lacking a strong programme for awareness raising, focused on the geomorphological and geological features of the property. It is therefore recommended that the Committee request the State Party to ensure that the new management plan, that will need to be developed once the medium-term plan expires in 2016, adequately reflects the geological values of the property and that the necessary scientific skills and human resources are available to implement the plan.

It is recommended that the Committee request the State Party to submit the new management plan for consideration by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, once it has been developed, and no later than December 2016.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.24**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 8B.11**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by the Committee at its 36th session in 2012;
4. Takes note of the submission of a proposal for a minor boundary modification to include the Sinyaya component, as requested by the Committee in Decision **36 COM 8B.11**;
5. Notes the medium-term management plan provided is lacking a strong programme for awareness raising, focused on the geomorphological and geological features of the property, and requests the State Party to ensure that the next management plan adequately reflects the geological features of the property, that form part of its Outstanding Universal Value, and that the necessary scientific and human resources are available to implement the plan;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2016**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including a 1-page executive summary, as well as a copy of the new management plan that will be developed for the property, for review by IUCN.

**25. Natural System of Wrangel Island Reserve (Russian Federation) (N 1023rev)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2004

Criteria (ix)(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1023/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1023/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Lack of Management Plan (issue resolved)

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1023/>

#### Current conservation issues

On 21 October 2014, the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to provide information on the geophysical prospecting in the marine area surrounding the property conducted by the oil and gas company Rosneft and on the planned construction of a naval base for the Russian Pacific Fleet within the property.

On 10 March 2015, the World Heritage Centre sent a second letter to the State Party seeking further information on these two issues, specifically regarding the presence of vessels within the waters of the Wrangel Island Strict Nature Reserve, ongoing construction of a military base, military training that took place within the property in September 2014 and oil exploration activities.

On 14 April 2015, the World Heritage Centre also sent a letter to the State Party of the United States of America regarding additional third party information received with regard to oil exploration planned by the Shell Oil company in the Chukchi Sea.

In its Decision **36 COM 7B.20**, the Committee had requested the State Party to develop and submit to the World Heritage Centre an effective Tourism Management Plan and an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the planned upgrading of tourism facilities. On 3 June 2014, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party of the Russian Federation reminding it of the Committee Decision and requesting it to provide the documents. None of these documents have been provided to the World Heritage Centre to this date.

#### Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

Information regarding the construction of a military base within the property and the fact that some construction works have already been carried out raise concerns. In addition the potentially significant impacts from construction works on the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), permanent presence of military personnel on the island and increased marine and air traffic could have significant negative impacts on the highly sensitive tundra ecosystem of the property and on the populations of key species, including polar bears and walruses.

Oil exploration activities in the vicinity of the property undertaken by Rosneft have the potential for significant impacts on the OUV and integrity of the property, including its unique arctic wildlife, and are of serious concern. According to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the project, which is available online in Russian, the three zones where seismic surveys and other prospecting activities are planned, border the buffer zone of the site. Third party information, which has been shared with the State Party, indicates that one of the ships had entered the marine area of the property several times. No information has been received from the State Party regarding whether potential impacts of such activities on the property's OUV and integrity have been assessed. It is recommended that the Committee reiterate its position that oil and gas exploration and exploitation are incompatible with World Heritage status, and that it urge the State Party to prepare an EIA for all oil exploration activities in the vicinity of the property, including a specific assessment of potential impacts of such activities on the OUV of the property, in conformity with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment and taking into account the high sensitivity of arctic areas. It is further recommended that the Committee request the State Party to provide a copy of the EIA to the World Heritage Centre in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, for review by IUCN, and to ensure that no activities associated with oil and gas exploration occur within the property and its vicinity if they are likely to negatively impact the OUV of the property.

Information provided by the third party on the oil exploration planned by Shell Oil, which was sent for clarification to the State Party of the United States of America, raises concerns on the potential impacts in case of a very large oil spill during exploration or production at the sites for which Shell Oil purchased leases (Oil and Gas Lease Sale 193 in the Chukchi Sea, Alaska). One of the publicly available oil spill models prepared by Shell visualizes a worst-case scenario in which oil plumes would enter the buffer zone of the property within 30 days following the spill. A detailed EIA for this lease sale has been prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management which confirms potential impacts on Wrangel Island in case of an oil spill. It is recommended that the Committee request the State Party of the United States of America to ensure that no development proceeds before the potential impacts of the oil exploration planned by Shell Oil on the OUV of the property have been fully assessed, in conformity with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment. As mentioned above, it is further recommended that a copy of the EIA of the project is provided to the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, for review by

IUCN. The EIA should be provided prior to processing approval permits for exploration activities in view of ensuring that any oil exploration or exploitation in the Chukchi Sea will not have negative impacts on the OUV of the property.

It is noted that the request of the Committee in its Decision **36 COM 7B.20** to develop and implement a tourism management plan for the property and EIAs for any planned tourism infrastructure developments, taking into account the high sensitivity of the tundra ecosystem, and to submit these documents to the World Heritage Centre, has not been implemented by the State Party. It is recommended that the Committee reiterate this request.

Considering the significance of potential impacts on the property and the lack of information from the State Party, it is recommended that the Committee urge the State Party to halt any construction works within the property and exploration activities within the marine areas surrounding the property until the impacts on the property's OUV are fully assessed. It is further recommended that the State Party invites a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property to evaluate the state of conservation and assist the State Party with suitable solutions to ensure that all planned activities within the property and its surrounding marine areas do not negatively impact the OUV of the property.

### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.25**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision 36 COM 7B.20, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Expresses its concern that the construction of a military base appears to have started within the property, with potential to impact significantly on its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), regrets that the State Party did not provide any information on this matter, as required by Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, nor a response to requests from the World Heritage Centre, and urges the State Party to immediately halt any construction works within the property until the potential impacts are fully assessed and suitable measures to avoid deterioration of the OUV of the property are in place;*
4. *Notes with serious concern the reported oil exploration activities undertaken by Rosneft in the vicinity of the property, and that one of the exploration ships is reported to have repeatedly entered the property, reiterates its position that oil exploration or exploitation is incompatible with World Heritage status, which is supported by the commitments made by industry leaders not to undertake such activities within World Heritage properties and requests the State Party to urgently ensure that no oil exploration or exploitation activities occur within the property, nor are permitted in its vicinity if they could have negative impacts on the property, taking into account the high sensitivity of the property's Arctic ecosystem;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to undertake Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) of the abovementioned activities, including an assessment of potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on the OUV of the property, in line with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment, and to submit these EIAs to the World Heritage Centre, for review by IUCN;*
6. *Further requests the State Party of the United States of America to ensure that no development proceeds before the potential impacts of the oil exploration planned by Shell Oil on the OUV of the property have been fully assessed and to submit these EIAs to the World Heritage Centre, for review by IUCN, prior to any approval of permits*

*for exploration activities, in order to ensure that any oil exploration or exploitation in the Chukchi Sea will not have negative impacts on the property;*

7. *Requests furthermore the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property and evaluate current and potential impacts from the construction of the military base within the property and from the oil exploration activities undertaken by Rosneft and/or others, as well as other planned activities in the area and their cumulative impacts;*
8. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to develop and implement an effective plan for tourism use within the property, taking into account the particular sensitivity of the tundra ecosystem, conduct an EIA for the planned tourism infrastructure development, in line with IUCN World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment, and submit these documents to the World Heritage Centre, for review by IUCN;*
9. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.*

## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

### 27. Cerrado Protected areas : Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1035)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2001

Criteria (ix)(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1035/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1035/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD100,000 - World Heritage Biodiversity Programme for Brazil; USD 30,000 - Rapid Response Facility support for firefighting

Previous monitoring missions

March 2013: IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Insufficient legal framework and protection in place

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1035/>

Current conservation issues

On 4 February 2015, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1035/documents/>.

The State Party reports that some actions have been undertaken towards enabling the restoration of the legal protection status of parts of the property. Studies on the region of the Chapada dos Veadeiros component, including on socioeconomic issues, land structure and natural environment, had been commissioned and were concluded in November 2014 and alternatives are currently being worked out for expansion and consolidation of the protected areas within the area originally designated as World Heritage and in its surroundings.

The State Party notes that the process towards restoring legal protection and extension of the current Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park is, however, receiving political resistance as it involves unresolved land tenure issues. Due to presidential elections, 2014 was considered by the State Party as a politically inappropriate year for conducting the required public consultations on the expansion of protected areas. These consultations are therefore expected to be carried out throughout 2015.

On 3 April 2015, the State Party provided additional information stating that a proposal for the expansion of the Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park was in process of being finalized and was expected to be ready by May 2015. Once public hearings have been held on the proposal, it will be submitted to the Ministry of Environment and subsequently to the President of Brazil for approval. The proposal for expansion of the national park is stated to include areas of the 2001 expansion, as well as additional areas south of the national park.

No information is provided on the implementation of other recommendations of the 2013 IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission.



### Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

The information provided by the State Party on the steps undertaken towards the restoration of the legal protection status of the areas within the Chapada dos Veadeiros component of the property is noted. However, it is regrettable that despite some progress, adequate protection of this component has not been restored. It is also noted that the State Party did not submit a proposal for significant boundary modification of the property, which was requested by the Committee at its 37th session, and that no new conservation units have been established within the property and in its surroundings to date, despite some efforts deployed by the State Party in this domain. It is recommended that the Committee urge the State Party to resolve land tenure issues in and around the Chapada dos Veadeiros component of the property, in order to enable significant progress to be made with the restoration of its protection status and the design of a revised boundary, in consultation with the landowners of the areas that would be considered for inclusion in the property and its buffer zone. The additional information provided by the State party on 3 April 2015, stating that the proposal for expansion of the Chapada dos Veadeiros component is expected to be finalized and presented for public hearings by May 2015, is noted.

It is recalled that this issue was first raised by the Committee at its 35th session in 2011. Since then the Committee has repeatedly reiterated its request to restore the legal protection status for the entire property. Despite some progress achieved by the State Party, the legal protection regime over 72% of the Chapada dos Veadeiros component has not been restored to date and the property's integrity is considered to not be guaranteed and therefore the property remains in a situation of potential danger in line with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*. In Decision **37 COM 7B.29**, the Committee considered that if no significant progress to address the lack of protection of parts of the property had been achieved by its 39th session, the property would be considered for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It is therefore recommended, in line with Decision **37 COM 7B.29**, that the Committee inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and that it request the State Party to develop a proposed set of corrective measures, a timeframe for their implementation and a Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR), in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN.

### Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.27

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **37 COM 7B.29**, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013),
3. Reiterates its concern that the majority of the Chapada dos Veadeiros component of this serial property continues to no longer benefit from National Park status, and that its integrity is therefore no longer guaranteed;
4. Recognizes the actions undertaken by the State Party to consider alternatives for the expansion and consolidation of protected areas within the area originally designated as World Heritage and its surroundings, but notes with concern that no significant progress to address the lack of protection of parts of the property has been achieved to date, and considers, in line with Decision **37 COM 7B.29**, that the property meets the conditions for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in conformity with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*;
5. **Decides to inscribe Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;**
6. Requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, to develop a proposed set of corrective measures, a timeframe for their implementation and a proposal for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property

from the List of World Heritage in Danger, for examination by the Committee at its 40th session in 2016;

7. *Regrets* that no major boundary modification of the property has been submitted for consideration by the World Heritage Committee, in line with Paragraph 165 of the Operational Guidelines and as requested by the Committee at its 37th session, and that no new conservation units have been established within and outside the property;
8. *Urges* the State Party to resolve land tenure issues in and around the Chapada dos Veadeiros component of the property, in order to enable significant progress to be made with the restoration of its protection status and the design of a revised boundary, in consultation with the landowners of the areas that would be considered for inclusion in the property and its buffer zone;
9. *Also requests* the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.

## **29. Area de Conservación Guanacaste (Costa Rica) (N 928bis)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1999

Criteria (ix)(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/928/documents/>

### International Assistance

Requests approved: 3 (from 2000-2004)

Total amount approved: USD 80,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/928/assistance/>

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/928/>

### Current conservation issues

On 26 February 2015, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party requesting information on the Las Pailas geothermal project adjacent to one of the components of the property (Rincón de La Vieja National Park).

On 13 March 2015, a response was received from the State Party, which noted that the geothermal project was located outside the boundaries of the property. With its letter the State Party also provided an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) developed in 2005 for the original Las Pailas project and a revised version of the Environmental Management Plan (2012) that was prepared for the expansion of

the project (Las Pailas II). The letter also refers to three bills proposed in the Legislative Assembly that would enable the use of geothermal resources in protected areas, including the property.

On 10 April 2015, the World Heritage Centre sent another letter to the State Party requesting further information about these bills, and recommending that the State Party undertake an assessment of the impacts of the existing infrastructure and of the potential impacts from the expansion of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property.

On 27 April, in a letter to the World Heritage Centre, the Minister of Environment and Energy of Costa Rica states that the abovementioned bills are no longer under discussion and confirms that the Government of Costa Rica has no intention to support any bill which allows the exploitation of geothermal energy resources at the property. Furthermore, the State Party highlights that the President of the Republic has formally reiterated in several occasions this commitment.

#### Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

The 2005 EIA submitted by the State Party lacks a specific assessment of potential impacts on the OUV of the property.

The confirmation of the State Party that the project is located outside the property's boundaries is noted. However, the geothermal facilities are directly adjacent to the Rincón de la Vieja National Park component of the property, and the EIA recognizes that the area potentially directly affected during the construction and operation of the project includes a small portion within the boundaries of the national park, and thus the property.

It also needs to be noted that this EIA was prepared for the first unit of Las Pailas project, which has already been completed and is now operational. No EIA was prepared for the expansion of the project and only a revised Environmental Management Plan was prepared to reflect this expansion. It is therefore recommended that the Committee request the State Party to undertake an assessment of current and potential impacts of the existing infrastructure and its foreseen expansion on the OUV of the property, also taking into consideration potential cumulative impacts, in line with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment, and urge the State Party to suspend any construction works until such an assessment has been completed, submitted to the World Heritage Centre, and reviewed by IUCN.

#### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.29**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Requests the State Party to undertake an assessment of current and potential impacts of already existing and planned infrastructure of the Las Pailas geothermal project and its expansion on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and integrity of the property, in line with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment, and urges the State Party to suspend any on-going construction works associated with the expansion of the project until such an assessment has been completed, submitted to the World Heritage Centre, and reviewed by IUCN, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
3. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, a progress report, including the above mentioned assessment, and by **1 December 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017.

### **30. Morne Trois Pitons National Park (Dominica) (N 814)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1997

Criteria (viii)(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/814/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 2 (from 1998-2001)

Total amount approved: USD 14,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/814/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Cable car construction project (issue resolved)

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/814/>

Current conservation issues

On 17 July 2013, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party requesting information on geothermal projects adjacent to the property. A further request was sent on 13 September 2013.

On 29 November 2013, the State Party provided a response confirming its intention to move ahead with the development of geothermal resources. The State Party noted that the exploratory phase of the project had been completed, which included drilling of three exploratory wells, and that the next phase of the project would include drilling and testing of two full size production wells. The State Party also provided some project documentation, including the Dominica Geothermal Development Project Brief.

In May 2014, the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to also submit completed Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) for review by the Advisory Bodies, but no reply was received from the State Party.

In a letter dated 26 January 2015, the World Heritage Centre reiterated its request to the State Party to submit the completed EIA for the two production wells, as well as the results of their environmental monitoring which was scheduled for October 2013-June 2014 according to the above mentioned Project Brief. The World Heritage Centre further requested the State Party to provide a feasibility study for the construction of the Small Geothermal Power Plant and an EIA for this development, including assessment of its potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, in line with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment.

On 11 March 2015 and on 10 April 2015, the World Heritage Centre sent further letters to the State Party requesting the above mentioned documentation. No response from the State Party has been received at the time of drafting this report.

Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

It is regrettable that the State Party did not provide the documentation requested by the World Heritage Centre. The limited information available in the Project Brief submitted by the State Party indicates that the project is directly adjacent to the property and can therefore potentially have significant impacts on its OUV and integrity. It is therefore essential that an EIA for this project includes a specific assessment of potential impacts on the OUV of the property.

Given that the State Party did not provide any of the requested EIAs, it is unclear whether such an assessment has been undertaken.

It is recommended that the Committee request the State Party to submit, as a matter of urgency, an EIA for the drilling of two production wells and the construction of the Small Geothermal Power Plant, including a specific assessment of potential impacts on the OUV of the property, and to suspend the project until the submitted EIA has been reviewed by IUCN.

It is also recommended that the Committee request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission to assess the current status of the geothermal project, the state of conservation of the property, including any impacts from the exploratory phase of the project, and potential impacts of the planned Small Geothermal Power Plant on the OUV and integrity of the property.

### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.30**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Regrets that the State Party did not provide completed Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) for the two geothermal production wells, nor the feasibility study or an EIA for the construction of a Small Geothermal Power Plant adjacent to the property, and requests the State Party to provide all available documentation on the project as a matter of urgency, including an assessment of potential impacts of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, in line with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment;*
3. *Urges the State Party to suspend the project until these documents have been submitted to the World Heritage Centre, for review by IUCN;*
4. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to assess the current status of the project, the impacts of existing geothermal infrastructure and potential impacts of the planned Small Geothermal Power Plant on the OUV of the property;*
5. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.*

### **31. Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve (Mexico) (N 1290)**

*Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2008*

*Criteria (vii)*

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

*Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1290/documents/>*

*International Assistance*

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1290/assistance/>

State of conservation of properties  
inscribed on the World Heritage List

WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add, p. 44

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

January 2011: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Illegal logging
- Growth in human population
- Tourism pressures associated with growth in visitor numbers and heavy concentration in specific areas
- Agricultural advances
- Forest fires

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

### Current conservation issues

On 5 February 2014, the World Heritage Centre wrote to the State Party of Mexico requesting further information in relation to media reports that the 2013-2014 overwintering population of Monarch butterflies in the property had plummeted to cover an area of only 0.67 hectares, compared to its 1996-1997 peak of 18.19 hectares.

On 3 March 2014, the State Party replied, noting that the issue of the Monarch butterfly migration had been discussed at the February 2014 North American Leaders' Summit, where a Trilateral High Level Working Group for the conservation of the Monarch butterfly migration was established.

On 9 and 26 February 2015 respectively, the State Party submitted a communication issued by SEMARNAT and an update on activities following the February 2014 North American Leaders' Summit, where a Trilateral High-Level Working Group for the conservation of the Monarch butterfly migration was established. On 27 February 2015, the World Heritage Centre requested the States Parties of Canada and the United States of America to provide additional information on the implementation of the measures following the trilateral agreement from the February 2014 Summit. The State Party of Canada responded on 15 April 2015. The United States of America sent on 20 April 2015 excerpts from the Pollinator Strategy Monarch Butterfly Conservation drafted on 29 March 2015.

The reports present the following:

- The spatial coverage of the Monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) population increased by 69% in 2014-2015 to 1.13 hectares;
- The Trilateral High Level Working Group agreed on the roadmap for the development of a trilateral action plan to be delivered at the next North American Leaders' Summit in late 2015;
- The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service launched a campaign to support Monarch conservation.
- Long Point National Wildlife Area, Prince Edward Point National Wildlife Area and Point Pelee National Park in Canada have been added to the "Trilateral Monarch Butterfly Sister Protected Area Network" to advance Monarch conservation;
- In Canada, Monarch butterfly is categorized nationally under "species of special concern", and a management plan has been developed;
- Projects for 2015-2016, supported by Environment Canada, will aim to directly target Monarch butterfly conservation;
- The State Party of Mexico also reports further progress in addressing illegal logging.

A trilateral meeting was held on 12 April 2015, and an update by the State Party of Mexico has been requested by the World Heritage Centre.

### Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

It is recommended that the Committee express utmost concern at the reported decline in the overwintering population of Monarch butterfly in the property. Notwithstanding the 69% increase recorded in 2014-2015, the area covered remains significantly lower than the historical peak, and the second lowest since the monitoring started in 1993.

Considering the responses provided by the States Parties concerned, it is recommended that the Committee commend the States Parties for their considerable efforts to conserve the Monarch butterfly, including through the establishment of a Trilateral High Level Working Group. It is recommended that the Committee request the State Party of Mexico to submit the trilateral action plan, once completed, to the World Heritage Centre for review by IUCN, and to report on the outcomes of trilateral meeting held in April 2015 and the upcoming North American Leaders' Summit in late 2015.

It is noted with appreciation that the State Party reports continued progress in controlling illegal logging within the property. Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.32**, it is recommended that the Committee request the State Party for an update on progress achieved with the implementation of the recommendations of the 2011 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission.

Considering the significance of the Monarch butterfly migration as an outstanding natural phenomenon and the justification of the property's inscription on the World Heritage List, it is recommended that the Committee request the three States Parties to provide, by 1 February 2016, a joint progress report on the activities undertaken, and the results achieved, to conserve the Monarch butterfly, and by 1 December 2016, a joint report on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the Committee at its 41st session in 2017.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.31**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.32**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Expresses its utmost concern about the reported decline in the overwintering population of Monarch butterfly in the property, notwithstanding the increase recorded in 2014-2015;*
4. *Commends the States Parties of Mexico, Canada and the United States of America for their considerable efforts to address the decline of the Monarch butterfly population, including through the establishment of the Trilateral High Level Working Group;*
5. *Notes with appreciation the continued progress reported by the State Party in controlling illegal logging within the property, and requests the State Party to provide an update on progress achieved in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2011 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit the trilateral action plan, once completed, to the World Heritage Centre, for review by IUCN, and to report on the outcomes of the trilateral meeting held in April 2015 and the upcoming North American Leaders' Summit in late 2015;*
7. *Further requests the States Parties of Mexico, Canada and the United States of America to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, a joint progress report, and by **1 December 2016**, a joint updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017.*

## **MIXED PROPERTIES**

### **AFRICA**

#### **34. Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Tanzania, United Republic of) (C/N 39bis)**

*Year of inscription on the World Heritage List* 1979, extension in 2010

*Criteria* (iv) (vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

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

*Previous Committee Decisions* see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/39/documents/>

##### *International Assistance*

Requests approved: 16 (from 1979-2014)

Total amount approved: USD 300,099

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/39/assistance/>

##### *UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds*

USD 50,000 from Switzerland, USD 35,000 from the Netherlands, USD 20,000 from the United Nations Development Assistance Plan (UNDAP) and USD 8,000 self-benefitting funds from the United Republic of Tanzania in 2013-2014; USD 50,000 from the Flanders Funds-in-Trust in 2014-2015.

##### *Previous monitoring missions*

April 1986: IUCN mission; April-May 2007 and December 2008: World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission; February 2011: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission; April 2012: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission.

##### *Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports*

- Increased human population
- Poaching
- Spread of invasive species
- Tourism pressure
- Grazing pressure
- Governance of the property and community involvement
- Challenging situation of community livelihoods
- Potential impact of lodge development project on the crater rim
- Impact of different road-surfacing options
- Proposed museum building at Laetoli
- Condition and conservation of the Laetoli hominid footprints

*Illustrative material* see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/39/>

##### *Current conservation issues*

On 6 January 2015, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/39/documents/>. Progress in a number of conservation issues addressed by the Committee at its previous sessions is presented in the report as follows:

- The Cultural Heritage Department was established and became operational in July 2014, and preparations for a road map on capacity building for the new department were initiated. In addition, the State Party plans to commission a consultancy for the development of General Management Plans and Conservation Plans for the cultural assets within the property, as soon as funds become available;



- Draft building codes have been finalised and preparations of a study on road strategy and a feasibility study, which will include an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to evaluate the impact of proposed road-surfacing options have been initiated, but are dependent upon funding availability;
- Lodge development projects have been relocated from the crater rim to ecologically non-sensitive areas, which have been identified in consultation with stakeholders. These projects are subject to EIAs;
- To address the negative impacts from increased livestock grazing and population pressure, the cattle improvement project has continued at the experimental farm block at Ngairish sub-village of Kakesio. Alternative land for agriculture is being sought outside of the conservation area and sensitization of pastoralists on voluntary relocation to the Jema village within Ngorongoro District continues. In addition, a local traditional leaders committee has been established;
- Following the successful launch of the UNESCO project “People and Wildlife: Past, Present and Future” in August 2013, a government stakeholders workshop was held in July 2014 to improve dialogue and the exchange of information among stakeholders, in order to develop a renewed approach to balancing sustainable livelihoods of local communities with the goals of wildlife protection, ecosystem conservation and management as well as sustainable tourism;
- On 10 September 2014, the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority sent a letter to UNESCO with the information that geothermal energy assessment and potential development activities may take place within the Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA). UNESCO replied that this proposed activity needs to be carefully evaluated before drafting specific documents and before making any irreversible decisions, in accordance with the Operational Guidelines;
- On 31 October 2014, the State Party orally informed the World Heritage Centre that during an EIA, a second set of footprints was discovered at the Laetoli site close to the original set discovered. On 12 November 2014, the World Heritage Centre met with the State Party to discuss this new discovery, the hotel development activities at the site, as well as the State Party’s plans to establish an international Advisory Committee for the Laetoli Hominid Footprints Conservation Project. On behalf of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, ICCROM then participated in the first meeting of the Advisory Committee, from 21 to 29 November 2014. In addition, the State Party reports that no proposals have been finalized for the long term conservation of the Laetoli footprints to address reported damage to their integrity, following partial re-excavation in 2011 nor for a site museum. Moreover, a feasibility study has been commissioned on the Laetoli museum project;
- Through an extra-budgetary project financed by the Flanders Funds-in-Trust to UNESCO, the site management and local stakeholders are participating in a series of workshops beginning in March 2015 to develop a tourism strategy based on the new online learning module developed by the World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Programme. Moreover, the State Party reports that a consultancy has been advertised for the preparation of a tourism destination strategy, which will examine tourism trends, map the future of tourism and develop proposals for tourism within the NCA.;
- The General Management Plan will be reviewed by 2016, incorporating the sustainable tourism strategy and management of the cultural assets therein. The State Party reports that a monitoring plan for safeguarding the state of conservation of the property is also being maintained, and that copies of relevant technical and regulatory documents shall be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies.

#### *Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies*

The creation of the Culture Heritage Department is positively acknowledged; however, assurance is still needed from the State Party that adequate resources shall be secured for its long-term operation as well as the development of general management plans for the cultural assets within the property.

The relocation of the lodge development projects from the crater rim to ecologically non-sensitive areas, identified in collaboration with communities and subject to EIAs that shall be submitted to the NCA Authority Board and the World Heritage Centre, is noted. It is recommended that the Committee request the State Party to further clarify the new locations that have been identified for these developments, and to ensure the EIAs will include a specific assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property to consider all

criteria for which it was inscribed on the World Heritage List, including ecological values and the aesthetic values of the property that justify its inscription under criterion (vii). The development of draft building codes is also acknowledged.

The progress in developing a road strategy and conducting a feasibility study, including an EIA for the road is noted. Although the lack of funding for these activities is acknowledged, it is recommended that the State Party be reminded that no development should be conducted before a full EIA, including a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), is completed, and the report has been submitted to the World Heritage Centre and reviewed by IUCN.

In addition, the State Party's report on continued efforts to improve cattle profitability, identify alternative land for agriculture outside the property and sensitize pastoralists on voluntary relocations is noted. The creation of the local traditional leaders committee is welcomed.

The collaboration with UNESCO for the "People and Wildlife" project as well as for the Sustainable Tourism Strategy is welcomed. In view of developing an overall strategy for multiple land-use, as per Decision **38 COM 7B.61**, it is recommended that the Committee encourage the State Party to continue its efforts to use the dialogue process as an opportunity to review wide-ranging governance issues, including management and conservation approaches, stakeholder involvement and benefit sharing, and to continue efforts to identify adequate options for sustainable livelihoods that do not negatively impact on the OUV of the property, in close cooperation with stakeholders and in particular the resident communities. It is also recommended that activities for sustainable livelihoods and sustainable tourism are carefully aligned with the work to update the General Management Plan.

The creation of the international Advisory Committee for the Laetoli Hominid Footprints Conservation Project is welcomed as well as the decision to undertake a feasibility study on the proposed site museum. The State Party report cites that the outcomes of the meeting are attached as an annex to their report, but no annex was received by the World Heritage Centre. A request was sent to the State Party to submit the outcomes as soon as possible. The Committee may wish to urge the State Party to submit the study to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, before any decisions are made regarding the museum and the conservation of the footprints. A detailed report on the new set of footprints discovered at the site in October 2014 should also be submitted, and the State Party may wish to invite an Advisory mission to the property to address any problems with the state of conservation following partial excavation of the hominid footprints and to advise on the immediate conservation needs of both sets of footprints, while waiting for a decision to be made about the site museum.

There is concern that geothermal energy development could impact negatively on the OUV of the property, including on its outstanding natural beauty as recognized under criterion (vii). It is therefore recommended that the Committee request that the State Party ensure that geothermal development inside the property will not be permitted, and identify alternative locations well outside of the property for any geothermal energy development.

No updated information has been provided on progress achieved in addressing the threat of poaching, especially of elephants, as well as other conclusions or recommendations of the 2012 Reactive Monitoring mission. The State Party should be encouraged to continue its efforts to fight poaching, and to provide information on their efforts to implement the recommendations of the 2012 reactive monitoring mission. Moreover, in accordance with Decision **38 COM 7B.61**, it is recommended that a clear invasive species control strategy be put in place and the occurrence of invasive plant species, in particular *Parthenium hysterophorus* be closely monitored.

The General Management Plan, which is to be reviewed in 2016, should include all the elements relevant to sustainable management of the property, such as governance issues, land-use management, stakeholders involvement and benefit sharing, building codes, the monitoring plan, the road strategy, management of the cultural assets and a sustainable tourism strategy. The updated General Management Plan should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies along with copies of relevant technical and regulatory documents.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.34**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decisions **34 COM 8B.13**, **36 COM 7B.35** and **38 COM 7B.61**, adopted at its 34th (Brasilia, 2010), 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) and 38th (Doha, 2014) sessions respectively,
3. Welcomes the establishment of the Cultural Heritage Department within the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) and reiterates its request to the State Party to ensure that adequate resources are secured for its long-term operation;
4. Notes the decision to relocate the lodge development projects from the crater rim to other areas that the State Party considers less ecologically sensitive, and requests the State Party to submit an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) on the projects including a specific assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, as recognized under all its inscription criteria, in accordance with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment and ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage properties (HIAs), and inform the World Heritage Centre of any further changes or developments that may negatively impact the OUV of the property, in line with the Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
5. Urges the State Party to urgently mobilize necessary funds to complete the initiated work on the EIA, including an HIA, for the proposed road surfacing options, including a specific assessment of impacts on OUV in accordance with the IUCN World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment, and the ICOMOS Guidance on HIAs for Cultural World Heritage properties, and to submit it to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies;
6. Also welcomes the continued efforts to maintain an open dialogue process with all stakeholders through the "People and Wildlife" project with UNESCO and other efforts to address sustainable livelihood and wildlife protection with stakeholders and to reduce the impacts of livestock grazing and increased population pressure on the OUV of the property, and reiterates its request for an overall strategy to be developed to address these issues in close cooperation with the different stakeholders and in particular the resident communities;
7. Furthermore welcomes the creation of the international Advisory Committee for the Laetoli Hominid Footprints Conservation Project, as well as the feasibility study commissioned on the Laetoli Museum project, and also requests a copy of the final report with outcomes of the first Advisory Committee meeting held in November 2014, as well as a copy of the feasibility study be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies before any options are pursued or any irreversible decisions are made;
8. Further requests the State Party to urgently submit a detailed report on the new set of footprints discovered at the site in October 2014, and encourages the State Party to consider inviting an ICOMOS Advisory mission to address problems with the state of conservation of the hominid footprints following partial excavation, and to advise on the immediate and long-term conservation needs of both sets of footprints, while waiting for a decision to be made about the site museum;

9. *Notes with significant concern that a geothermal energy assessment and potential development activities may take place within the property, given the potential of such developments to impact OUV, and furthermore requests the State Party to ensure that no geothermal energy development will be permitted inside the property, and to identify alternative locations for any geothermal development well outside the property;*
10. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit updated information on any further progress achieved in addressing the threat of poaching, particularly affecting elephant populations as well as progress made in implementing the outstanding recommendations of the 2012 Reactive Monitoring mission to the property, including development of an invasive species control strategy, with particular reference to Parthenium weed (Parthenium hysterophorus);*
11. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, the updated 10-year general management plan, which should also include the following elements:*
  - a) *the forthcoming sustainable tourism development strategy for the Ngorongoro Conservation Area,*
  - b) *the road strategy,*
  - c) *general management plans for the cultural assets within the Ngorongoro Conservation Area;*
12. *Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017.*

## ASIA-PACIFIC

### 35. Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181quinquies)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1982, extension in 1989

Criteria (iii)(iv)(vi)(vii)(viii)(ix)(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/181/documents/>

#### International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/181/assistance/>

#### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

#### Previous monitoring missions

March 2008: joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission.

#### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Potential construction of a dam (issue resolved)
- Commercial logging in areas adjacent to the World Heritage property
- Road construction projects

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/181/>

#### Current conservation issues

On 28 January 2015 the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/181/documents/>.

The following information is presented in the report:

- Work has commenced on a survey of cultural attributes in the property, in consultation with the Aboriginal community, and records are being upgraded. It is anticipated that a final report will be presented to the Committee in 2018;
- Information is provided that cultural sites are protected under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* and also under the *Aboriginal Relics Act 1975* (Tas), and that since 2010 six Aboriginal cultural heritage specialists are employed by the Tasmanian Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment to work across Tasmania, including in the property;
- A review of the management plan of the property is expected to be completed in 2015, with public comment currently being sought. A consultation process has also been established with Aboriginal people. The draft management plan is available online;
- In 2014 the Tasmanian Government started an Expression of Interest process for the development of tourism infrastructure within national parks and reserves, including the property. A total of 37 Expressions of Interest were received and evaluated by an Assessment Panel which provided recommendations on the proposals to the Tasmanian Minister for Environment, Parks and Heritage. 13 March 2015 was mentioned as a deadline by which the Minister would have invited selected proponents to submit a more detailed proposal;

- A range of issues associated with past use has been identified in the areas added to the property in 2013, including forestry and hydro-electricity infrastructure, in particular roads. A comprehensive audit of the rehabilitation requirements for these areas is required to guide future management efforts;
- Information is also provided on measures to address a number of threats affecting or having potential to affect natural values of the property, including climate change, invasive alien species, biosecurity issues, and pests and diseases.

The draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV) has been prepared by the State Party, but will not be submitted for consideration of the Committee at its 39th session for reasons described below.

*Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies*

The reported actions undertaken by the State Party to address the issues previously identified by the Committee are noted. The Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre have also made an initial review of the draft management plan.

The draft management plan and the expression of interest process for tourism infrastructure development raise a number of concerns, which require further consideration by the World Heritage Committee. A number of changes that are being proposed in the draft management plan would appear to directly threaten the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, including:

- a) A Wilderness Zone is no longer included as one of the Management Zones under the draft plan and has been renamed as the "Remote Recreation Zone". Wilderness character of the property has been recognized as a fundamental part of the property's OUV, with the proposed Statement of OUV recognizing that "Geological and glacial events, climatic patterns and Aboriginal occupation have combined to produce an exceptional landscape, renowned for its high wilderness qualities." A "Remote Recreation Zone" does not appear to adequately encompass the wilderness character and traditional occupation of the property proposed in the draft retrospective SOUV.
- b) The plan appears to create potential for logging operations in the property. It is proposed within Regional Reserves and Conservation Areas that form part of the property, enabled through the enactment of the *Forestry (Rebuilding the Forestry Industry) Act 2014*, which annulled the *Tasmanian Forest Agreement Act 2013*. The draft management plan would permit extraction of special species timber in the Recreation Zone, Self-Reliant Recreation Zone and Remote Recreation Zone and states that: "The objectives of regional reserves and conservation areas, as set out in Schedule 1 of the NPRMA [*National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002*], provide for the harvesting of special species timber. Special species timber is defined within the *Forestry (Rebuilding the Forestry Industry) Act 2014* and includes blackwood and timber of any other species or timber with particular properties as may be prescribed through the associated regulations".

Additionally, the draft management plan notes that the property includes areas classified as Future Potential Production Forest Land (FPPFL) under the *Forestry (Rebuilding the Forestry Industry) Act 2014*. Areas of FPPFL which are unallocated Crown Lands are not subject to the management plan and are managed under the *Crown Lands Act 1976* and in accordance with the *Forestry Act 2014*.

- c) Potential for extractive industry in the property appears to be created by the plan. The above-mentioned Schedule 1 to the NPRMA also states that the purposes of reservation for the areas designated as Regional Reserves include "mineral exploration and the development of mineral deposits". It needs to be recalled that the World Heritage Committee has repeatedly reiterated its position that mineral exploration and exploitation is incompatible with World Heritage status.
- d) The draft management plan also enables development of commercial tourism infrastructure, including in the Remote Recreation Zone. Access to the property by aircraft is permitted at designated locations in all four management zones.

- e) ICOMOS considers that there is as well a fundamental difficulty in creating a plan for which the cultural attributes have not been clearly defined. As a planned survey of cultural attributes is not due to be completed until 2018, the draft plan is not based on a clear identification of the cultural attributes. It should be recalled that the World Heritage Committee has repeatedly called for definition of the cultural value of the property. In the absence of such identification, and in the light of the proposed fundamental changes of direction, the management plan cannot be seen as a document that sustains the OUV of the property.
- f) The established public consultation process also raises some concerns as it is stated that “the draft plan may not be amended if a representation contradicts planning proposals for which there is widespread support”.

In addition to the above, the draft management plan proposes that consideration would be given to renomination of the property as an Aboriginal Cultural Landscape, with a possible new name for the property in line with the Tasmanian Government’s Aboriginal and Dual Naming Policy. If this were to be retained in the management plan, further clarifications on the implications for the World Heritage property, as currently inscribed, would need to be provided to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

Based on the above analysis it is recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to make necessary changes to the proposed management plan to ensure that an adequate protection and management regime is in place to sustain the property’s Outstanding Universal Value in the long term and to ensure that work on completely identifying cultural attributes is undertaken as soon as possible and earlier than 2018 if possible.

ICOMOS considers that the current draft retrospective SOUV that has been submitted to the World Heritage Centre does not include adequate detailed information on the cultural attributes for the whole property, or of their protection and management, as requested by the Committee at its 38th session (Decision **38 COM 8B.47**), and that these should be added before the Statement is reviewed.

It is also recommended that the Committee request the State Party to invite a joint IUCN/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the property in order to review and provide advice for the survey of cultural attributes, the completion of the retrospective SOUV, and the revision of the management plan, prior to any moves to finalize the latter, and to assess the state of conservation of the property as a whole. It is further recommended that the mission provide support to the State Party for the finalization of the retrospective SOUV.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.35**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **36 COM 7B.36**, **37 COM 8B.44**, and **38 COM 8B.47**, adopted at its 36th (Saint Petersburg, 2012), 37th (Phnom Penh, 2013) and 38th (Doha, 2014) sessions respectively;*
3. *Expresses its concern that substantial progress has not yet been made on the survey of cultural attributes requested since 2013, and that its completion is not foreseen until 2018, and urges the State Party to ensure this work is undertaken as soon as possible, and submitted to the World Heritage Centre, for review by ICOMOS;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to:*
  - a) *Undertake further study and consultation with the Tasmanian Aboriginal community in order to provide more detailed information on the cultural value of the property and how these relate to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV),*
  - b) *Provide detailed information on the legal provisions for the protection of cultural heritage in the extended property,*

- c) *Provide detailed information on the management arrangements for cultural heritage and, in particular, for the control of access to archaeological sites and sites of cultural significance;*
5. *Also urges the State Party to review the proposed new management plan for the property to ensure that it provides adequate protection for its OUV, including:*
    - a) *Recognition of wilderness character of the property as one of its key values and as being fundamental for its management,*
    - b) *Recognition of the cultural attributes of OUV, as also fundamental for its management,*
    - c) *Establishment of strict criteria for new tourism development within the property which would be in line with the primary goal of protecting the property's OUV, including its wilderness character and cultural attributes;*
  6. *Further urges the State Party to ensure that commercial logging and mining are not permitted within the entire property, and that all areas of public lands within the property's boundaries, including Regional Reserves, Conservation Areas and Future Potential Production Forest Lands, have a status that ensures adequate protection of the OUV of the property;*
  7. *Requests the State Party to secure adequate funding for the management of the property, taking into consideration the extension of the property as approved by the Committee at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013);*
  8. *Takes note of the proposed retrospective Statement of OUV (SOUV) that has been submitted by the State Party, and also requests the State Party to include additional information in the Statement, to ensure that it reflects accurately the cultural attributes of the property, and further requests the State Party to resubmit a revised draft of the retrospective SOUV to the World Heritage Centre for review, as soon as possible;*
  9. *Requests furthermore the State Party to invite a joint IUCN/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the property in order to review and provide advice for the revision of the management plan, prior to any decision to finalise the plan, on the survey of cultural attributes and on the re-drafting of the retrospective SOUV, and also to assess the state of conservation of the property as a whole;*
  10. *Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, and including an electronic and three printed copies of a revised draft management plan that is considered to adequately protect the OUV of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.*



## **CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

### **AFRICA**

#### **40. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2001

Criteria (ii) (iv) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1055/documents/>

##### International Assistance

Requests approved: 3 (from 2000-2010)

Total amount approved: USD 31,776

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1055/assistance/>

##### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: for a Heritage Impact Assessment in 2014: 85,000 USD: Netherlands Funds-in-Trust; for a workshop on Historic Urban Landscapes in 2011: 22,943 USD: Flanders Funds-in-Trust.

##### Previous monitoring missions

March 2004: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission; February 2005: World Heritage Centre Advisory mission on water and sanitation assessments; May 2010 and February 2015: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring missions

##### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Management systems/ management and conservation plan
- Clarification of boundaries and buffer zone
- Pressure from urban development;
- Marine transport infrastructure
- Encroachment of the archaeological sites
- Housing/ Deterioration of dwellings
- Solid waste

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1055/>

##### Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2015, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report for the property. Subsequently, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission took place from 9 to 11 February 2015 in Nairobi, due to the security situation in Lamu. Both reports are available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1055/documents>.

The State Party reports that the 'Lamu Port – South Sudan – Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) Corridor' development project is currently on hold following a petition filed at the High Court Judge at the Malindi Land and Environment Court by 146 land owners. The National Museums of Kenya (NMK), responsible for Kenya's World Heritage properties, will take advantage of this postponement to "fast track" all the pending issues with regards to the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and the mitigation measures for LAPSSET. Despite this report, the mission was told that construction on the first 3 berths of the new Lamu Port could begin in March or April 2015, and that other preparatory works were still ongoing in areas not related to the court petition. The mission confirmed that the general infrastructural developments will remain as previously planned. A new city and a "resort city" will be constructed in Lamu County, while at Manda Bay, near the Lamu Old Town, there will be a large 32-berth port and an extended airstrip to accommodate larger planes. The mission noted that works have been completed or are in progress on an administration building, police station, and power and water infrastructure. The mission highlighted the fact that the LAPSSET project is under the direct responsibility of the Office of the Vice President of Kenya, and enjoys apparent autonomy from the Lamu County Council and the NMK, which could allow potential negative impacts to arise.

The mission confirmed that, although the current preparatory works do not pose a direct threat to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of property, negative impacts could arise from a power station in Manda Bay and also from development in Lamu associated with the LAPSSET project, unless strong building controls are put in place. Living Swahili culture could be also vulnerable to major urban transformation, increased tourism and pollution. The mission was informed orally that in order to reduce negative impacts, a pledge not to construct direct LAPSSET developments on the islands of the Lamu archipelago was being considered; however, this has not been confirmed by the State Party in writing. There is also still an issue of indirect development.

The HIA on the LAPSSET project was successfully carried-out in 2014 and explored the potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures. The State Party reviewed the HIA and presented its recommendations to the NMK Board for adoption, as well as to the Kenya Minister for Sports Culture and the Arts. Moreover, the mission reported that a Strategic Impact Assessment will be conducted for the entire LAPSSET project.

While the State Party reports that the extra chapter of the Management Plan addressing threats from LAPSSET was completed, the mission was informed orally that it is still being prepared.

Although the State Party reports that the high level of community participation in the HIA process, as well as their involvement in the reactive monitoring mission, demonstrates the importance the State Party places on local community stakeholder involvement in the development and implementation of planning and mitigation measures to offset the impacts of the LAPSSET project, the mission concluded that there is a need for more engagement with local communities.

The State Party reports that an NMK surveyor was deployed to Lamu in December 2014 to map out the new boundaries and buffer zone and that these documents have been sent to the World Heritage Centre for approval; however, these maps have not yet been received, although the mission was able to review them.

The mission concluded that there is a need for stronger development controls for the property and its setting, for a stronger management system, for clarification of the boundaries and for an extended buffer zone.

#### *Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM*

Despite the State Party report, the mission team found that the LAPSSET project has not been halted, as requested by the Committee in order to allow time to fully understand its wider direct and indirect impacts, and put in place appropriate mitigation measures. Although the HIA undertaken in 2014 sets out potential impacts and potential mitigation measures, there is currently no clear understanding of how such measures might be put in place, nor how the processes of dialogue might reach that understanding.

There is a need for more information to be provided on what work has been undertaken so far and on the overall scope of the project (as some parts still remains unclear), as well as on precise details of specific aspects, such as the Manda Airport extension, the Lamu resort city, fishing plans, mangrove planting and surveys of coastal morphology. Although an update was provided orally to the mission team, an official written update is needed to confirm the overall scope and the progress made to date.

Furthermore, there is also a need to improve working systems in order to allow ongoing dialogue with key stakeholders so that potential impacts can be fully assessed and mitigation measures discussed at appropriate times as the project proceeds. In particular, closer collaboration is needed among LAPSSET and Lamu City Council and the NMK, as well as the site manager. A much greater engagement is also needed with local communities so that they are fully aware of the scope of the project as well as opportunities and developmental impacts.

Although the mission considered that the preparatory work that had already been undertaken did not impact directly on the property, there is nevertheless concern that there could be negative impacts, unless LAPSSET development is excluded from the Lamu archipelago, as informally suggested by the State Party during the mission.

Even if official LAPSSET development projects are kept off the islands, much stronger development controls and management systems need to be put in place within the property and its setting to cope with potential development associated with LAPSETT. The property boundary also needs to be clearly defined and its buffer zone needs to be extended in order to provide a robust system of control and assessment. The idea of additional constraints being put in place by a proposed Special Conservation Area for the entirety of the Lamu Archipelago, as suggested during the mission, is welcomed.

Although the State Party is proposing to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the whole project including impacts on the OUV, and this is to be welcomed, there remains a need to strengthen the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIAs) to ensure the dynamics of the coastal morphology in relation to the Lamu islands are fully respected and for further HIAs to be undertaken for individual aspects of the project. It would be desirable if the HIAs are formalized as part of the wider SEA.

Given the size and scope of this major development project, and the resources drawn in to achieve its delivery, it is suggested that the Committee might wish to request consideration be given to the inclusion of a conservation dimension to benefit the property. This could support programmes for traditional, sustainable livelihoods and traditional Swahili practices, including building, as well as oral traditions.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.40**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **34 COM 7B.46**, **35 COM 7B.39**, **36 COM 7B.43**, **37 COM 7B.40** and **38COM 7B.49**, adopted at its 34th (Brasilia, 2010), 35th (UNESCO, 2011), 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012), 37th (Phnom Penh, 2013) and 38th (Doha, 2014) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes that the February 2015 Reactive Monitoring mission had to take place in Nairobi due to the security situation in Lamu;*
4. *Regrets that, despite reporting to the contrary, the State Party did not halt the LAPSSET project in order to allow time for a full assessment of its wider direct and indirect impacts on the property and for appropriate mitigation measures to be defined and implemented;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, details of work so far undertaken for LAPSSET near the property, as well as precise details for the Manda Airport extension and the Lamu resort city, and clarification of fishing plans, mangrove planting, and surveys of coastal morphology;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to confirm whether the scope of the LAPSSET project will exclude the Lamu archipelago, as suggested to the mission;*

7. Welcomes the detailed Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) undertaken in 2014 on the LAPSSET project and its clear assessment of potential adverse impacts, and stresses the need for detailed discussion among the State Party, the developer, local communities and other stakeholders on how the proposed mitigation measure outlined might be addressed;
8. Invites the State Party to submit HIAs for individual major parts of the overall project; also welcomes the proposed Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and encourages the State Party to ensure that the 2014 HIA is included as an annex to the SEA;
9. Urges the State Party to strengthen the integration of the LAPSSET project with the Lamu City Council and the National Museums of Kenya (NMK), including appointing an NMK representative on the LAPSSET Board, and to widen and strengthen community engagement;
10. Also urges the State Party as soon as possible to put in place stronger development controls for the property and its setting; and recalls its request for the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, the new chapter of the management plan, covering the LAPSSET development project and integrating the results of the HIA;
11. Reiterates its requests made at its previous sessions for the State Party to furnish maps clarifying the boundaries of the property, and further requests the State Party to define and submit proposals for extending the buffer zone to cover Lamu and Manda islands as a minor boundary modification as soon as they are completed and approved;
12. Further welcomes the detailed recommendations of the 2015 mission and requests furthermore the State Party to take them into account in the development of the LAPSSET project;
13. Requests moreover the State Party to give consideration to the inclusion of a conservation dimension within the LAPSSET project that could support programmes for traditional, sustainable livelihoods and traditional Swahili practices, including building as well as oral traditions;
14. Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.

## 41. Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1988

Criteria (iii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/116/documents/>

### International Assistance

Requests approved: 4 (from 1981-2015)

Total amount approved: USD 686,310

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/116/assistance/>

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 110,000 (Italian Funds-in-Trust); USD 23,100 (Croisi Europe); USD 86,900 (European Commission), USD 53,000 (Netherland Funds-in-Trust)

### Previous monitoring missions

2002, 2005: World Heritage Centre missions; 2006: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission, 2014: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- No management and conservation plan
- Pressure from urban development
- Deterioration of dwellings
- Waste disposal problems
- Encroachment of the archaeological sites

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/116/>

### Current conservation issues

On 13 February 2015, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report on the property, available at <http://whc.unesco.org/fr/list/116/documents/>. This report should be completed by a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission report in accordance with Decision **38 COM 7B.50**, however this mission was postponed due to the precarious security situation in Mali. The State Party report provides the following information:

- Several measures have been adopted to respond to land pressure issues, encroachment of animals and looting of artefacts at all four archaeological sites of the property: strengthening of surveillance, recruitment of guards, clear boundary markers, renewal and setting up of signposting;
- The Ministry responsible for State-owned Property, Land Affairs and Heritage was requested to transfer the land of the archaeological sites directly to the Ministry of Culture to provide security and protection against urban pressure;
- The Ministry of Urban Planning was also requested to accelerate the procedure for the adoption of local urban regulatory measures;
- The Geographical Institute of Mali was also requested to redefine the boundaries of the archaeological sites and their buffer zones, taking into account the earlier construction works;
- Measures have been adopted to combat illegal and unsanitary occupation of the river banks that border the site.

Furthermore, on 4 May 2015, the State Party submitted an intermediary report in the framework of the international assistance project for the reinforced protection of the property. This project has as objective the implementation of the Emergency Action Plan, adopted by Decision **38 COM 7B.50**. The important points of this report are as follows:

- An information and awareness raising meeting was organized to strengthen the involvement of local communities in the protection and conservation of the site;
- Three panels have been prepared to raise awareness of the local communities regarding the management of waste disposal along the river banks;
- Anti-erosion measures have been implemented at the Djenne-Djeno archaeological site;
- A mission was organized to finalize the adoption of the urban regulatory measures.

*Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM*

The State Party has undertaken numerous efforts in the implementation of Decision **38 COM 7B.50**, and more particularly in the implementation of activities of the Emergency Action Plan for the conservation and protection of the property. However, these efforts are far from sufficient in view of the many problems and threats that affect the integrity and authenticity of the property.

The precarious security situation of Mali has hindered the capability of the State Party to intervene at site. The actions carried out are mostly of an administrative nature, oriented towards security procedures, the archaeological sites and the adoption of urban regulatory measures. These actions also include measures for solid waste management and illegal occupation of the river banks. The urban and architectural situation of the old urban fabric (earthen constructions, the oldest of which date back to the 15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> centuries), is also seriously threatened by illegal works, as indicated in the State Party report. In addition to the institutional coordination measures between the different authorities, technical measures of a general nature are mentioned: inventory of traditional practices, standards for the conservation of earthen architecture in respect of new needs of comfort, cadastral plan and stocks of traditional materials. In the face of a particularly difficult situation, it is recommended that the Committee express its deep concern and insist on the need to urgently implement concrete and operational actions in respect of all the components of the property: the archaeological sites and the old urban fabric.

Together with the measures envisaged by the State Party, the intermediate report of the international assistance project as allows to observe an initial response to the main challenges evoked. The State Party should implement without delay the different stages of the international assistance project, mobilizing additional means to do so. Other than the World Heritage Fund, the State Party has not been able to raise additional funds for the property, and more important international assistance would be welcome. In the absence of significant progress in the implementation of the Emergency Action Plan, the property is likely to respond to conditions set out in paragraphs 177-182 of the *Operational Guidelines* referenced at the time of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Before this however, a Reactive Monitoring mission should confirm this eventuality.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.41**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision 38 COM 7B.50, adopted at its 38th session (Doha, 2014),*
3. *Takes note of the efforts undertaken by the State Party in the operational implementation of the Emergency Action Plan for the conservation and protection of the property;*
4. *Notes with concern the precarious security situation in Mali that has hindered the capability of the State Party at the site;*
5. *Expresses its deep concern regarding the low level of implementation of the Emergency Action Plan in view of the numerous threats to the integrity and authenticity of the property;*

6. Requests the State Party to increase its efforts and mobilize additional means to accelerate the implementation of the Emergency Action Plan;
7. Calls upon the international community to provide the necessary support for the protection and safeguard of the property through the implementation of the Emergency Action Plan;
8. Reiterates its request to the State Party to invite a joint UNESCO/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission as soon as the security situation permits, to assess the progress achieved in the implementation of the Emergency Action Plan and the ascertained or potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
9. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016, **with a view to considering, in the absence of significant progress in the implementation of the Emergency Action Plan and the ascertained or potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

#### 42. Le Morne Cultural Landscape (Mauritius) (C 1259bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2008

Criteria (iii)(vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1259/documents/>

##### International Assistance

Requests approved: 1 (from 2004-2004)

Total amount approved: USD 17,487

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1259/assistance/>

##### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

##### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

##### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Factor identified in the ICOMOS evaluation for the nomination of the property in 2008:

- Development pressures

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1259/>

##### Current conservation issues

On 3 April 2015, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1259/documents/>, in response to concerns raised by UNESCO relating to

proposed major developments in the buffer zone of the property. The report also provides detailed information on on-going conservation initiatives and on protection and management.

- *Trochetia Development*

The site of the Trochetia development project, partly in the property and partly in the buffer zone, lies at the foot of Le Morne mountain, in the former village of Makak. In 2007, preliminary archaeological research works undertaken at the site revealed the major archaeological potential of the area and the opportunity to document further the significance of Le Morne.

The development project was proposed in 2007, a year before inscription. The State Party halted the proposals in the light of its impact on the spiritual, cultural and historical values of the landscape and for the way it would jeopardize the integrity and authenticity of the property. The State Party has continued to maintain its objection to the project.

The United Kingdom-based investors have now taken the matter to the Supreme Court, claiming their investments have been expropriated and demanding compensation. Matters of law relating to the case are due to be heard on 16 July 2015.

While the legal issues are being considered, the developers have refused to allow access to the development site, which in turn means that access cannot be gained to the mountain. This has become a major obstacle in relation to the implementation of parts of the Management Plan, and in the implementation of conservation projects on the summit, of archaeological surveys, and of the development of small scale visitor facilities.

- *Legislative and managerial frameworks:*

The report details the legislative and managerial frameworks that are in place and managed by the Le Morne Heritage Trust Fund (LMHTF) institution, under the aegis of the Ministry of Arts and Culture, as well as the detailed planning framework which has, so far, proved effective in ensuring that only projects that support the spirit of Le Morne, and which are in line with the legislative tools, are approved. In the last 8 years, 47 development applications were received and 27 were approved, including six hotels.

The Management Plan was reviewed in 2013 and 2014 and the revised version will soon be adopted. This reflects the management of the property and the buffer zone as one entity.

*Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM*

The potential impact of the proposed *Trochetia* development, partly in the property and partly in the buffer zone, on the Outstanding Universal value (OUV) of the property is noted. The matter is to be considered by the Supreme Court in July 2015 with regard to a challenge by the developers. It is recalled that, at the time of inscription, the Committee requested the State Party to refrain from approving any developments in the property (Quebec City, 2008) (Decision **32 COM 8B.18**).

It is also noted that this dispute is constraining access to Le Morne Mountain and having a negative impact on the ability of Le Morne World Heritage Trust to undertake its conservation and other work on the mountain.

In response to the request of the Committee at the time of inscription, the legislative and planning mechanism has been enforced in relation to no-development in the property and proposed development in the buffer zone. Nevertheless, the approved developments in the buffer zone include six hotels, for which no details have been forwarded to the World Heritage Centre for review.

It is recommended that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to assess development pressures on the property.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.42**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*



2. Recalling Decision 32 COM 8B.18, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes the efforts made by the State Party to enforce the various legislative and planning frameworks, as requested by the Committee at the time of inscription, and reminds the State Party to ensure that new development projects that might impact on Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review, as set out in Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, together with Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs);
4. Acknowledges the efforts made by the State Party to revise the Management Plan and requests it to provide this revised Management Plan and all its annexes to the World Heritage Centre, once approved;
5. Also notes the legal challenges that have been filed for the proposed Trochetia development, which could have a negative impact on the OUV, and that matters of law in relation to these challenges will be heard by the Supreme Court in July 2015, and also requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre on the outcome of this hearing;
6. Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the property, as soon as possible, to assess the development pressures and the overall conservation of the property;
7. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.

#### 45. Stone Town of Zanzibar (Tanzania, United Republic of) (C 173rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2000

Criteria (ii) (iii) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/173/documents/>

##### International Assistance

Requests approved: 1 (from 1998-1998)

Total amount approved: USD 15,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/173/assistance/>

##### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: 24,000 USD for the inventory of the public spaces in Zanzibar (Netherlands Funds-in-Trust).

##### Previous monitoring missions

May 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission; January 2011: ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission; September/October 2013: ICOMOS Advisory Mission; October/November 2014: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Management system/management plan
- Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure
- Development and environmental pressures
- Natural disasters and lack of risk-preparedness
- Visitors/ tourist pressures
- Housing pressure
- Lack of human and financial resources
- Lack of legal framework

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/173/>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2015, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report for the property, which addressed the requests of the Committee. A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission visited the property from 29 October to 3 November 2014. Both reports are available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/173/documents/>.

In its report, the State Party reiterates that it does not believe it has taken any actions to contravene the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and agreed upon matrix, stating that they remain under the four storey height limit (3 + ground floor) and only exceed it through an allowed penthouse. In addition, it believes that the new wing of the hotel does not go higher (in absolute height) than the Grade 1 Mambo Msiige building next door taking into account the pitched roofs that would have historically been on Mambo Msiige. For this reason, it has not halted construction works, as requested by the Committee. Nevertheless, the State Party acknowledges that the new building has encroached on public beach and states it will take steps to remediate this situation. It further acknowledges that it currently has a lack of adequate resources and effective management, not as serious however as indicated by previous missions, and will take necessary steps to strengthen management.

The mission noted the extensive dialogue among the State Party, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre over a number of years, including discussions leading to an agreed-upon matrix to be used as a guideline for intervention at the Mambo Msiige building site. Unfortunately, the mission confirmed that the new building, as constructed, was indeed six storeys in height (two storeys higher than the agreed limit), and significantly encroached on both the public beach and adjacent protected open space, and was being finished with inappropriate materials. Many interior finishings, both at Mambo Msiige and the new building, were considered by the mission to be inconsistent with traditional Swahili construction and the importance of Mambo Msiige as a Grade 1 building.

The mission also found that development pressures had increased unabated, and their management remains a serious challenge. Lack of communication and dialogue between the Stone Town Conservation and Development Authority (STCDA), as heritage manager, and other government agencies in Zanzibar, such as the Zanzibar Municipality and Zanzibar Investment Promotion Authority (ZIPA), has led to a number of projects being planned that could have a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, including the proposed Darajani Corridor Project, the proposed Yacht Club Project, the Edible Oils Project, the Malindi Fish Landing Project, and the commercial lease of Tippu Tip House.

Concerns were also expressed about the state of conservation of the building stock, the use of inappropriate materials in restoration and renovation, and the fact that the open space network in the Stone Town is under considerable threat.

The mission noted that the Urban Development Control Authority, which brings together many government stakeholders under the auspices of the STDCA, as well as the Heritage Board and Stakeholders Forum, all of which are essential to ensuring the effective and sustainable management of the property, were not operational at the time of the mission.

The mission also noted that the 2008 Heritage Management Plan and the 2010 Stone Town Conservation and Development Act were not being implemented, nor was the agreed upon Traffic Plan, pointing to an overall continued lack of development control and effective management.

Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM

The ongoing work on the Mambo Msiige project has had a highly negative impact on the OUV of the property. In addition to significantly altering the building fabric of a Grade 1 building in the town, it has

also introduced a large, non-conforming construction next door. The new building is six storeys, which is higher than allowed, according to the management plan and building regulations, set out by the State Party for the property. Furthermore, the building has seriously encroached on both the public beach and the protected open space, as well as introduced non-conforming materials to its facade (for example, imitation wood siding panels) and its interiors (for example, marble flooring in Mambo Msiige). While it is not considered feasible anymore to reduce the height of the new building, it is still essential that the damage be mitigated where possible. The 2014 mission points out a number of steps that could be taken, such as relocating the pool, reconfiguring the open space and relocating generators that currently take up a big part of it, and replacing some of the most non-conforming materials, etc. It should be noted, however, that according to published sources, the hotel has now opened for business, making it more difficult to carry out the necessary mitigation measures.

The Mambo Msiige project is symptomatic of a large scale break-down in the management of the property, in part due to the non-implementation of the 2008 Management Plan and the 2010 Stone Town Conservation and Development Act. Without effective communication and management, the many development projects currently in preparation have a strong potential to have an adverse impact on the property, through the creation of major changes to the built environment. The proposed Development Control Authority, the Heritage Board and the Stakeholders Forum all have the potential to improve the situation somewhat, but at the time of the mission, none had actually been set up and put into function. The management of the STDCA must be strengthened and in constant contact with other government agencies that solicit and approve development projects. It must also be able to have significant input into development decisions that have a potential to affect the OUV.

In addition, there is some concern about the physical condition of the building stock and the general lack of adherence to conservation guidelines in restorations and renovations by private owners.

On its own, the completion of the Mambo Msiige project would constitute an ascertained danger and as such, would be enough to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Considering the number of the other proposed development projects and their potential impacts, coupled with the lack of an adequate and effective management, and the general deteriorated state of the buildings in the Stone Town, it is therefore recommended that the Committee consider inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.45**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **35 COM 7B.45**, **36 COM 7B. 49**, and **38 COM 7B.55**, adopted at its 35th (UNESCO, 2011), 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) and 38th (Doha, 2014) sessions respectively,*
3. *Deeply regrets that the State Party did not halt work on the Mambo Msiige project as requested in the abovementioned decisions, and allowed the developer to complete the project without taking into account the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and the jointly agreed upon matrix and guidelines for a revised design;*
4. *Considers that the newly completed six storey hotel (two stories above the agreed matrix and guidelines and encroaching onto the public beach and protected open space) has a significant adverse impact on the urban form and silhouette of the property and a substantial adverse impact on its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), and notes that the State Party, itself, recognizes in its 2015 state of conservation report, the negative impacts of the encroachment;*
5. *Urges the State Party to work with the current property management to undertake all feasible mitigation measures, as outlined in the 2014 mission report, to lessen the*

negative impacts of the hotel on the OUV of the property, and to provide a proposal for this work, including a timeline for implementation for submission to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies;

6. Also notes that the State Party recognizes the lack of effective management procedures, as evidenced by the fact that the 2008 Heritage Management Plan and the 2010 Stone Town Conservation and Development Act have not yet been implemented, and requests the State Party to begin their implementation as soon as possible;
7. Further notes that the State Party has taken steps to improve governance of the property through setting up a Development Control Authority, the Heritage Board and the Stakeholders Forum, and also requests the State Party to act with urgency to establish these organizations and ensure their effective implementation with appropriate guidance from the Advisory Bodies;
8. Further requests the State Party to halt any development projects until they have been reviewed according to the Management Plan, in collaboration with the proposed new management structures above-mentioned and guided by HIAs, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
9. Requests furthermore the State Party to engage with urgency in the implementation of the approved Traffic Plan;
10. Calls upon the international community to provide assistance to the State Party to improve the management capacity and systems for the property;
11. Invites the State Party to request International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund to strengthen the management and conservation of the property;
12. Also regrets that the State Party has not complied with all the requests expressed by the Committee in Decision **38 COM 7B.55**, in particular related to the lack of significant progress in implementing the conservation plan and in reversing the decay in most of the building stock, in spite of the recommendations of the Committee over several sessions since 2007, leading to the poor overall state of conservation of the property;
13. Also considers that the serious conservation condition of the property and the lack of effective management and adequate governance, which has allowed inappropriate development such as the completion of the Mambo Msiige project, and other potential development projects, pose a serious and specific danger to the OUV of the property;
14. Further considers, therefore, that the property is in danger, in conformity with Chapter IV.B of the Operational Guidelines and **decides to inscribe the Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) on the List of World Heritage in Danger**;
15. Requests moreover the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a set of corrective measures, a timeframe for their implementation, and a Desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR), for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016;
16. Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.

## ARAB STATES

### 48. Qal'at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun (Barhain) (C 1192ter)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2005

Criteria (ii)(iii)(iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1192/documents/>

#### International Assistance

Requests approved: 1 (from 2002-2002)

Total amount approved: USD 26,500

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1192/assistance/>

#### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

#### Previous monitoring missions

January-February 2006: World Heritage Centre mission; June 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; July 2012: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Advisory mission

#### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Project of land reclamation (North Star) in the bay in front of the property, as well as the project of a fishing harbour (issue resolved)
- Physical and visual integrity threatened by the urban and architectural development projects around the protected area
- Visual integrity threatened by a project of a causeway foreseen off the northern coast as part of the global response to the traffic congestion in this part of the country
- Physical and visual integrity of the property threatened by a segment of the "N Road" project, a highway planned on the northern coast of the country whose route is expected to cross the western part of the buffer zone, at a fifty meter distance from the boundaries of the property

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1192/>

#### Current conservation issues

In 2014, the State Party submitted the Integrated Management Plan for Qal'at al-Bahrain (2013-2018). On 31 March 2015, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1192/documents/>, together with a Rapid Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) entitled "Road Connectivity Development for Nurana Island in the Kingdom of Bahrain".

The State Party reports that, due to a restructuring of the Bahrain Government end of 2014, the review of the proposed revision of the Heritage Law, Decree 11 of 1995, to include the notions of cultural landscape, historic urban centres and other heritage categories, has so far not taken place. Subsequently, no memorandum of understanding with owners of lands located within the area designated for the extension of the World Heritage property has been signed either. For the same reason, the revision of land-use and zoning regulations which are subcategories of the Physical Planning Legislation of 1994 has not been done in late 2014, as foreseen.

The State Party reports that, following the decision to abandon the N-Road project, alternative options, other than the bridge option approved by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session, are necessary in the short term to connect the Nurana Island to the mainland and are being explored. Studies on the speed of reclamation development along the Northern coast of the county have shown that the connection points, which are necessary to build the bridge, can only be reached around 2025. The development of Nurana Island therefore requires a temporary access solution. Two alternatives have been identified: a causeway/bridge and tunnel to cross the visual corridor towards the East (Option 1) and a causeway/bridge and on-land corridor to connect the Nurana Island to the coast, on the Western side of the property (Option 2). The Bahrain Authority for Culture and Antiquities (BACA) considered that both options could have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property and while being elaborated as temporary solutions, could become permanent. The BACA therefore requested that a Rapid HIA be carried out by Manara Development (the developer of Nuarana Island). The purpose of the HIA is to seek an in-principle agreement from the World Heritage Centre to proceed with the proposals.

#### *Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM*

Based on the outcomes of the Rapid HIA, the BACA considers that both options are acceptable in principle but with the condition that further studies be carried out in order to ensure that there would not be any impact on the OUV of the property. However, the HIA is based on two options that are only in the preliminary design stage and that there was insufficient baseline data to fully assess potential impacts on the heritage components, particularly on the Dammam aquifer and the property's archaeology or in terms of noise and visual intrusion.

The Rapid HIA concludes that the Dammam aquifer, the principal aquifer in Bahrain, could be damaged by both access options, which would affect the OUV of the property. It also shows that both options would have an impact on the buffer zone where unexcavated in-land and potential underwater archaeological areas could be affected. Both options would also require heavy works, which could affect the fragile setting in which these would be implemented, as well as the local communities (villages' inhabitants, fishermen, property's visitors, etc.). Finally, both options would have an impact on the views from the property, especially towards the sea in the case of Option 1.

The issues raised by the Rapid HIA require that further accurate studies be carried out to conclusively assess the impacts of both options to connect the Nurana Island to the mainland. These studies include soil investigations, geophysical and archaeological surveys, as well as noise and visual impact. These studies should be completed to inform the detailed design development of both options and then the HIA revised so the impacts of the proposals can be comprehensively assessed in relation to the OUV. No decision on the project should be made before this process is completed and evaluated by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. At this stage, on the basis of the available information, it is not possible to recommend in principle approval.

The Ministry of Culture and BACA deployed a lot of effort to elaborate and implement a detailed and comprehensive management and conservation plan of the property. However, this needs to be empowered by a long-term development plan of the area where the property is located to guarantee that the latter's OUV would be preserved. To that end, the urban context of the property could justify using the holistic and integrated approach carried by the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. A technical meeting involving all the actual and potential future stakeholders may also be useful once the results of the complementary studies recommended by the Rapid HIA are released.

#### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.48**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions 37 COM 7B.47 and 38 COM 8B.49, adopted at the 37th (Phnom Penh, 2013) and 38th (Doha, 2014) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the completion and implementation of the comprehensive management and conservation plan;*

4. Also notes the delay in the reviewing of the proposed revision of the Heritage Law, as well as in the signature of memoranda of understanding with the owners of lands located within the area designated for the extension of the World Heritage property, and in the revision of land-use and zoning regulations and requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with information on these matters as soon as progress has been made;
5. Takes note of the results of the Rapid Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) on the road connectivity development for Nurana Island and in light of potential negative impact, also requests that the HIA is reviewed on the basis of additional studies recommended by this Rapid HIA to inform the development of design options and submitted to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, prior to any decision concerning the option to connect Nurana Island to the mainland;
6. Expresses its concern regarding the important pressure put on the property by the urban development taking place around it and invites the State Party to assess the impacts of proposed long-term development of the setting of the property, including through the approach carried by the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape;
7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017.

## 51. Hatra (Iraq) (C 277rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1985

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/277/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 1 (from 1999-1999)

Total amount approved: USD 3,500

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/277/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Major looting of Iraqi archaeological sites (issue resolved)
- Destruction and damage due to the armed conflict

*Illustrative material* see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/277/>

Current conservation issues

On 12 April 2015, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report for the four World Heritage properties in Iraq, as well as for ten of the eleven sites included in the country's Tentative List. The report is available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/277/documents/>.

The State Party reports that, between 2011 and 2013, the responsible authorities carried out conservation work in the central area of the ancient city and the zone of temples, and also developed a parking square and some green spaces. These works were favoured by a calm situation at the site. The State Party also reports that the responsible authorities have not been able to access the property since it has been occupied by ISIL and turned into a military camp, and that the only information available is the one provided by media.

Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM

Other sources report that parts of the site, and notably sculptures on the walls, have been destroyed by armed groups, using weapons, explosives and bulldozers. This information has been communicated via Internet (either through articles or videos) or e-mail messages or orally by reliable experts, representatives of archaeological missions or the responsible authorities themselves who confirm that the property has been damaged but are not able to define the scale of destruction.

On 17 July 2014, an expert meeting held at UNESCO Headquarters led to the adoption of an Emergency Response Action Plan for the Safeguarding of Iraq's Cultural Heritage (also see Part I of Document WHC-15/39.COM/7). The content of this action plan should be taken into consideration even if the prevailing situation makes its implementation difficult.

The confirmation by the State Party of the occupation of the property by ISIL and the absence of detailed information about the situation at the site raise a very high concern that the conditions to ensure the conservation and protection of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property are not optimal anymore. The property being also threatened by both ascertained and potential danger, in accordance with paragraphs 177 to 179 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the World Heritage Committee may wish to consider inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

It would be essential, as soon as the security conditions permit, that the responsible authorities carry out a rapid assessment of the state of conservation of the property and submit the results of this assessment to the World Heritage Centre, prior to any action on the ground.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.51**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **25 BUR V.281**, adopted by the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee at its 25th session (UNESCO, 2001),
3. Commends the State Party for its efforts to ensure the protection of the property in spite of the difficult prevailing situation;
4. Expresses its great concern about the absence of information on the state of conservation of the property and requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed of the evolution of the situation on the ground;
5. Considers that the optimal conditions are not present anymore to ensure the conservation and protection of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property and that it is threatened by both ascertained and potential danger, in accordance with paragraphs 177 to 179 of the Operational Guidelines;



6. **Decides to inscribe Hatra (Iraq) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;**
7. *Also requests the State Party, as soon as it is feasible and in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a set of corrective measures and a timeframe for their implementation, as well as a Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR);*
8. *Further requests the State Party, as soon as the security conditions on the ground allow the responsible authorities to visit the site, to carry out a rapid assessment of the state of conservation of the property and to submit the results of this assessment to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, prior to any action on the ground;*
9. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2016, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.*

## 52. Petra (Jordan) (C 326)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1985

Criteria (i)(iii)(iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/326/documents/>

### International Assistance

Requests approved: 4 (from 1987-2010)

Total amount approved: USD 167,079

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/326/assistance/>

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided: USD 1 million from the Italian Fund-in-Trust

### Previous monitoring missions

September 2000: ICOMOS mission; March 2004: UNESCO mission; 2009: UNESCO technical expert missions; December 2010: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission.

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Heavy flooding in 1996 (issue resolved)
- Insufficiency or non-existence of sewage disposal facilities (issue resolved)
- Insufficient conservation of antiquities (issue resolved)
- Impact of new hotels under construction in the vicinity of the World Heritage site of Petra
- Uncontrolled development of villages in the vicinity of the site
- Proliferation of shops
- Construction or road widening projects leading to the site
- Other encroachments upon the integrity of the site
- Lack of management plan for the property

- Lack of clear boundary delimitations

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

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2015, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report and on 19 March 2015, additional supporting documents, which are available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/326/documents/>. The report and documents provide detailed information on the on-going wide range of initiatives for the conservation, protection and management of the property. The report addresses in detail the concerns of the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013). At the invitation of the State Party, the World Heritage Centre undertook a mission to Petra, in February 2015, to discuss the progress achieved and the pending needs.

- *Buffer Zone*: the State Party undertook a comprehensive study to define the buffer zone for the property, which includes a Protected Area, subdivided in four out of which a No-Development Zone, in addition to five areas which include Eco-Tourism, Agricultural, Eco-Overlooking, Viewing Nodes, and a Petra Archaeological Park (PAP) Special Management Zone. Specific protection resources and legal instruments were allocated to each area. Consultations with local communities are underway to finalize the legal adoption of all the provisions related to the Buffer Zone.
- *Disaster Risk Reduction Plan*: in a UNDP supported project, "International Risk Assessment for the Petra Development and Tourism Region" (2013), the risks associated with potential earthquakes, flash floods, landslides and rock fall were assessed. In 2014, a Flash Flood Study was carried out following which an Early Warning System (EWS) for flash floods was considered a priority. The Siq Stability Monitoring Project implemented by UNESCO Amman has allowed the installation of monitoring reference points throughout the Siq to ensure accurate measurements and allow risk mitigation decisions. The project provided GIS training for PAP and Department of Antiquities (DoA) surveyors. The Siq stability is a major concern and rock falling incidents continue.
- The Petra Conservation Action Plan, adopted in December 2014, annexed to the report, has been developed building on the numerous studies undertaken on Petra in the past years; it sets the strategies and the priorities to conservation needs in particular with regards to imminent risks, and outlines the limited financial resources available to address them. The Petra Development and Tourism Region Authority (PDTRA), the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities (MoTA) and the DoA have strengthened working relationships and launched a series of initiatives inserted within the (PAP) Operational Priorities Plan (2010-2015). The Site Management Plan will be developed with the support of UNESCO Amman.
- A Visitor management strategy was developed as a reference to articulate actions on the core functional areas of the Park, with a particular focus on conservation, protection, visitor experience, services, facility operations, maintenance and management, while New bylaws were adopted in July 2014 setting the legal framework for the PAP operations, related to governance, protection, and tourism management, and a division of roles and responsibilities between PAP and DoA.
- The State Party also provides information on capacity building and training initiatives, newly recruited staff.

The State Party reports on various other matters, such as: Archaeological database and regulations for the archaeological investigations, conservation works and studies at the Temple of Winged Lions, the ad-Deir Plateau, and the Wadi al-Jarra, awareness raising for better animal treatment, the planned construction of the Petra Back Road Project including an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), the Petra Museum Project, the Um Sayhoun Local Development Centre, and a study on the Um Sayhoun community, as well as a tourism and local development project entitled Petra Cultural Heritage Village Phase 2: Conceptual Master Plan.

Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM

The State Party has achieved considerable progress in addressing the World Heritage Committee concerns at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013). In particular, the State Party has adopted a

conservation action plan, which is being reviewed by the Advisory Bodies. It has also improved the coordination between PDTRA and DoA.

Nevertheless, and in view of the important challenges and tasks that lie ahead, there is still need to develop a comprehensive Management Plan for the property, including priority capacity building needs with the necessary resources to address them, and ensure the official endorsement of this Management Plan by the governing bodies. The visitor management strategy, including regulations for public use, in consideration of the carrying capacity of the property, is still awaited.

The efforts of the State Party to envisage the challenges faced by Petra in an integrated manner, at the level of the territory taking into account social and economic concerns, are important. Indeed, the scale of the PAP entails an integrated regional plan and sustainable local development policies. It is recommended that the Committee encourage the State Party to pursue this integrated approach, to opt for in depth-feasibility studies and projects prior to implementation, and to urgently allocate appropriate resources to an equitable solution for the livelihood of the Um Sayhoun Community, which was evicted from the property.

The buffer zone and its related local regulations shall be submitted in their final version and in accordance with the required format to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies. Special attention should be given to refrain from building new constructions within the No-Development Zone, as is the case today with the planned extension of a Hotel, according to information that the World Heritage Centre was given by the State Party during its February 2015 mission, and to avoid urban encroachment, as observed by the mission in the Um Sahyoun Village. It is recommended that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to refrain from further constructions in the vicinity of the site, and submit all final construction and development plans prior to launching any construction procedures, in particular with regards to the final construction plans of the Petra Back Road Project and the Petra Museum.

### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.52**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **37 COM 7B.50**, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013),*
3. *Notes the considerable progress made by the State Party to improve the conservation and management of the property in response to the concerns voiced by the World Heritage Committee, and in particular the adoption of the Petra conservation action plan;*
4. *Reiterates its request to pursue the progress made to manage the property and submit a Management Plan for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, while ensuring synergies with existing planning initiatives (e.g. the 2015 Conservation Action Plan and the Petra Archaeological Park Operational Priorities Plan of 2010-2015), and undertake the necessary adoption process to ensure its effective enforcement;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to sustain its efforts in creating opportunities for sustainable local development around the property;*
6. *Urges the State Party to allocate the necessary resources to ensure that sustainable livelihood solutions are provided for the local communities displaced from the World Heritage property;*
7. *Requests the State Party to sustain on-going efforts, with particular attention to the following:*

- a) Pursue the progress made to adopt the buffer zone and develop adequate regulatory measures to ensure its protection, and submit a minor boundary modification proposal by **1 February 2016**, for review by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016,
  - b) Strictly control urban encroachment by refraining from building new constructions in the planned No-Development area of the buffer zone,
  - c) Pursue the efforts to address Disaster Risk Reduction and secure the necessary resources for its implementation, prioritizing the stabilization of the Siq;
8. Also requests the State Party to submit the final construction plans for the Petra Back Road and the Petra Museum Projects for approval by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies prior to the start of the works;
9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017.

#### 54. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1984

Criteria (iii)(vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/299/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 5 (from 1986-2001)

Total amount approved: USD 35,667

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/299/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 19,173 (1997-2001) for the International Safeguarding Campaign

Previous monitoring missions

2004: Evaluation mission by the UNESCO Office in Beirut; September 2006: UNESCO mission following the 2006 summer conflict; February 2009: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission; September 2012: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Need for an international safeguarding campaign (issue resolved)
- Construction of a tourist complex (land fill) (issue resolved)
- Construction project of a large fish market (issue resolved)
- Construction project of a coastal motorway (issue resolved)
- Uncontrolled construction (issue resolved)
- Project to build a new tourist marina (issue resolved)
- Road construction project (issue resolved)
- Need for a Urban Master Plan for the city

- Lack of management mechanism (including legislation)
- Important and often uncontrolled urban development
- Public works, tourism developments
- Absence of a management and conservation plan
- Insufficient maintenance
- Major highway development near the property and the redevelopment of the port

*Illustrative material* see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/299/>

*Current conservation issues*

On 31 March 2015, the State Party submitted a report together with associated documents and an updated 'Action Plan' for the property. This report is available at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/299/documents/> and reports the following:

- The General Directorate of Antiquities (DGA), within the Lebanese Ministry of Culture, signed a partnership agreement with the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities and the Tunisian Heritage Institute, in December 2014 regarding the 'ARCHEOMEDSITES' project, which is funded by the European Union. A range of conservation activities, including development of a management plan for the property, preparation of a GIS archaeological map of Tyre, finalisation of a marine protection zone, education and training, as well as resolution of the boundary and buffer zone will all be addressed within the scope of this project.
- A number of national and international experts have been recruited to undertake analysis for the preparation of the management plan, including: consideration of the archaeological context, legal analysis and culture-based SWOT (Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis. A workshop was held on 21 March 2015 to prepare the strategy for the management plan.
- The Saida-Naqoura Highway archaeological investigation project has been delayed, but will commence in April 2015.
- A concept strategy regarding traffic in Tyre which forms part of an extensive report: 'Detailed Engineering Studies – Phase II for Urban Development and Conservation in Tyre' was also provided.
- Discussions have been held regarding mosaic conservation and related methodologies and the State Party reports that the results from a forthcoming expert workshop in April 2015 will be sent to the World Heritage Centre.
- A comprehensive report will be submitted in response to the Committee's decision to refer the request for a minor boundary modification and buffer zone to the State Party (Decision **37 COM 8B.45**), following preparation of the forthcoming management plan.

*Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM*

The State Party report and the revised Action Plan indicate that significant progress has occurred since the 2012 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission with a number of the conservation issues addressed by the Committee at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013), as follows:

- Ensure coordination within the Baalbek and Tyre Archaeological Project (BTAP) and cooperation between the General Directorate of Antiquities (DGA), the "Cultural Heritage and Urban Development" (CHUD), the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to effectively monitor the design and implementation of the BATP;
- Recruitment of a number of national and international experts, including a GIS expert responsible for the Archaeological Map of Tyre and a related property database;
- Recruitment of archaeologists, field training and deployment of archaeology teams, thereby substantially strengthening the human capacity of the DGA;
- The proposed Marine Protection Zone proposal is awaiting approval from the Minister of Culture, but will now be considered within the framework of the forthcoming management plan and following consideration of the Minor Boundary Modification request;
- Resources have been deployed for some ongoing maintenance work, including vegetation control, the development of a regular maintenance plan for the city and al-Bass sites, as well as commencement of a program for protection of selected surfaces and structures, through the Cultural Heritage and Urban Development (CHUD);

- A fire prevention strategy is being prepared and will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre during 2015;
- A conservation project for the green bath mosaics, which was to be undertaken in collaboration with ICCROM and the Getty Conservation Institute, was cancelled because the budget was not approved. However, the State Party has indicated that mosaic conservation will commence in 2015, subject to expert workshop discussions which will occur within the framework of the 'ARCHEOMEDSITES' project;
- Implementation of regular monitoring will be included within the forthcoming management plan and will be informed by discussions at the forthcoming expert workshop; and
- Additional minor enhancement and maintenance interventions and consultation with local stakeholders are also proposed as part of the 'ARCHEOMEDSITES' project.

The State Party has made significant progress in relation to the conservation of the property. However, there are a number of recommendations from the Committee which are yet to be fully implemented. Some of these matters may appropriately be addressed within the overall management plan and the 'ARCHEOMEDSITES' project; however it is desirable that important initiatives, such as preparation of the comprehensive traffic study, as well as specific measures for fire prevention, drainage and sewerage, mosaic conservation, vegetation control and effective monitoring of conservation interventions, proceed expeditiously.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.54**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.52**, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013),*
3. *Welcomes the progress that has been made with a number of management and conservation measures which were addressed by the Committee at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013), as well as the submission of an updated Action Plan for the management and conservation of the property;*
4. *Also welcomes the partnership agreement with the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities and the Tunisian Heritage Institute, which will facilitate the preparation of a management plan for the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party, in accordance with Decision **36 COM 7B.52**, to continue its progress with the implementation of the recommendations of the 2012 Reactive Monitoring mission, particularly:*
  - a) *Undertake a planning process for the development of a management plan for the property and include provisions for a conservation strategy, risk preparedness, presentation and interpretation as well as for regulatory measures,*
  - b) *Ensure that the management structure becomes fully operational by securing adequate resources for all aspects of documentation, conservation and monitoring,*
  - c) *Establish a maritime protection zone around the seashores of Tyre,*
  - d) *Improve on-going maintenance practices for vegetation control and put in place measures for fire prevention and adequate drainage and sewage systems,*
  - e) *Establish a recovery programme for detached mosaics and ensure their protection until a decision is made on their conservation and restoration,*

- f) *Monitor conservation interventions to assess their efficacy and use the monitor results to inform the development of the conservation strategy,*
  - g) *Further develop and implement the framework for coordination of the Baalbek and Tyre Archaeological Project (BTAP) and enhance cooperation between the General Directorate of Antiquities (DGA), the “Cultural Heritage and Urban Development” (CHUD), the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to effectively monitor the design and implementation of the project;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to provide a copy of the forthcoming management plan to the World Heritage Centre as soon as it has been prepared;*
  7. *Further welcomes the submission of a concept strategy regarding traffic in Tyre, provided as part of a broader urban development and conservation program, but further requests the State Party, in accordance with Decision **36 COM 7B.52**, to carry out a comprehensive traffic study that clarifies all projected street networks and roundabouts, including Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) for the South Highway and its crossing at Tel el-Maachouk, and to submit this study to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;*
  8. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, as well as a revised and updated version of the Action Plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017.*

## **56. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libya) (C 190)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1982

Criteria (ii)(iii)(vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/190/documents/>

### International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/190/assistance/>

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

January 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission; August 2008: World Heritage Centre mission.

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Need to complete the Conservation and Management Plan in order to co-ordinate actions in the short- and medium-term

- Need to provide a detailed map at the appropriate scale showing the boundaries of the property and buffer zone, as well as regulatory measures foreseen to ensure the protection of the property
- Inadequate protection leading to threat to rock-hewn monumental tombs, vandalism and the development of agricultural activities in the rural zone
- Urban encroachment and uncontrolled building construction leading to destruction of archaeological areas
- Inappropriate earlier restoration work
- Problem of discharge of sewage from the modern town into the Wadi Bel Ghadir
- Inadequate on-site security and control systems
- Need for a presentation and interpretation system for visitors and the local population

*Illustrative material* see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/190/>

*Current conservation issues*

The State Party did not provide a report on the progress in implementing the recommendations adopted in Decision **37 COM 7B.53**, which was requested by the Committee at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013). No recent information on the state of conservation of the property is available.

*Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM*

Other sources report that the property has suffered from vandalism, as well as looting, and is at risk due to the presence of armed groups only 80 kilometers far from the site. They also report that the urban encroachment has increased with more illegal constructions within the boundaries of the site.

The prevailing situation in the country raises a high concern about the capacity of the responsible authorities to ensure the protection and conservation of the property. It is recommended that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to submit information about the situation at the property as soon as the security situation permits and foresee to examine the state of conservation of the property at its 40th session in 2016.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.56**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **37 COM 7B.53**, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by the Committee at its 37th session in 2013;
4. Expresses its high concern regarding the absence of information on the state of conservation of the property in the prevailing situation;
5. Requests the State Party to submit information on the state of conservation of the property as soon as the security situation permits, and notably concerning the urban encroachment and the protection of the site from looting and vandalism;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.



## 57. Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libya) (C 287)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1985

Criteria (iii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/287/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/287/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2011: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Vandalism

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/287/>

Current conservation issues

The State Party did not provide a report on the progress in implementing the recommendations adopted in Decision **37 COM 7B.54**, which was requested by the Committee at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013). No recent information on the state of conservation of the property is available.

Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM

The prevailing situation in the country raises a high concern about the capacity of the responsible authorities to ensure the protection and conservation of the property, although the latter is far from the zones affected by the conflict.

There is no information on whether the responsible authorities were able to launch the conservation and recovery measures of the sites vandalized in 2009, as identified in the 2011 reactive monitoring mission. It is recommended that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to submit information about the situation at the property as soon as the security situation permits, and foresee to examine the state of conservation of the property at its 40th session in 2016.

### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.57**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **37 COM 7B.54**, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by the Committee at its 37th session in 2013;
4. Expresses its high concern regarding the absence of information on the state of conservation of the property in the prevailing situation;

5. *Requests the State Party to submit information on the state of conservation of the property as soon as the security situation permits, and notably on whether the conservation and recovery measures of the sites vandalized in 2009, as identified in the 2011 Reactive Monitoring mission, have been launched;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.*

## ASIA-PACIFIC

### 62. Historic Monuments and Sites in Kaesong (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) (C 1278rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2013

Criteria (ii)(iii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1278/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 2 (from 2006-2009)

Total amount approved: USD 55,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1278/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Threats identified at the time of inscription in 2013:

- Need to develop tourism management and interpretation plans for the nominated property components
- Need to further develop the monitoring system to ensure coordination between the monitoring bodies

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1278/>

Current conservation issues

On 3 March 2015, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1278/>, and which provides information on the progress made with the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's recommendations (Decision **37 COM 8B. 30**), as follows:

- *Tourism management plan and interpretation plans:* The National Agency for the Protection of Cultural Heritage (NAPCH) is in the process of preparing the tourism management plan and interpretation plans, in close cooperation with UNESCO Beijing. The "Training Workshop on Tourism Management at the Historic Monuments and Sites in Kaesong" held in July 2014, co-hosted by UNESCO Beijing assisted with the preparation of the vision, strategies and timeline. The first draft is expected to be ready by July 2015 and overall completion scheduled for January 2016.
- *Monitoring system:* In order to enhance the monitoring system and the coordination between the responsible authorities, the State Party decided to establish by 2015 a department (NAPCH and provincial authorities) tasked with monitoring the state of conservation and controlling activities within of property.

*Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM*

The steps taken by the State Party to respond to the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee should be noted. In particular, the holding of a training workshop on tourism management with the assistance of UNESCO Beijing should be acknowledged, as this has actively assisted the authorities with the development of the tourism management plan, with a clearly defined vision, strategies and objectives.

The decision to establish a department for the monitoring of the property and enhance cooperation among the government bodies, national and provincial authorities is a positive step towards ensuring the management of the serial property components as a whole.

No information on the guidelines for protection and management was included in the state of conservation report. In view of the still outstanding completion of the tourism management plan and interpretation plan, as well as tangible progress with the monitoring system, it is recommended that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to report on the progress made by 2017.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.62**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **37 COM 8B.30**, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013),
3. Acknowledges the steps taken by the State Party to respond to the recommendations, notably the holding of a training workshop on tourism management in cooperation with UNESCO Beijing;
4. Encourages the State Party to proceed with the development, adoption and implementation of the tourism management plan and interpretation plans, in close cooperation with UNESCO Beijing, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017.

**66. Cultural Landscape of Bali Province: the *Subak* System as a Manifestation of the *Tri Hita Karana* Philosophy (Indonesia) (C 1194rev)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2012

Criteria (ii)(iii)(v)(vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1194/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1194/assistance/>

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

January 2015: ICOMOS/ICCROM Advisory mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

The following factors were identified at the time of inscription of the property in 2012:

- Vulnerability of the *subak* system
- Lack of support for traditional farming systems and of benefits that would allow farmers to stay on the land
- Protection of the setting of the landscape to protect the water source that underpins the *subak* system
- Development pressures
- Lack of functioning governance system to implement the Management Plan

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1194/>

### Current conservation issues

On 28 January 2015, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report. Furthermore, as recommended by the Committee, a joint ICOMOS/ICCROM Advisory mission was invited by the State Party and visited the property in January 2015. Both reports are available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1194/documents>, and the information can be summarized as follows:

- With a view to enhancing the participation of *subak* communities, a mechanism known as Communication and Coordination Forum for the management of the Cultural Landscape of Bali Province has been initiated. This Forum involves *subak* communities and customary villages, as well as the government of 5 regencies (Buleleng, Tabanan, Badung, Gianyar and Bangli). Under this Forum, the traditional *subak* communities, along with the caretakers of the *pura* (temples) in the *subak* system, are further empowered by their involvement in their respective Regional Secretariat of the regencies. In addition, the traditional *subak* communities are also involved through the establishment of a forum of *Pekaseh* (head of *subak* organization), which meets regularly and has established an *awig-awig* (set of by-laws based on customary laws). This network provides opportunity for more interaction between farmers and the authorities.
- Although the Governing Assembly, a key part of the management plan in place at the time of inscription, is functioning, the Coordination Forum and the *pekaseh* Forum are expected to strengthen the involvement of *subak* communities with the Governing Assembly.
- An adaptive co-management system has also been established between academicians, government institutions, civil society organizations, and the local community to better identify and implement necessary measures in managing the property. In 2014, a World Heritage Monitoring System, equipped with a regional database and a digital thematic mapping system, was established.
- The State Party is exploring the possibility for the property to become a National Strategic Area. Such National Strategic Areas are protected by law, and would not allow for development activities that could threaten the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the area.

### Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM

The Advisory mission noted that the commitments made at the time of inscription for effective management to protect the OUV of the property still remain high. However the mission also noted that the pressure for land conversion remains significant, creating a considerable vulnerability that is challenging the ability of the authorities to sustain OUV. The current nesting of national, Province and Regency legislation and policy appeared to be insufficient to regulate the conversion of land within the property, as the traditional management systems – led by the *pekaseh* – have considerable autonomy to make land conversion and/or development decisions.

The mission also noted the growing need for strategic planning for community-centred cultural and eco-tourism, particularly for Jatiluwih and the area near Mount Batur, although the entire property is vulnerable to tourism pressure due to the lack of effective strategic planning.

At the time of inscription, due to the centrality of the communities and their traditional structures in the OUV of the property, it was envisaged that there would be full engagement of the *subak* farming communities with the Governing Council for the effective implementation of the management plan. However, the mission noted that the representation and engagement of the farmer community in the Governing Council, as proposed at the time of inscription, seems not to have been effectively implemented. Although the new Forum Coordination mechanism recently started by the State Party could be considered as a potential contribution to the improvement of the management system, the mission considered that it was too early to evaluate the effectiveness of this mechanism.

The mission, while welcoming the tax relief to *subak* farmers in Gianyar and Tabanan Regencies mentioned to the mission, considered that the establishment of financial mechanisms to support traditional *subaks* and reduce pressure for land conversion is a continuing priority across the whole property.

In order to strengthen the overall management processes, the mission recommended that the Governments of Indonesia and Bali Province should recognize formally the revised structure of the management system (incorporating the Forum Coordination). The mission also recommended the development of:

- Regular and well-supported engagement between the Province and Regency Governments and the Forum Coordination;
- Financial and other incentives to support the livelihoods of *subak* communities, through land taxes, and through optimising other forms of income, such as farm produce and agro-tourism;
- A catchment management approach to water quality, forest management and natural resources as part of strategic planning to safeguard the water catchment areas and essential for the healthy functioning of the *subak* system;
- More effective coordination in relation to land conversion processes and changes in land use, including new developments;
- Action Plans to reflect the wide range of issues that impact on the property;
- Effective mechanisms for strategic planning;
- Impact assessments for new developments in the property and its wider setting;
- Detailed and strategic tourism planning to ensure that enhanced tourism activity can support the *subak* communities and contribute to the long-term sustainability of the property.

The mission considered that all of these (and other recommendations) were of high and urgent priority, even though many of them will be ongoing and/or long-term in duration.

Acknowledging the high vulnerability of the property to development pressures and land conversion, and the fragility of the traditional *subak* systems, it is recommended that the Committee urge the State Party, as a matter of urgency, to strengthen the overall management of the property through much greater engagement of, and support for, *subak* communities, and through more detailed strategic planning, including addressing the need to safeguard the water catchment areas and foster sustainable cultural tourism.

### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.66**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **38 COM 7B.14**, adopted at its 38th session (Doha, 2014),

3. Commends the State Party for having invited an Advisory mission to share concerns and issues raised by the Committee; and notes that the commitments made at the time of inscription for effective management to protect the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property still remain high;
4. Notes with concern that the pressure for land conversion remains significant, creating a considerable vulnerability that is challenging the ability of the authorities to sustain OUV and that, although it was envisaged at the time of inscription that there would be full engagement of the subak farming communities with the Governing Council for the effective implementation of the management plan, this seems not to have been effectively implemented;
5. Takes note that improvements are being introduced to engage communities more effectively through new Forum Coordination mechanisms, although it is too early to evaluate the effectiveness of this mechanism for the overall management of the property;
6. Also commends the action taken by one Regency to provide tax incentives to the farmers; and also notes that the establishment of financial mechanisms to support all the traditional subaks and reduce pressure for land conversion is a continuing priority;
7. Further notes that no comprehensive tourism strategy is in place covering all regencies;
8. Also takes note of the importance highlighted by the mission regarding the protection of water catchment areas for the survival of the subak system;
9. Requests the State Party, in order to strengthen the overall management processes and to address these issues, to implement the recommendations of the Advisory mission as a matter of priority, including the development of the following on an on-going and long-term basis:
  - a) Engagement between the Province and Regency Governments and the Forum Coordination,
  - b) Financial and other incentives to support the livelihoods of subak communities,
  - c) Means to safeguard the water catchment area, essential for the healthy functioning of the subak system,
  - d) More effective coordination in relation to land conversion processes, and changes in land use, including new developments,
  - e) Action Plans to reflect the wide range of issues that impact on the property,
  - f) Effective mechanisms for strategic planning,
  - g) Impact assessments for new developments in the property and its wider setting,
  - h) Detailed and strategic cultural tourism planning;
10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017.

## 68. Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 481)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2001

Criteria (iii)(iv)(vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/481/documents/>

### International Assistance

Requests approved: 1 (from 1999-1999)

Total amount approved: USD 13,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/481/assistance/>

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: Japanese-funded project: USD379,040 (1996-97), Total Italian-funded projects through Lerici Foundation: USD 482,194 (1996-2004; 3 project phases): Phase I (1996-1997) = USD161,124; Phase II (1998-1999) = USD 164,000; Phase III (2003-2005) = USD 157,070

### Previous monitoring missions

January/February 2011: UNESCO Mission; November 2011: France-UNESCO Convention Programme mission; February 2012: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission; April 2013: France-UNESCO Convention Programme mission, March 2014: France-UNESCO Convention Programme mission; February 2015: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission.

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- New infrastructure construction including new proposed road
- Lack of coordinated management mechanism
- Parking lot and visitor centre
- Lack of sufficient professional staff

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/481/>

### Current conservation issues

On 24 February 2015, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/481/documents/>. The report provides information as follows:

- *Route 14A:* Work on the road construction was suspended and the proposed new road alignment will be subject to an archaeological survey prior to the development of detailed plans.
- *Master Plan and Land Use Plans:* As reported in 2014, the project to revise the overall Master Plan and to develop local Land Use Plans for the Vat Phou Champasak protected area was begun in 2012. The inclusion of the cultural landscape in the Master plan was debated at the Korean National University of Cultural Heritage in Buyeo, Republic of Korea, during a workshop held end of 2014. Co-ordination of the Pakse Master Plan with the various district master plans was discussed at a meeting with the Ministry of Transportation in 2014, and the subject of the ADB-backed international working group. Efforts have been made to ensure the Master Plan of Vat Phou Champasak covers neighbouring areas to allow for a comprehensive strategic vision for territorial development. Zoning plans were developed in accordance with the Master Plan.
- *Urban Planning:* The new urban planning document was signed in 2014 providing an initial emergency regulatory framework for heritage protection.
- *Construction projects:* No new constructions were completed since the last state of conservation reporting. The official gallery was reconstructed due to imminent collapse.



Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM

The joint World Heritage/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission to Vat Phou was undertaken from 17 to 21 February 2015. The mission reviewed the Route A14 construction and the amended road proposal, verified the information on archaeological surveys to assess the significance of archaeology along the route, as well as the status of Heritage Impact Assessments. Progress with the development of the Master Plan and land use plans, as well as the effectiveness of the management plan and management system were also reviewed. A principal conclusion reached by the mission is that the level of threats to the property does not currently warrant the property being considered for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Nevertheless, a number of serious issues exist and need to be studied and solutions urgently found in order to effectively protect the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), without disadvantaging the local community.

Route A14 had already been partly completed prior to its suspension in 2014. Traffic is currently being diverted through Champassak town and over the remains of the Ancient City, while some traffic continues to pass over the suspended section. The mission recommended that an effective and efficient road system should be formulated and fully implemented before the unbuilt section of Route 14A is completed. Furthermore, the mission recommended that:

- Route 14A will be for light vehicles only and limited to visitors to Zone 4 and local residents,
- Route 14B will be the international connection for heavy vehicles between southern Lao PDR, Cambodia and Thailand,
- Tourist coaches will park in designated areas at the northern and southern perimeter of the property,
- The district road through Champasak town and the Ancient City will be strictly limited to light traffic generated by the villagers themselves. The need for the proposed additional local roads will be analysed and justified before construction,
- Route 14A should be completed according to the original alignment 24 metres from the north-west corner of the fourth enclosure wall of the Ancient City, rather than according to the proposed realignment 100 metres from the corner.

The mission noted that a number of new constructions have been undertaken in the monumental complex, without notification being given in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and despite previous Committee decisions. These contribute to the haphazard densification of the main monumental complex. Therefore, it is vital that the State Party develops a control system to enforce planning laws and regulations. The Management Plan should be reviewed and updated and to reflect the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV). Both of these should ensure that no new construction should be permitted along the section from Km 29 to Km 34, which is adjacent to the Ancient City and has high archaeological sensitivity. Consideration should be given to removing any constructions that have occurred along Route 14A since 2010, in order to reinforce the authority of the control system.

The mission also noted that the Master Plan and Local Land Use Plans were adopted in November 2014, awaiting the presidential approval. The plans focus mainly on the area of Champasak Town and were prepared in a consultative process with local stakeholders and authorities. However, there is an urgent need to improve the Master Plan to address long-term planning issues and to effectively control the transformation of the cultural landscape. A detailed statement of the Master Plan's overall vision should be prepared, that makes clear how the various local plans relate to each other.

The mission also recommended further enhancement and strengthening of inter-agency cooperation, including between provincial and national level authorities, should be put in place in order to continue to address the conservation and management issues at the property by the Lao PDR National Committee for World Heritage. In particular, the various committees concerned with the World Heritage property should be convened regularly and their decision-making processes reinforced through provision of greater technical support.

Finally, the mission noted the need for a clearer definition and understanding of the physical and other attributes of the property that convey its OUV, particularly in relation to the wider landscape and Champasak town. Such consideration should involve meaningful consultation with the local community.

**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.68**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **38 COM 7B.17**, adopted at its 38th session (Doha, 2014),
3. Takes note of the findings and recommendations of the joint World Heritage/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission to the property;
4. Urges the State Party to formulate and implement an effective and efficient road system before the unmade section of Route 14A is completed and opened to traffic, and requests the State Party to:
  - a) Limit the use of 14A to light vehicles, residents and visitors only; with Route 14B being used as the international connection for heavy vehicles between southern Lao PDR, Cambodia and Thailand,
  - b) Arrange for tourist coaches to park in designated areas at the northern and southern perimeters of the property,
  - c) Limit the use of the district road through Champasak town and the Ancient City to light traffic generated by the villagers themselves,
  - d) Analyze and justify the need for proposed additional local roads,
  - e) Complete Route 14A according to the original alignment 24 metres from the north-west corner of the fourth enclosure wall of the Ancient City, rather than according to the proposed realignment 100 metres from the corner;
5. Regrets that in spite of previous recommendations a number of new constructions have been undertaken in the monumental complex, without overall site planning, thus contributing to the haphazard densification of the main monumental complex;
6. Reiterates its requests to the State Party to develop, as a matter of urgency, a Master Plan based on landscape approach, taking into consideration the nature of the property as a cultural landscape and the buried archaeology, and the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), and to
  - a) Ensure that the local land use zoning plans conform to the Master Plan,
  - b) Provide within the Master Plan an overall strategic landscape protection and development framework addressing long-term planning issues,
  - c) Ensure co-ordination with emerging wider territorial plans,
  - d) Submit copies of the Master Plan to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies prior to final approval;
7. Also urges the State Party ensure the provisions of the management plan are put in place and reflect the OUV of the property, as well as to render it more practical and operational by including, among other things, an improved monitoring framework;
8. Notes the need for a clearer definition and understanding of the physical and other attributes of the property that convey its OUV, particularly in relation to the wider cultural landscape and Champasak town. Such consideration should involve meaningful consultation with the local community;

9. *Recommends to the State Party to further enhance and strengthen inter-agency cooperation, including between provincial and national level authorities, in order to continue to address the conservation and management issues at the property by the Lao PDR National Committee for World Heritage and to ensure that the various committees concerned with the World Heritage property should be convened regularly and their decision-making processes reinforced through provision of greater technical support;*
10. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, and the remaining recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017.*

## **69. Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C121bis)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1979

Criteria (iii)(iv)(vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger 2003-2007

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/121/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 15 (from 1979-2006)

Total amount approved: USD 342,679

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/121/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 10 million (1979-2001) from the International Safeguarding Campaign; USD 45,000 (2005) and USD 20,000 (2011) from Netherlands Funds-in-Trust.

Previous monitoring missions

February 2003: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; April 2007: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission; March 2011: UNESCO international expert advisory mission; November 2011: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Natural disaster (severe earthquake of 25 April 2015)
- Uncontrolled urban development resulting in the loss of traditional urban fabric, in particular privately-owned houses
- Lack of coordinated management mechanism
- Construction of forest road ; project for tunnel road in Pashupati Monument Zone Project for the extension of the Kathmandu International Airport
- New development projects, in particular the crematorium in Pashupati Monument Zone and the reconstruction of Bhaidegah Temple

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/121/>

Current conservation issues

On 25 April 2015, a 7.9 magnitude earthquake struck middle Nepal, 80 kilometer northwest of Kathmandu. The earthquake and the aftermath resulted in disastrous loss of human life and extensive

and irreversible damage to the historic monuments and buildings of the Kathmandu Valley World Heritage property. According to initial assessments carried out by UNESCO and its partners on the ground, the monuments and sites within the property have suffered extensive damages, as well as other cultural and natural heritage sites located in the area. In particular, major damages have been reported in the Durbar Squares of Patan, Hanuman Dhoka (Kathmandu) and Bhaktapur. All historical structures within the seven monuments zones of the property were affected.

On 25 January 2015, in response to Decision **37 COM 7B.65**, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/121/documents>. However, the contents of this report will have to be assessed in the new context and therefore, are not presented in this report.

#### *Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM*

The devastating earthquake that struck Nepal on 25 April 2015 resulted in huge loss of human life and extensive damage to the historic monuments and buildings of the Kathmandu Valley World Heritage property. Initial assessments conducted jointly by UNESCO and the Department of Archaeology, Nepal, recorded damages caused by the earthquake to the property. In particular, the historical structures of the Durbar Squares of Patan, Hanuman Dhoka (Kathmandu) and Bhaktapur are almost completely destroyed. The temples in all seven monument zones of the property have been severely affected and many of them have collapsed completely. It is therefore recommended that the Committee express its condolences to the States Parties of Nepal, India, China, Bangladesh and Pakistan for the tragic loss of life and damage to the property following this disastrous earthquake.

Considering the extensive damage of the earthquake to the property which represents both ascertained and potential danger, in accordance with paragraphs 177 to 179 of the *Operational Guidelines*, it is further recommended that the Committee inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Committee may also request the State Party, in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop and implement an Emergency Action Plan to address threats and to define both the corrective measures and the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR) as soon as possible, and call upon the international community to assist the State Party of Nepal in its efforts to protect, conserve and rebuild the monuments after this disaster.

A first mission is already being planned with the participation from UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS-ICORP, ICOM, and the Smithsonian Institution. This mission is at the invitation of the Department of Archaeology of Nepal. It is scheduled to take place in the next few weeks, to be followed by an emergency field training for Nepali professionals to take place in June 2015. An update of this report may be presented to the Committee at the time of its 39th session in Bonn.

#### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.69**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision 37 COM 7B.65, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013),*
3. *Expresses its profound sympathy and deepest condolences to the State Party of Nepal for the tragic loss of life and damage caused to the property, following the devastating earthquake of 25 April 2015;*
4. *Considers that the extensive damage of the earthquake to the property represents both ascertained and potential danger, in accordance with paragraphs 177 to 179 of the Operational Guidelines;*
5. ***Decides to inscribe the Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;***

6. *Requests the State Party, in close co-operation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop and implement an Emergency Action Plan to address threats, to establish corrective measures and to develop a proposal for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR) as soon as possible, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016;*
7. *Calls upon the international community to provide financial and technical support to the State Party of Nepal in protecting, conserving and restoring the World Heritage property of Kathmandu Valley following the earthquake;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2016, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.*

## **70. Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1981

Criteria (iii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/143/documents/>

### International Assistance

Requests approved: 0 (from 1982-2015)

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/143/assistance/>

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds Total amount granted:

USD 30,000 from UNESCO Regular Programme Funds for condition survey of Jam Nizzammuddin tomb (2011).

### Previous monitoring missions

November-December 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Mission; October 2010: World Heritage Centre fact-finding mission to the property following the major flood that devastated the area in August 2010; May 2012: joint UNESCO/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission.

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Significant decay of the property caused by local climatic conditions and alluvial erosion
- Stability of the foundations (earth mechanics) of the Jam Nizamuddin tomb
- Lack of definition of boundaries of the property and buffer zone of the necropolis
- Lack of monitoring
- lack of a Comprehensive Master Plan and a management plan

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/143/>

### Current conservation issues

On 30 March 2015, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session 2013. This document is similar to the one provided in 2012 and there are no indications or details on the status of implementation of the provisions made. According to the document, the Government of Sindh approved the "Development of

World Heritage Site of Makli Hill Monuments, Thatta” in 2012, however no details of the work carried out in 2013 and 2014 have been provided in the document with the budget of Pk Rs471.881 million. The report includes the information as follows:

- The Master Plan including conservation actions is being prepared and progress made with a large number of actions is mentioned in the report. These include a comprehensive inventory, comprehensive strategy for emergency work, conservation and maintenance works. However, no further details about their implementation status have been provided. An action plan for capacity building has been prepared with the assistance of Aachen University (Germany). Damage assessment and a treatment plan for Jam Nazamuddin tomb, mentioned in the previous SOC report, are still underway.
- As part of the Master Plan, it is reported that the identification of boundaries and buffer zone, as well as adequate regulatory measures have been completed, but no details have been provided.
- As part of the Master Plan activities, planning to formulate a management plan including conservation action, public use and disaster risk management plan is underway.
- The report makes reference to welcoming an Advisory mission but no invitation from the State Party has been received.
- The report contains a detailed account of various factors affecting the heritage such as earthquakes. The report also provides details about the financial and other assistance received from the State Party and donors.

#### *Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM*

It is noted that some of the issues raised by the Committee and those anticipated through an Advisory mission have been partially addressed. They include the defining of boundaries and buffer zone and a capacity building strategy. Although reference is made to a strategy for stabilization of emergency work, no details have been provided. Despite financial assistance provided by UNESCO (2011), damage assessment and a treatment plan for Jam Nazamuddin tomb, which is one of the key attributes carrying the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), and mentioned in the previous state of conservation report, have not been completed. The progress with works envisaged as part of the Master Plan to ensure long term protection of the OUV appears to be very slow and no attempt has been made to develop a disaster risk management plan as the property is located in an earthquake prone area.

Another area of concern is the slow progress made with Master Plan, especially in view of the threats to the OUV of the property. It is recommended that the Committee express its concern over the slow progress with actions to preserve the property, in view of the significant threat to the OUV, which are still remaining. Therefore, the State Party should expedite the completion of the Master Plan as a matter of priority. It is also recommended that the Committee further request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the general state of conservation of the property, including factors that constitute a serious threat to the property and conservation of Tomb of Jam Nizamuddin, to review the progress of finalizing the Master Plan and to provide advice with the implementation of activities listed in the Master Plan.

#### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.70**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision 37 COM 8B.30, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013),*
3. *Expresses its concern over the slow progress of works in view of the significant threats to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, which have yet to be fully addressed;*

4. Urges the State Party to speed up the completion of the Master Plan, which has listed all the issues raised by the Committee at its previous sessions, as a matter of priority;
5. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the property to:
  - a) Review the state of conservation of the property, including factors that constitute a serious threat to the property and the conservation of Tomb of Jam Nizamuddin,
  - b) Provide advise to the State Party with the completion and implementations of the Master Plan,
  - c) Assist the State Party with further developing and prioritising activities listed in the Master Plan;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.

## EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

### 83. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1985

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/356/documents/>

#### International Assistance

Requests approved: 17 (from 1986-2004)

Total amount approved: USD 457,208

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/356/assistance/>

#### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 211,900 (Conservation of Hagia Sophia); USD 36,686.30 (Convention France-UNESCO); USD 155,000 (in the framework of the International Safeguarding Campaign for Istanbul and Göreme)

#### Previous monitoring missions

January 2000, May 2001, 2002, December 2003, 2004: World Heritage Centre missions; April 2006, May 2008, April 2009, November 2012: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring missions

#### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Continued degradation of the vernacular architecture within the protected zones (particularly Ottoman-period timber houses in the Zeyrek and Süleymaniye core areas)
- Quality of repairs and reconstruction of the Roman and Byzantine Walls and associated palace structures, including Tekfur Saray and the "Anemas Dungeon" (Blachernae Palace)
- Development and absence of a World Heritage management plan (issue resolved)
- Lack of coordination between national and municipal authorities and of decision-making bodies for safeguarding World Heritage at the site
- Impacts of new buildings and new development projects on the World Heritage property, mainly within the framework of Law 5366, and the lack of impact studies before large-scale developments are implemented
- Potential impacts of the new metro bridge across the Golden Horn as well as of the Bosphorus Transition Tunnel Project for Motor Vehicles

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/356/>

#### Current conservation issues

On 30 January 2015, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/356/documents/>. This addresses conservation issues raised by the Committee. A meeting was held between the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS on 6 May 2015 during which the State Party clarified these issues:



- *Golden Horn Metro Crossing Bridge*: Refinements are being undertaken to the colour of the bridge, based on the recommendation of the Advisory Bodies, its pylon lighting, landscaping of the entrances and conservation along the approach routes.
- *Eurasia Road Tunnel*: A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was submitted, as requested by the Committee, as well as an evaluation of options for extending the tunnel to the west so that it emerges beyond the Land Walls thus removing the necessity for an eight lane highway and interchanges between the Historic Peninsula's Sea Walls and the sea.
- *Yenikapi Land Reclamation project*: The filling of the land reclamation was completed between February and September 2013. A HIA commissioned in line with the Committee's recommendation was submitted. The use of the new space has been re-stated as being for the future provision of sewage treatment plants, as well as for green spaces and areas for meetings.
- *Management Plan*: Through a series of workshops that started in late 2014, the Management Plan is being reviewed to take into consideration the decisions and recommendations of the Advisory Bodies. Completion is set for June 2015.
- *Ottoman Houses*: The term 'vernacular architecture buildings' now replace 'Ottoman timber buildings' and includes masonry buildings as well as those of Ottoman date or style. A protocol for the Municipality to offer low interest loans to private owners is pending the authorities' approval. The Ministry of Culture and Tourism continues to work on new legislation for grants to private property owners.

The following details of specific developments are provided:

- *Suleymaniye*: Redevelopment is proceeding in accordance with the existing approved plan.
- *Sulukule Renewal Area*: The new build elements of the comprehensive redevelopment project are stated to be complete, while the 'Survey, Restitution and Restoration Projects' are as 'approved by the Regional Conservation Council'.
- *Fener-Balat Renewal Areas*: This is being revived with the active participation of the stakeholders to be a 'parcel-based implementation'.
- *Ayvansaray Renewal Area*: The comprehensive redevelopment of this area is well advanced, incorporating a few 'reconstructed' timber buildings.

The State Party also reported on the following:

- The Silhouette Master Plan has been extended to the Asian side of Istanbul.
- Measures are being undertaken to address the quality of repairs and the issue of reconstruction of the Roman and Byzantine Walls and associated palace structures, including Tekfur Saray. Studies regarding the proposed works to the Tekfur Saray are being prepared.
- A HIA is being prepared for the proposed reconstruction of the Ayasofya Madrasa, in response to concerns raised by the World Heritage Centre in 2014.
- The Yedikule Restoration Implementation Project (Garden Areas by the Land Walls) has been suspended and the planning and the design works will be revised. The State Party has indicated that an HIA will be prepared in this regard.

#### *Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM*

It is noted that the State Party has almost finalised refinements to the Golden Horn Metro Crossing Bridge and that the adopted colour accords with the 2012 Mission Report recommendation.

It is also noted that the design work on the Eurasia tunnel started in 2005, the contract was let in 2008, the detailed design was completed in 2012(although no information on this was provided to the 2012 mission), financing was in place by December 2012, and the works, which started on the Asian side in June 2014, are now about 50% complete. The requested HIA and the Options Appraisal (called the Evaluation of Extension of the Tunnel beyond the Land Walls) were thus carried out after the plans were finalised and while construction was on-going. The State Party therefore could not evaluate options for extending the tunnel beyond the Land Walls or of removing an intersection at Yenikapi, as requested by the Committee, as the length of the tunnel and the final positions of the portals had been

agreed and 'the project has no time and cost flexibilities'. Technical, environmental, social, cultural and economic issues were not sufficiently evaluated.

The current plans are for the western tunnel portal to emerge towards the eastern end of the Historic Peninsula and for the current two-lane boulevard of Kennedy Cadesi to be converted into a six to eight-lane urban motorway approach road, together with a complex interchange. The HIA acknowledges that such an intervention will provide a 'spatial barrier' cutting off access from the Historic Peninsula to the sea.

As a result of the HIA, changes have been made, such as moving the administration building and half the toll gates to the Asian side, changing the configuration at Yenikapi to avoid buried archaeology, re-uniting the Marble Tower with the Land Walls, and providing extra pedestrian bridges. These will provide mitigation but will do little to remove the major impact of a six- eight-lane highway that will funnel traffic into the Historic Peninsula and disrupt its relationship with the Sea of Marmara, one of the attributes of OUV.

The HIA for the Yenikapi Land Reclamation project was also undertaken after much of the construction work had been completed between February and September 2013. The objective of this reclamation project has been restated to prioritise the future provision of sewage treatment plants, as well as to increase the amount of green space needed in the Fatih neighbourhood and surroundings. An HIA was commissioned in line with the WHC recommendation but was only undertaken after the work on the land- fill was in progress. The HIA acknowledges the important attribute of the Peninsula's valuable cityscape to the property's OUV, but concludes that as the peninsula's silhouette facing the Sea of Marmara is of significantly lower value than where it faces the Bosphorus and Golden Horn, it will only be compromised if the project is seen from viewpoints located close to the coastline. The impact on the relationship between the Historic Peninsula and the sea is not directly assessed.

In order to address concerns of the Committee that the lack of conservation and rehabilitation of traditional timber buildings was reaching a critical stage, a new Directorate for Restoration and Repair is to be established within the Department of Cultural Properties. A protocol is also in the process of being signed by the relevant authorities to provide long-term low interest loans to private owners of vernacular buildings to help with simple maintenance and repair. A long term strategy to reverse the degradation of Ottoman style vernacular buildings is yet to be put in place.

The development at Suleymaniye is proceeding, although the Mission requested a review.

The Committee may wish to express concern that for the major Eurasia Tunnel and the Yenikapi Land Reclamation project, information was only provided after the designs were complete and work was in progress. As a result, for the Eurasia tunnel, detailed consideration has not been given to the requests of the Committee to consider alternative locations for the western tunnel portal, and only minor modifications are being suggested. Although these modifications are welcome, they do not address the fundamental concerns over the major impact of the proposed six-eight lane tunnel approach road in the buffer zone on the Land Walls and on the overall relationship between the Historic Peninsula and the Sea.

The Committee may wish to request the State Party to invite a Reactive Monitoring Mission to consider both these schemes and in particular to assess their actual and potential impact on OUV and all means possible to mitigate negative impacts. The mission could also discuss with the State Party how the revision of the Management plan might address procedures to ensure that Impact Assessments and full consultation for major projects are carried out appropriately and in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, before any irreversible decisions are made.

### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.83**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision 37 COM 7B.85, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013),*

3. *Welcomes the efforts made by the State Party to review the Management Plan for the property and notes that completion of the review is foreseen for mid-2015.*
4. *Also notes of the State Party's submission of the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the Eurasia Tunnel and requested Options Appraisal but regrets that the requested HIA and Options Appraisal for the Eurasia Tunnel were only undertaken at a late stage in the project rather than at the design stage, and that as a result few options could be properly assessed;*
5. *Reiterates its view that the new six-eight-lane highway would have a highly significant, negative impact on the Sea Walls, the Marble Tower, and the overall relationship between the Historic Peninsula and the sea, one of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV);*
6. *Expresses its concern that the HIA for the Yenikapi Land Reclamation Project was also undertaken while work was in progress, and further notes that this project will add cumulatively to the negative impacts of earlier developments along the Marmara Sea side of the Peninsula;*
7. *Notes furthermore the urgent need for an integrated plan on the peninsula's coastlines and the open spaces surrounding the Theodosian Land Walls, in line with the recommendations of the 2012 Mission;*
8. *Also welcomes the intention of the State Party to set up a new Directorate for Restoration and Repair within the new Department of Cultural Properties, and the proposed protocol that would enable grants to be offered to private owners for the repair and maintenance of vernacular buildings and reiterates the need for an overall long term conservation strategy to be developed for Ottoman timber buildings;*
9. *Also expresses its concern that a number of major projects have been developed without adequate Impact Assessments being undertaken in advance of approval or work commencing, and without formal notification being provided in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and considers that there is a need for progress to be made with the revision of the Management Plan in order that these procedural issues might be addressed in a revised governance structure;*
10. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the property to consider the impact of the proposed six-eight lane highway on the OUV of the property and all possible ways to mitigate this impact; to consider the impact of the Yenikapi Land Reclamation project on the profile of the Historic Peninsula; and overall to consider the management of the property;*
11. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, a progress report on the implementation of the above and, by **1 December 2016**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017, both reports including a 1-page executive summary.*

## 94. Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2001

Criteria (ii)(iv)(vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1033/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1033/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the "Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn"; September 2012: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the "Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn" and "Historic Centre of Vienna"

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- High-rise construction projects in Central Vienna
- High-rise construction project of Vienna Main Train Station

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1033/>

Current conservation issues

On 9 January 2015, the State Party submitted a report on both the properties "Historic Centre of Vienna" and "Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn", which addresses the requests made by the Committee at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013) and is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1033/documents>. In Decision **37 COM 7B.71** regarding the Historic Centre of Vienna, the Committee requested that the State Party submit a report to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2014.

*Development proposals for the area of the Vienna Ice-Skating Club / InterContinental Hotel / Konzerthaus*

The report provides details of proposals to re-develop this area at the edge of the property and to replace three buildings from the early and mid-20th century that are not seen to contribute positively to the townscape. The design submitted is for a linear block and a square tower, the latter 73 metres in height. The report justifies the choice of this design by accepting the views of "a jury composed of top-level international specialists" that a high-rise block, instead of a "slab", would avoid negative impacts on the cityscape. No substantial evidence has been provided, and no visual impact assessment was carried out to justify this assertion. It is however acknowledged that "if implemented, the project would have numerous technical and urbanistic effects on the surrounding area of the city".

The report states that there is a need to clarify whether the project is compatible with the applicable building laws of Vienna and with the currently valid Land Use and Development Plan for the area. But mention is also made of the need for modification of the legally applicable Land Use and Development Plan for this part of Vienna, if the project is to go ahead. At the time of writing this report, no decision on the project has been made.

*Vienna High Rise Concept & Glacis Master Plan*

Since the Vienna High-Rise Concept, approved as a basic planning tool by the Vienna City Council in April 2002, did not refer to the World Heritage and no longer correspond to current requirements, the report notes that a new High-Rise Concept has been developed under the aegis of the Vienna University of Technology and was approved by Vienna City Council on 19 December 2014. This

concept document proposes new methodologies and no longer includes 'exclusion zones' for high-rise buildings, but rather suggests that every potential high-rise project must be analysed with regard to its impact, including on both World Heritage properties in general, and on visual axes in particular, and must demonstrate added value to its immediate surroundings.

A Master Plan was also developed in 2014 for the Glacis area that covers the immediate periphery of the property. It originally encircled the city walls and was developed when the walls were torn down in the late 19th century. This Plan follows similar methodologies to the High-Rise Concept.

The State Party indicates that both documents are to be translated into English and submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

#### *Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM*

The English version of the Vienna High Rise Concept is not yet available but, on the basis of explanation given in the report, it does not appear to be strong enough as a planning framework, which would imply the definition of a clear framework with requirements for the assessment of impact on Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) through Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs), as well as clear guiding principles. Theoretically, the existing High-Rise Concept could be efficient if each and every case was to be individually evaluated on the basis of guiding principles, but the current situation of the development proposals for the Vienna Ice-Skating Club / InterContinental Hotel / Konzerthaus demonstrates how the Concept currently allows for subjective evaluation. No formal HIAs have been carried out and decisions appear to have been based on the review of an informal experts' panel.

It is not clear how this Concept or the Glacis Master Plan relate to the Management Plan, nor how they relate to Vienna's Urban Development Guidelines 46 (on high-rise development), which the 2012 mission recommended should be strengthened to allow for more detailed impact assessments, over and above those on visual axes, and to ensure that greater consideration is given to the attributes of OUV. Overall, these new and revised planning documents do not appear to have the potential to strengthen the preservation and conservation of the World Heritage property through embedding impact on OUV at the heart of planning policies.

The 2012 mission noted that, since the inscription of the property, urban development had reached a critical level and that its cumulative impacts were beginning to have an adverse impact on OUV.

In the particular case of the development proposals for the Vienna Ice-Skating Club / InterContinental Hotel / Konzerthaus area, and although redevelopment offered the opportunity to re-contextualize the area with regard to the Beethoven-Platz and the fine "Gründerzeit" buildings across the street, the plans have not respected the mission's recommendation to reject any request to increase the height of buildings or to take the opportunity to reduce the height of the buildings and their negative visual impact. Instead a building is now proposed that is far higher than the existing one and which would appear to have a major negative impact on key views. This building is proposed without detailed drawings being provided, without any 3D modelling and without a formal HIA being undertaken. Finally, it is not clear that any of the new planning tools have acted to constrain this development in terms of its adverse impact on OUV, but rather seem to be promoting high-rise development across various parts of the property.

#### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.94**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision 37 COM 7B.71, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party on the revised High-Rise Concept and the new Glacis Master Plan, and that copies of English translations of these planning documents will be provided to the World Heritage Centre shortly;*
4. *Notes that the details provided for the proposed development of the Vienna Ice-Skating Club / InterContinental Hotel / Konzerthaus area, as requested by the Committee, do*

*not include detailed architectural drawings, 3D modelling, or a formal Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA);*

5. *Recalls the concerns expressed by the 2012 mission regarding the critical level reached by urban development since inscription and its cumulative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, and the need for new tools to orient the development process towards sustainable development that protects the attributes of OUV;*
6. *Expresses its concern that this proposed development appears to be in contravention of the recommendations of the 2012 mission in terms of the height of the buildings and their contribution to the surroundings, and that the designs appear not to have been constrained by the new planning tools;*
7. *Considers that the new tools developed since the 2012 mission do not appear to ensure that OUV is adequately protected, and that details of proposed developments need to be provided to the World Heritage Centre as a matter of urgency, as well as information on the new and revised planning tools and how they relate to the Management Plan and other planning mechanisms;*
8. *Requests the State Party to halt any further approvals for high-rise projects until they can be fully appraised by the Advisory Bodies on the basis of HIAs;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to invite an ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the property, to consider current high-rise proposals, changes to planning tools, as well as the effectiveness of the overall governance of the property against the background of the concerns expressed by the 2012 mission and its call for stronger emphasis on the protection of the attributes of OUV;*
10. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 40th session in 2016.*

## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

### 90. Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso (Chile) (C 959rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2003

Criteria (iii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/959/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 1 (2010)

Total amount approved: USD 140,688

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/959/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2013: ICOMOS Advisory mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Interventions planned at the port, such as the Barón Port and the Prat Dock, as well as for touristic facilities and real estate projects
- Fragmentation of competencies and mandates by sectors and by different levels of government, as well as by the different types of specific protection and use of different areas, does not allow for the management of the property with respect to its Outstanding Universal Value and within a broader perspective

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/959/>

Current conservation issues

On 28 November 2014, the State Party submitted a progress report on the state of conservation on the Port Expansion Project (Terminal 2) and the Puerto Barón Mall. The project for the Terminal has been under evaluation since September 2014 by means of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), as required by Law No 19.300 for General Environmental Rules. In this framework, the National Monuments Council undertook studies and issued observations on the basis of ICOMOS' Guidelines on Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) for World Heritage cultural properties, and the Recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape (HUL).

Regarding the Puerto Barón Mall Project, an inter-institutional group called "Conservation Committee of the Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso" was created by Presidential Instruction. This committee developed guidelines and intervention criteria for alternative architectural designs in order to reach the necessary balance between protecting heritage and the legitimate development requirements of the port.

Concerning the protection of archeological heritage, the State Party submitted an updated Archaeological Management Plan in April 2015.

On 9 February 2015, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report and on 26 March 2015 additional information submitted on the results of the revision of the project, available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/959/documents/>. It reiterates that the country is implementing a new National Urban Development Policy -governed by the National Urban Development Council of which

the National Monuments Council is a member- and that one of its key objectives is the integration of identity and heritage into territorial planning through a single tool of urban planning regulation, the Local Regulatory Plan. In the case of Valparaíso, this plan will cover the whole city and should provide a single navigation chart. Two of the six stages of the process have been concluded to date. The Master Plan for the World Heritage area will be connected to the Local Regulatory Plan, as well as with the local Development Plan. This is expected to generate a more coherent and coordinated planning and management structure.

The State Party also informs of the massive fire that ravaged the city in April 2014 –affecting the upper city outside of the World Heritage area, and on a number of specific conservation projects including nine elevators, emblematic buildings and urban spaces.

#### *Analysis and Conclusions of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM*

The State Party provided a systematic response to each of the Committee's recommendations and relevant additional information on a number of specific conservation projects, including elevators, emblematic buildings and urban spaces. It is recommended that the Committee commend the State Party on these efforts, in a situation in which it had to address the emergency situation caused by the massive fire of April 2014.

It is noted that the National Urban Development Policy has, as one of its main objectives, the integration of identity and heritage into territorial planning through Local Regulatory and Development Plans. The full connection and interaction of the Heritage Management Master Plan for the World Heritage area with these instruments should ensure due attention to the HUL aspects of the World Heritage area and its wider context.

The above instruments should also provide appropriate mechanisms for the integrated management. In addition, the creation of the Ministry of Culture, as well as the establishment of an inter-ministerial National Programme for World Heritage Sites, would reinforce the institutional framework for cultural heritage.

However, there is some concern about the possible long timeframes that will be required to implement the policy and its planning instruments and the submission of a comprehensive report on the territorial, local and World Heritage site planning mechanisms and their integration would be welcome, along with an analysis of their effectiveness for the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and its attributes and the integrated management structures that would be put in place.

The response given by the State Party on the Terminal project is noted and it is welcomed that actions are taken to apply the ICOMOS Guidelines on HIAs for World Heritage cultural properties and HUL recommendations in the impact assessment. It is recommended that the Committee request the State Party to present the finalized studies to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for evaluation, together with an analysis of how these studies and the project design respond to the recommendations of the 2013 Advisory mission.

As to the Puerto Baron Mall, the commitment of the State Party is demonstrated by the creation of a Conservation Committee of the Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso, and by the important and valuable modifications regarding the dimensional, spatial and integral conservation of the Bodega Simón Bolívar and the volumes that will allow for better visibility of the Bodega from the amphitheater. Although the developer cannot be requested to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment, considering the great scale of the project, which will have indirect impact on the entire city of Valparaíso, and especially on the property, it would be desirable for a HIA to define any impacts on the OUV of the property, and in particular on the vitality of the sea port upon which Valparaíso's prosperity was based and on the city's amphitheatre-like layout.

The revised Archaeological Management Plan will ensure the adequate treatment of archaeological finds in the area of the Puerto Baron project. The historical background has been documented and will serve as a basis to interpret the context of object that might be found and also those found during the first excavations (October 2013) following which construction works were stopped until the archaeological management plan had been put in place.



**Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.90**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **38 COM 7B.41**, adopted at its 38th session (Doha, 2014),
3. Commends the State Party for its efforts to advance in the drawing up planning mechanisms for the city and for the great number of conservation works, including the elevators, that are being undertaken in a situation where it also had to address the emergency situation caused by the massive fire of April 2014;
4. Requests the State Party to submit:
  - a) a timeline for the implementation of the Urban Development Policy and its instruments in the city of Valparaiso,
  - b) a comprehensive report on the territorial, local and World Heritage site planning mechanisms and their integration,
  - c) an analysis of the effectiveness of the above for the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and its attributes and the integrated management structures that would be put in place;
5. Notes the response given by the State Party on the Terminal 2 Project, welcomes the actions taken to apply the ICOMOS Guidelines on Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) for World Heritage cultural properties and Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) recommendations in the impact assessment and also requests the State Party to present the finalized studies, as soon as they become available, together with an analysis of how these studies and the project design respond to the recommendations of the 2013 Advisory mission;
6. Also welcomes the efforts of the State Party to review the Puerto Baron Mall Project, and also commends the progress made to date with modifications to the plans and the further development of the Archaeological Management Plan and, while acknowledging that a full Environmental Impact Assessment cannot be undertaken, highly recommends that the State Party undertake a HIA to define formally any impacts of the project on the OUV of the property, and in particular on the city's amphitheatre-like layout and the vitality of the sea port upon which Valparaiso's prosperity was based, for submission when completed to the World Heritage Centre;
7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2016**, an updated report, including a 1-page executive summary, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session in 2017.

## II. OMNIBUS

As part of its functions and within the Reactive Monitoring process, each year the World Heritage Committee examines the state of conservation of a number of selected properties, inscribed on the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and those that are under threats (see Paragraph 169 of the *Operational Guidelines*). To this effect, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies prepare detailed reports on the state of conservation (“SOC reports”) of those properties which are presented for examination to the Committee (see Documents WHC-15/39.COM/7A, 7A.Add, 7B and 7B.Add).

On the basis of these reports, the World Heritage Committee decides, in consultation with the State Party concerned and as per Paragraph 24 of the *Operational Guidelines*, whether additional measures are required to protect the property.

However, after a careful review of the state of conservation reports submitted by the States Parties concerned, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that in a number of cases, the requests made by the World Heritage Committee to the State Party have been responded to in a satisfactory manner by the authorities concerned and/or adequate measures have been taken (for example, a comprehensive Management Plan for the property has been finalized or a development project potentially affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been cancelled) and that the property can therefore no longer be considered under threat.

In this sense, and in the context of the ever-growing workload of the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that it is not necessary to present yet another detailed SOC report for examination by the World Heritage Committee but rather a brief summary of the progress achieved for the conservation of such properties, which can therefore be removed from the Reactive Monitoring process.

With Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.93** proposed below, the World Heritage Committee is therefore invited to note with satisfaction that its requests have been addressed by the States Parties concerned and that in the judgment of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, the Outstanding Universal Value of the properties listed below is no longer under threat.

As a result, no further report on the state of conservation of these properties is required in the future, unless in the event of a new threat or development at the property.

## **CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

### **ASIA-PACIFIC**

#### **Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Iran, Islamic Republic of) (C 1208 bis)**

On 18 March 2015, the State Party submitted a detailed state of conservation report, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1208/documents/> and addressed the progress made in the implementation of the World Heritage Committee Decision **37 COM 7A.31**, adopted at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013).

At the same session, the Committee commended the efforts made by the State Party to meet the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in danger (DSOCR), and decided to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, considering that the property remained vulnerable, the Committee recommended the State Party to pay attention to the following matters:

- Revise the existing Management Plan to include visitor management component and action plans with timeframes and adequate resources for implementation;

- Control illegal construction and ensure effective protection of the buffer zone through the development and adoption of regulatory measures,
- Achieve consistency in restoration through the development guidelines and criteria for interventions to ensure a balanced approach to conservation that sustains the conditions of authenticity and integrity of the property,
- Ensure continuing site security with the involvement of the local authorities and communities.

The State Party, in its report, has provided details of progress made on all four items. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the state of conservation of the property is currently being adequately addressed by the State Party and no further reporting is required in the short term. The State Party is encouraged to continue with the implementation of all relevant measures and plans requested by the Committee, defining appropriate degrees of intervention for each element of the property, in order to ensure an appropriate state of conservation and to prevent threats from affecting its Outstanding Universal Value.

## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

### Rio de Janeiro, Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea (Brazil) (C 1100rev)

In response to the Decision approved by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Decision **36 COM 8B.42**), the State Party submitted a Management Plan of the property on March 2014. The Plan provides information on the overall management framework for all the components parts of the serial property. The management Plan is accessible at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1100/documents/>

Further information still needs to be provided by the State Party on the remaining requests of the Committee related to protection, conservation and management of the property.

#### **Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.93**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Takes note with satisfaction of the measures taken by the States Parties concerned to address its previous requests to mitigate the threats on the Outstanding Universal Value of the following World Heritage properties :*
  - ***Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Iran, Islamic Republic of),***
  - ***Rio de Janeiro, Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea (Brazil);***
3. *Encourages the States Parties concerned to pursue their efforts to ensure the conservation of World Heritage properties;*
4. *Reminds the States Parties concerned to inform the World Heritage Centre in due course about any major development project that may negatively impact the*

*Outstanding Universal Value of a property, before any irreversible decisions are made, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines.*