

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Monte San Giorgio

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Italy
- Switzerland

Type of Property

natural

Identification Number

1090bis


Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2003, 2010

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Monte San Giorgio	45.889 / 8.914	1089.34	3207.45	4296.79	2003
Total (ha)		1089.34	3207.45	4296.79	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Map of Inscribed Property 2010	28/01/2009	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Oliver Martin
Office fédéral de la Culture
Chef de la section Patrimoine culturel et monuments historiques
Département fédéral de l'intérieur (DFI)
- Adele Cesi
Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali
Funzionario
Ufficio Patrimonio Mondiale UNESCO, Segretariato Generale - Servizio 1

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Giovanna Staub

Comment

This is Giovanna Staub private address. The professional address is c/o Museo dei Fossili del Monte San Giorgio Via Bernardo Peyer 9 6866 Meride Additional Telephone Number: +41 79789 42 51 Additional e-mail: site_manager@montesangiorgio.org Alberto U. Marchi is the italian side site manager e-mail: alberto.marchi@usa.net address: via Sanvito Silvestro, 60 I-21100 Varese phone number: +39 328 72 14 957

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](#)

Comment

We can not find any imagines in OUR PLACE neither in WCMC. What shall we do?

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

Comment

There were no updates

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief synthesis

The pyramid-shaped, wooded mountain of Monte San Giorgio beside Lake Lugano is regarded as the best fossil record of marine life from the Triassic Period (245 – 230 million years ago). The sequence records life in a tropical lagoon environment, sheltered and partially separated from the open sea by an offshore reef. Diverse marine life flourished within this lagoon, including reptiles, fish, bivalves, ammonites, echinoderms and crustaceans. Because the lagoon was near to land, the fossil remains also include some land-based fossils including reptiles, insects and plants. The result is a fossil resource of great richness.

Criterion (viii): Monte San Giorgio is the single best known record of marine life in the Triassic period, and records important remains of life on land as well. The property has produced diverse and numerous fossils, many of which show exceptional completeness and detailed preservation. The long history of study of the property and the disciplined management of the resource have created a well documented and catalogued body of specimens of exceptional quality, and are the basis for a rich associated geological literature. As a result, Monte San Giorgio provides the principal point of reference, relevant to future discoveries of marine Triassic remains throughout the world.

Integrity

The property encompasses the complete Middle Triassic outcrop of Monte San Giorgio including all of the main fossil bearing areas. The Italian portion of the property included is an extension in 2010 of the originally inscribed area in Switzerland, which was added to the World Heritage List in 2003. The resulting extended property fully meets the integrity requirements for a fossil site. The main attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property are the accessible fossiliferous rock exposures, with intact strata which occur in many parts of the property.

Protection and Management Requirements

The property benefits from legal protection in both Italy and Switzerland that provides an effective basis for the protection of its geological resources. Site protection also focuses on landscape protection and has resulted in appropriate legislative controls and existing management procedures that are effectively enforced at the local level and which are underwritten by National, Regional and Provincial government support.

Strong transboundary collaboration between the States Parties of Italy and Switzerland is in place, including mechanisms that are agreed by all of the local municipalities in both countries, through common signed accords and declarations. A joint management plan is also in place for the property, and the States Parties and local authorities are committed to providing adequate ongoing staffing and

management resources to the property. Maintenance of the effectiveness of the transboundary cooperation and the related management plan is a key ongoing requirement for the protection of the property. Staff with a specific responsibility for site management are in place in both countries, and collaborate effectively to ensure a fully coordinated management of the property, including in relation to its presentation.

The main management requirement in relation to the values of Monte San Giorgio is the in situ protection of fossil bearing areas. Although these areas are generally difficult to access, it is important to ensure their accessibility for managed legal scientific excavation. Continued scientific excavation is a key requirement to maintaining the values of this property as a world reference area for paleontological research.

Maintenance of the relationships between the property and leading research institutes is also essential to both its scientific value and its presentation. Because the in situ fossil resources both require excavation and preparation to be of scientific value, and are not publicly accessible or visible, the completeness, presentation and safety of the fossil collections held in a limited number of universities and museums is key to the protection of the values of the property. These collections are maintained through strict adherence to appropriate legislative controls on excavation within the property. The housing of resultant fossil finds, and the standards of curation, specimen preparation and research, and museum display are of the highest quality in the main research collections related to the property. This presentation of the fossil finds from the property in major international museums also needs to be complemented by the appropriate provision of visitor centres and services within or near to the property, and a programme to establish and maintain these services is in place. An active ongoing programme of communication and interpretation for visitors to the property is required to ensure the fullest appreciation of the Outstanding Universal Value of Monte San Giorgio.

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

(viii)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised

2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value
























3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact	Origin
3.1	Buildings and Development		
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities	    	
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage		
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	   	
3.9	Other human activities		
3.9.1	Illegal activities	   	
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage	   	
Legend	 Current	 Potential	 Negative
	 Positive	 Inside	 Outside

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

No factor is both current and negative.

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

3.17.1 - Comments

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comments to questions 4.1.4 and 4.1.5 The boundaries of the World Heritage property and of the buffer zone are known by the management. By local residents, communities and landowners their are less known, but informations programmes are planned to improve the knowledge.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

Switzerland:

Although the site does not have a distinct legal status in its own right at present, both it and the buffer zone are treated as a single site under Swiss law, and receive identical protection. Thus at the federal level, MSG is defined and mapped in the 'Federal Inventory of Landscapes, Sites and Natural Monuments',

declared and ratified in 1977. The protected area is in essence the same as the combined area of the nominated Site and buffer zone. The inventory binds all federal authorities to respect the values for which the site is listed, and also applies to bodies to whom cantonal powers are delegated.

The Cantonal Development Plan (CDP) identifies this same area of land as a Landscape Protection Zone (LPZ). In such zones, the protection of natural landscape features has the highest priority amongst different human uses. The CDP sets out six general objectives for protection, promotion of research and preparation of management plans. The protected area is also translated into the Local Development Plans of the Communes, which include plans providing for different land uses. Within these plans, the significant natural areas within the LPZ are identified as nature reserves, although the detailed policies for protection in both the cantonal and local plans are not recorded in the nomination documentation. All fossil remains in Canton Ticino are protected through the 'Cantonal Regulations for the Protection of Flora and Fauna' which were passed in 2002. These regulations include sections which replace legislative decree passed in 1974, which protects fossil remains. Under the regulations, important fossil material throughout the Canton is identified as the property of the State. A cantonal permit is required for all fossil excavation and collection activities, providing a very strict regulatory system which has been applied to fossil excavations on MSG for many years with permits only having been granted to universities with a proven research record (principally Zürich and Milan).

Italy:

In total 43.4% of the extension is in public ownership and 56.6% is owned by private landowners. Both the property and its buffer zone lie within a Landscape Protection Zone recognised under Italian law (Area di rilevanza ambientale LR 86/1983).

National, Regional, Provincial and Local legislative frameworks currently in place to protect the integrity of MSG. Since 1939, the protection of palaeontological heritage in Italy has been regulated by law and fossil material is considered to be property of the state. The most recent integration of laws regarding palaeontology defines all aspects of palaeontological heritage as cultural heritage and as such it comes under the control of the Ministry of Cultural Sites. Under this legislation, only approved institutions are permitted to research the area's palaeontological resources. In 2007 the municipalities of Besano, Porto Ceresio and Viggiù applied for a further paleontological constraint and safeguard on the palaeontological heritage of the area of the extension.

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

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

4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining

the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

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

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

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

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

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

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

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

Switzerland:

Management responsibilities for the site are divided between the federal, canton and commune levels, with no single management authority. However management of the fossil resource is exclusively the task of the Canton Ticino.

The site does not currently have a management plan, but a draft management plan was submitted subsequent to the submission of the nomination document. At this stage the draft plan sets out broad statements of intent, and details of current programmes that are being developed by the Canton, in some cases with the support of the Federal and local authorities, and partners in Italy. The plan is not yet at a sufficiently advanced stage to be able to identify the specific management requirements of the site, as distinct from the wider buffer Monte San Giorgio (Switzerland)

Italy:

As a fossil property the primary management requirement is related to the conservation of the fossil resource. Due to both the limited accessibility of the key exposures and the strict national regulation and permitting system, effective management is readily achieved. Only a limited number of excavations have been permitted by major organizations and institutions (e.g. Milan Museum, Milan University and the Museum of Induno Olona) and this has ensured not only an accurate and thorough recording of the finds, but also their detailed preparation and the widespread dissemination of findings. The integrity of the overall collection has been further enhanced by its concentration (99.9% of known specimens) in a limited number of locations at the Zurich, Lugano and Milano museums, together with a limited number of specimens at the small museums in Meride and Besano. These comprise a unique, consolidated, well-preserved, fully catalogued and well-protected resource, and thus continued strong links between the management of MSG and these institutions is essential. Ongoing monitoring of key geological and palaeontological features will continue to be assured

through strict application by the responsible authorities (Guardia di Finanza, Carabinieri, Guardie Ecologiche Volontarie) of the regulations contained within the national property law (Codice dei beni Culturali). The existence of several local museums supported by numerous volunteers also results in an almost constant monitoring of key sites that would make any unauthorized excavation extremely difficult. The regional development plan and town-planning schemes (PRG) of the communes are regularly reviewed and updated and are key factors in ensuring the ongoing conservation of MSG. There is at present no overall process for monitoring the state of conservation of the site at regular intervals. Human resources are dedicated to the protection and management of the extension, mainly via part-time staff who have wider roles in hunting regulation, forest service and volunteer organisations.

A range of educational and research activities is also supported across the extension. The Lombardy Region supports a part-time official to oversee excavations, and Milan and Insubria Universities have one part-time paleontology researcher/technician each, Besano Museum has two part-time technicians as well as a part-time director and the full-time equivalent of a museum guide, Clivio Museum a part-time curator and a part-time director (as well as volunteers), and the Province of Varese a part-time officer for conservation of the historical Viggiù quarries.

Comment

Following the 2010 inscription of the Italian side both countries manage the property on the base of a transboundary management plan, attached to the Italian application.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

Following the 2010 inscription of the Italian side both countries manage the property on the base of a transboundary management plan, attached to the Italian application.

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

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

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

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

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

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

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

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

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

Local communities / residents	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable

Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Poor

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

Local communities have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management

4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

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

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

There is contact but only **some cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

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

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

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

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

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	48%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	22%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	28%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	2%

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

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

The available budget is **sufficient** but further funding would enable more effective management to international best practice standard

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Two different financing systems and the following different operating timing need a strong co-ordination to manage all shared projects and to satisfy the high UNESCO WHL visitors expectations. The Swiss main financing system follows a funding from the Confederation and the Italian one is based on a spot system-projects following applications at different levels. To improve finance resources can be helpful to reach the two main tasks of transboundary coordination and visitor's satisfaction.

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

Full-time	0%
Part-time	100%

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

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	0%

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

Paid	32%
Volunteer	68%

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

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

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

Research and monitoring	Fair
Promotion	Fair
Community outreach	Fair
Interpretation	Fair
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Fair
Conservation	Fair
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Not applicable
Tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Not applicable

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

Research and monitoring	Medium
Promotion	Medium
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	Medium
Education	Medium
Visitor management	Medium
Conservation	Medium
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Not applicable
Tourism	Medium
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Not applicable

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

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

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

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

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

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient**

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

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

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

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

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

List may be not complete

<http://www4.ti.ch/dt/da/mcsn/temi/mcsn/il-museo/monte-san-giorgio/pubblicazioni-scientifiche/> 2008 § Cristina Lombardo, Marco Rusconi & Andrea Tintori (2008) New perleidiform from the Lower Ladinian (Middle Triassic) of the Northern Grigna (LC). Riv.It.Paleont.Strat., 114/2: 263-272 § Renesto S. and Felber M. (2008). Un pachipleurosauride dai livelli centrali del Calcare di Meride in Canton Ticino (Svizzera) Geologia Insubrica 10: 9-12 § Sun Z.-Y., Tintori A., Lombardo C., Jiang D.-Y., Hao W.-C., Sun Y.-L., Wu F.-X. & Rusconi M. (2008) A new species of the Genus Colobodius Agassiz 1844 (Osteichthyes, Actinopterygii) from the Pelsonian (Anisian, Middle Triassic) of Guizhou (South China). Riv. It.Paleont.Strat., 114/3: 363-376, Milano § Olivier RIEPPEL (2008) ON THE NOTHOSAURIAN GENERA CERESIOSAURUS AND LARIOSAURUS. Geologia Insubrica 10: 1-4 2009 § TINTORI A., JIANG D., MOTANI R., RIEPPEL O., GAETANI M. & SUN Z. (2009) –Palaeobiogeography and migration ways of Tethyan Vertebrates during Middle-Late Triassic. International conference on Vertebrate Palaeobiogeography: abstract book. pp. 82-84, Bologna § Tintori A., Balini M., Bona F., Lombardo C. & Ravazzi C. (2009). Relevant Palaeontological sites in Lombardy. Epitome: 3, 559 – ISSN 1972-1552 2010 § Tintori A., Lombardo C. & Renesto S. (2010) I vertebrati triassici della Lombardia 150 anni dopo Stoppani. Orombelli G., Cassinis G. & Gaetani M. (Eds) Una Nuova Geologia per la Lombardia. Istituto Lombardo –Accademia di Scienze e Lettere, Convegno in onore di M.B.Cita: 89-114, Milano § Tintori A. & Lombardo C. (2010) La ripresa dalla Crisi P/Tr è stata più rapida del previsto? X Giornate di Paleontologia, Rende 2010, abstract book, p. 52. § Tintori A. (2010) Not only Monte San Giorgio: a new deal for Middle Triassic Fishes. V International meeting on Mesozoic Fishes: Global Diversity and Evolution. Museo del Desierto, Saltillo, Coahuila, Mexico August 1th-7th, Abstract book: 83, Un. Autonoma Estado Hidalgo § Tintori A., Sun Z.-Y., Hitij T., Lombardo C., Jiang D.-y. & Zhalohar Jure (2010) Short and long distance diversities in the fish assemblages of the Middle Triassic. V International meeting on Mesozoic Fishes: Global Diversity and Evolution. Museo del Desierto, Saltillo, Coahuila, Mexico August 1th-7th, Abstract book: 85, Un.Autonoma.Estado Hidalgo. § Tintori A., Sun Z.-y. & Lombardo C. (2010) How fast was the recovery after the Permo/Triassic crisis? The answer from the Actinopterygian fishes. Abstract International Symposium on Triassic and later Marin Vertebrate Faunas, August 28-September 8, Beijing,, 42-46. § Lin H.-q., Sun Z.-y., Tintori A., Hao W.-c. & Jiang D.-Y. (2010) New insights on Habroichthys Brough, 1939 (Actinopterygii, Habroichthyidae): the material from the Middle Triassic of Yunnan Province, South China. Abstract International Symposium on Triassic and later Marin Vertebrate Faunas, August 28-September 8, Beijing,, 57- 61 § Markus FELBER et Andrea TINTORI (2010) Le Monte San Giorgio, patrimoine mondial de l'UNESCO : une chance pour le développement et la valorisation d'un site « géo-paléontologique » et d'une région. La frontière franco-suisse : un petit pas pour les dinosaures. Colloque scientifique Porrentruy, 29 - 30 octobre 2010, Paléojura et l'Ambassade de France : 49-52 2011 § Tintori. A. (2011) Comment on "The vertebrates of the Anisian/Ladinian boundary (Middle Triassic)

from Bissendorf (NW Germany) and their contribution to the anatomy, palaeoecology, and palaeobiogeography of the Germanic Basin reptiles” by C. Diedrich. (Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 273 (2009) 1–16). Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology, V 300/ 1-4: 205-207, 1 February 2011 § Adriana Lòpez-Arbarello, Zuo-Yu Sun, Emilia Sferco, Andrea Tintori, Guang-Hui Xu, Yuan-Lin Sun, Fei-Xiang Wu & Da-Yong Jiang (2011) New Species of Sangiorgioichthys Tintori and Lombardo, 2007 (Neopterygii, Semionotiformes) from the Anisian of Luoping (Yunnan Province, South China). Zootaxa 2749: 25–39 (2011) § Da-Yong Jiang, Olivier Rieppel, Nicholas C. Fraser, Ryosuke Motani, Wei-Cheng Hao, Andrea Tintori, Yuan-Lin Sun, and Zuo-Yu Sun (2011) New information on the Protorosaurian reptile *Macrocnemus fuyuanensis* Li et al., 2007 from the Middle/Upper Triassic of Yunnan, China. Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology, 31(6): 1230-1237 § Markus Felber & Andrea Tintori (2011) Geoguida del Monte San Giorgio – Sito del Patrimonio Mondiale dell’UNESCO (Svizzera – Italia). Geo-tourist map. Geologia Insubrica Ed., Morbio Inf. 2012 § Cristina Lombardo, Andrea Tintori & Daniele Tona (2012) A new species of Sangiorgioichthys (Actinopterygii, Semionotiformes) from the Kalkschieferzone of Monte San Giorgio (Middle Triassic; Meride, Canton Ticino, Switzerland). Bollettino Società Paleontologica Italiana, 51 (3): 203-212.

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

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

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

In **many locations and easily visible** to visitors

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

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Average
Local businesses and industries	Poor

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

There is a planned education and awareness programme but it only **partly meets the needs** and could be improved

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

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

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

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

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

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

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

Once finished the first step of structure improvement (Visitor Centers and Local Museums) the next step is to develop further information and educational programmes (local schools) with the help of different educational supports (books, videos, panels, audioguide, apps etc.) .

4.7. Visitor Management

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

Last year	Major Increase (100%+)
Two years ago	N/A
Three years ago	N/A
Four years ago	N/A
Five years ago	N/A

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

Entry tickets and registries
Transportation services
Tourism industry

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

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

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

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

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

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

The fee is collected, and makes **some contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

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

4.8. Monitoring

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

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

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

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

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

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Average
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Not applicable
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

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

Implementation is **underway**

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

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

There are national monitoring programmes. The transnational monitoring programme is planned, but is not fully operative yet.

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

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

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

No factor is both current and negative.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

Answers provided have not outlined any serious management need.

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

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

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

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

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

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

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

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

5.4.1 - Comments

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

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

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

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

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

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff

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

yes

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

The application is not userfriendly. The navigation could be easier and faster, even by an interactive index the get straighter to the different sections.

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

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

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

Most of the required information was accessible

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

The World Heritage Convention
The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

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

UNESCO	Not Applicable
State Party	Not Applicable
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

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

Automatically generated in online version

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