

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Selimiye Mosque and its Social Complex

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Turkey

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

1366

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2011


1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Selimiye Mosque and its Social Complex	41.678 / 26.559	2.5	37.5	40	2011
Total (ha)		2.5	37.5	40	

Comment

During the nomination processes of the property, the buffer zone was extended from 40 ha to the 40,50 ha complying with ICOMOS recommendations. This information and the revised map indicating the precise boundaries of the property and its buffer zone (as presented in the below Question 1.4) had been transmitted to the World Heritage Center before the inscription of site in 2011.

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Map of inscribed property - Selimiye Mosque and its Social Complex	29/06/2011	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

Comment

General Directorate of Pious Foundations

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Sule Kilic Yildiz
Ministry of Culture and Tourism
Art Historian
General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums

Comment

Dr. Nurçin Çelik Architect and Conservation Expert Site Manager Edirne Municipality, Directorate of Development and Urbanisation UNESCO World Heritage Site Management Unit Telephone:+90 284 214 19 44 Fax:+90 284 225 01 76 Email: celik.nurcin@gmail.com

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

Comment

<http://www.dmselimiyecamii.com/>

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

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief synthesis

Dominating the skyline of Edirne, former capital of the Ottoman Empire, the Selimiye Mosque Complex commissioned by Selim II is the ultimate architectural expression by the architect Sinan of the Ottoman külliye. The imposing mosque stepping up to its single great dome with four soaring slender minarets, spectacular decorated interior space, manuscript library, meticulous craftsmanship, brilliant Iznik tiles and marble courtyard together with its associated educational institutions, outer courtyard and covered bazaar, represent the apogee of an art form and the pious benefaction of 16th century imperial Islam. The architectural composition of the Selimiye Mosque Complex in its dominant location represents the culmination of the great body of work by Sinan, the most outstanding architect of the Ottoman Empire.

Criterion (i): The Selimiye Mosque Complex at Edirne is a masterpiece of the human creative genius of the architect Sinan, the most famous of all Ottoman architects in the 16th century. The single great dome supported by eight pillars has a diameter of 31.5 over a prayer space of 45mx36m, and with its four soaring minarets it dominates the city skyline. The innovative structural design allowed numerous windows creating an extraordinary illuminated interior. The mosque complex was recognised by Sinan himself as his most important architectural work.

Criterion (iv): The Selimiye Mosque with its cupola, spatial concept, architectural and technological ensemble and location crowning the cityscape illustrates a significant stage in human history, the apogee of the Ottoman Empire. The interior decoration using Iznik tiles from the peak period of their production testifies to a great art form never to be excelled in this material. The mosque with its charitable dependencies represents the most harmonious expression ever achieved of the külliye, this most peculiar Ottoman type of complex.

Integrity

The Selimiye Mosque Complex includes all the attributes of its Outstanding Universal Value within the property boundary, is well-maintained and does not suffer from adverse effects of development. In view of the importance of the dominant setting of the property and its landmark status, it is extremely important that all view corridors continue to be protected.

Authenticity

The Mosque Complex retains its authenticity in terms of form and design, materials and substance. The Mosque and Arasta retain their authenticity in terms of use and function, spirit and feeling. The madrasas have been slightly modified to serve appropriate new uses as museums.

Protection and Management requirements

The property is protected under the National Act on the Preservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage no. 2863 and the Act on Pious Foundations no. 5737, and all works require the approval of the Regional Conservation Council. A Coordination and Supervision Council, constituted by representatives of local and central institutions is being established by the Edirne Municipality to oversee development of the Management Plan for the Selimiye Mosque Complex. In addition there will be an Advisory Body made up

of academics, representatives of NGOs, Chamber of Architects, local and central government and local citizens, which will evaluate the Management Plan and provide suggestions. The objectives of the Management Plan are directed at ensuring the preservation of the Selimiye Mosque and transfer of its cultural and functional values as a whole to future generations. They cover structural preservation, management of development pressures including urban development within the buffer zone, management of visitors, visitor services, research and training, data management and administration. An Action Plan is included with short term (1-3 years) and long term (over 5 years) items. Good co-ordination between the various bodies holding responsibility for the Urban Conservation Plan (master plan) for the historical core of Edirne city and the Management Plan for the property, including its conservation, maintenance and visitor management is required to ensure effective management of the property. Documentation of the traditional systems of conservation and management of the property should be part of this.

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

(i)(iv)

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

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact						Origin
3.1	Buildings and Development							
3.1.1	Housing							
3.1.2	Commercial development							
3.1.3	Industrial areas							
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure							
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities							
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure							
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure							
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure							
3.3	Services Infrastructures							
3.3.5	Major linear utilities							
3.4	Pollution							
3.4.4	Air pollution							
3.4.5	Solid waste							
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric							
3.7.1	Wind							
3.7.2	Relative humidity							
3.7.5	Dust							
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)							
3.7.7	Pests							
3.7.8	Micro-organisms							
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage							
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses							
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage							
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation							
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events							
3.11.2	Earthquake							
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)							
3.13	Management and institutional factors							
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities							
3.13.3	Management activities							
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside		

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
3.1	Buildings and Development					
3.1.1	Housing	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	static
3.1.2	Commercial development	localised	one off or rare	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	high capacity	decreasing
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.5	Solid waste	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	high capacity	decreasing

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 **do not limit** the ability to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value **but they could be improved**

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

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

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

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

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

The buffer zone of the property can be extended covering the related area between Maarif Street and Balıkpazarı Street to ensure a better integrity of the site.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

The ownership of the mosque and the masradas belongs to the Sultan Selim Foundation, which is a part of the General Directorate for Pious Foundations.

The Mosque is used by the Edirne Provincial Office of Mufti, the Dar"ul-Hadis by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, and the Dar"ul-Kurra by the General Directorate of Pious Foundations.

The ownership of the Primary School and the Arasta belongs directly to General Directorate of Pious Foundations, and all the shops inside the market and the Primary School has been rented to private people.

The Mosque, madrasahs, library, and clock house inside the Selimiye Complex are "charity immovable" which are directly provided by the foundations to the public use free of charge. The Ottoman Bazaar, however, is a "flowing immovable" which are required to be evaluated as an income for the realization of the objectives and activities of the foundation. Mosque and madrasahs were first registered as monuments on the national inventory with the decision of The Superior Council for Real Estates, Antiquities and Monuments, dated 14.05.1978 and numbered 10370. With the decision of the Superior Council for Immovable Antiquities and Monuments dated 04.10.1985 and numbered 1147 the registration of Edirne Selimiye Mosque and Madrasahs were renewed. Arasta was first registered with the decision of Superior Council for Immovable Antiquities and Monuments, and was included to the complex with the decision of dated 04.07.2003 and numbered 7697. With this decision, the complex area is also registered as conservation site which overlaps the world heritage nomination area.

The historical city center, where the mosque and its complex with other significant monumental buildings are located, are also registered on the inventory as conservation site. The first registration goes back to 27.05.1988 date numbered 37. Continuation of its register with the decision dated 04.07.2003 and numbered 7697, and this decision also enlarged the conservation site to a wider area.

The buffer zone of the nominated property was determined with the huge participation of all stakeholders within the site in accordance with the Operational Guidelines and national site management legislation. After the approval by the decision of Regional Conservation Council dated 13.12.2007 and numbered 1715, it was authorized by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism on the 31st of December, 2007. Management plan studies are being carried within these boundaries. According to the national legislation, Edirne Municipality is the responsible institution to prepare urban conservation plan. All restoration and conservation activities for the mosque, madrasahs and the arasta are carried out according to the national Act on the Preservation of Cultural and Natural Heritage numbered 2863 and Act on Pious Foundations numbered 5737 and with the approval of the Regional Conservation Council. Supervision of the projects is the duty of the Edirne Regional Directorate of Pious Foundation. While fulfilling the entire operations, a cooperation and coordination have been established among the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, General and Regional Directorates of Pious Foundations, Edirne Municipality and Edirne Regional Conservation Council for Cultural and Natural Heritage. The task sharing among these institutions has been ensured by the acts.

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

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

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

The current conservation of the mosque, masrastas and arasta is under the responsibility of the General and Regional Directorates of Pious Foundations. However, daily tasks of cleaning, security, etc for Dar-ul-Hadis are held by the Edirne Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism, Dar-ul-Kurra; inner and outer courtyards are held by Edirne Regional Directorate of Pious Foundation; the mosque is held by Edirne Provincial Directorate of Religious Affairs; the library and the possession of the manuscripts are in the responsibility of the Edirne Provincial Public Library.

Following supplement 2, entitled "Site Management, Museum Management and Monuments Commission" of Act Numbered 2863 promulgated on 14.07.2004, the boundaries of the site management area have been approved by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Edirne Selimiye Mosque and Its Social Complex site buffer zone (management area) considered within the scope of the management plan.

In accordance with the related regulation Mr. Namık Kemal Döleneken (The Deputy Mayor of Edirne) has been appointed by Edirne Municipality as the site coordinator to provide coordination among the responsible institutions in planning and implementation process of management plan. Meanwhile, "Advisory Body", which is responsible to evaluate draft management plan and to give suggestion for implementation, was constituted by academicians, representatives of NGOs, chamber of architects, local and central government and local citizens. Additionally, the "Coordination and Supervision Council", which is mainly responsible for approving the management plan and steering the implementation of it, was constituted by the representatives of related local and central institutions are established in accordance with the regulation, as well. Management plan being prepared by the Municipality aims to maintain all these management responsibilities interrelate and to propose a well-structured management mechanism for the property.

A Draft Management Plan was submitted with the Nomination File in 2010.

Comment

In accordance with the related regulation Ms. Nurçin ÇELİK, who is an architect and conservation expert, has been appointed by Edirne Municipality as the site manager on the 21st of January, 2011.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

The Management Plan prepared by the Municipality was approved by the Coordination and Audit Board in 2012. The management plan includes an Action Plan for the next five years and many activities are being implemented by the responsible and related institutions. The implementation of the management plan has being monitored by the site management office and the site manager.

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 being **fully** implemented and monitored

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

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

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

Local communities / residents	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Poor
Visitors	Poor
Researchers	Poor
Tourism industry	Poor
Industry	Non-existent

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

Local communities 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 **little or no contact** 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)	0%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	17%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	60%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	10%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	13%

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 **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is some **ad hoc** maintenance of equipment and facilities

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

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

Full-time	100%
Part-time	0%

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

Permanent	58%
Seasonal	42%

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

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

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

Human resources are **inadequate** for management needs

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	Poor
Community outreach	Not applicable
Interpretation	Fair
Education	Poor
Visitor management	Not applicable
Conservation	Fair
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Non-existent
Tourism	Non-existent
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Fair

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

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

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

A capacity development plan or programme is drafted or in place, but is **not being implemented**

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** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

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

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

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

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

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

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 **one location and easily visible** to visitors

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

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Poor
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	Not provided but needed
Site museum	Not provided but needed
Information booths	Not provided but needed
Guided tours	Poor
Trails / routes	Not provided but needed
Information materials	Poor
Transportation facilities	Poor
Other	Not provided but needed

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

4.7. Visitor Management

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

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

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

Entry tickets and registries

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 **not being actively managed** despite an identified need

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?

No fees are collected

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

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

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient to define key indicators, **but this has not been done**

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

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

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

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

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

	World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
3.1 Buildings and Development							
3.1.1	Housing	Visual impact of high-rise building developments outside the buffer zone.	Preparation of a visual impact assessment study in order to protect authentic visibility of World heritage site within the metropolitan urban lanscape.	Monitoring will be systemized within the framework of monitoring activities for the management plan	Long term	Edirne Municipality Site Management Office	-
3.1.2	Commercial development	Visual impact of high-rise commercial building developments outside the buffer zone	Preparation of a visual impact assessment study.	Monitoring will be systemized within the framework of monitoring activities for the management plan	Long term	Edirne Municipality Site Management Office	-
3.2 Transportation Infrastructure							
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	Physical and visual impacts of motor vehicles on the World heritage site and buffer zone.	Developing an action plan dealing with transportatation facilities within the context of revision of the management plan	Monitoring will be systemized within the framework of monitoring activities for the management plan	Medium term	Edirne Municipality Site Management Office	-
3.4 Pollution							
3.4.5	Solid waste	Physical and visual impacts of solid waste in the World heritage site and its buffer zone.	Developing a strategy and plan dealing with solid waste in the urban area within the context of revision of the management plan.	Monitoring will be systemized within the framework of monitoring activities for the management plan.	Short term	Edirne Municipality Site Management Office	-

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones						
	Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.1.4	The boundaries of the World Heritage property are not known by local residents / communities / landowners	Organizing awareness building activities for local residents to familarize the boundaries of the property	Short term	Edirne Municipality Site Management Office	-	
4.3 Management System / Management Plan						
4.3.10	There is little or no contact with industry regarding management	Conducting activities to increase dialogue and coordination between related institutions.	Medium term	Edirne Municipality Site Management Office	-	
4.4 Financial and Human Resources						
4.4.12	Human resources inadequate for management needs	Improving the financial and administrative capacity of the site management office.	Long term	Edirne Municipality	-	
4.5 Scientific Studies and Research Projects						
4.5.2	Research in the property is not planned	Developing a creative system for planning scientific reseaches and studies.	Medium term	Site Management Advisory Board	-	
4.7 Visitor Management						

4.7.4	Visitor use of the property is not being actively managed	Preparation of visitor management plan within the context of the revision of the management plan	Medium term	Edirne Municipality Site Management Office Site Management Advisory Board	-
4.8 Monitoring					
4.8.2	Key indicators have not been defined	Definition of key indicators to monitor the conservation status of the site periodically.	Medium term	Edirne Municipality Site Management Office Site Management Advisory Board	-

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	Very positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	No impact
International cooperation	No impact
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Very positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	Very positive
Other (please specify)	No impact

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
Non Governmental Organization
Advisory bodies
Others

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

no

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

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

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Good
Advisory Body	Good

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

Most of the required information was accessible

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

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	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Satisfactory

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

• Geographic Information Table

Reason for update: During the nomination proceses of the property, the buffer zone was extended from 40 ha to the 40,50 ha complying with ICOMOS recommendations. This information and the revised map indicating the precise boundaries of the property and its buffer zone (as presented in the below Question 1.4) had been transmitted to the World Heritage Center before the inscription of site in 2011.

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

Periodic Reporting exercise provided a useful tool for assesing the progress made by the related institutions regarding the implementation of the management plan since its approval. It also provided a mechanism for exchange of information and experiences between related stakeholders. However, as the questionnaires have been designed in a way to cover all the World Heritage properties on a global level, some questions are too general and do not fit into well to the specific areas.