



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

35 COM

Distribution Limited

WHC-11/35.COM/7B

Paris, 6 May 2011

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-fifth session

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
19-29 June 2011

**Item 7B of the Provisional Agenda: State of conservation of World Heritage
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. In certain cases, the World Heritage Committee may wish to decide to discuss in detail the state of conservation reports which are submitted for adoption without discussion.

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

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/35COM/>

Table of content

I. INTRODUCTION	6
ELABORATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS	7
NEW, CONTINUING AND EMERGING ISSUES	8
STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT	12
II. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	15
NATURAL PROPERTIES	15
AFRICA	15
1. Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407)	15
2. Mount Kenya (Kenya) (N 800)	18
3. Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis)	22
4. Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal) (N 25)	22
5. Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N 1162)	25
6. Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199)	25
7. Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156)	30
8. Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas (Zimbabwe) (N 302)	30
ASIA-PACIFIC	31
9. Purnululu National Park (Australia) (N 1094)	31
10. Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154)	34
11. The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) (N 798)	34
12. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Area (China) (N 1083 bis)	34
13. Kaziranga National Park (India) (N 337)	37
14. Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)	37
15. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)	37
16. Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)	37
17. Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) (N 653)	38
18. Central Highlands of Sri Lanka (Sri Lanka) (N 1203)	41
19. Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590)	41
20. Ha Long Bay (Vietnam) (N 672bis)	45
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	46
21. Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)	46
22. Lagoons of New Caledonia: Reef Diversity and Associated Ecosystems (France) (N 1115)	46
23. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)	46
24. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)	46

25. Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719).....	50
26. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation (N 768rev)	54
27. Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685bis)	55
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	56
28. Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1032)	56
29. Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205bis)	56
30. Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1)	56
31. Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)	56
32. Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve (Mexico) (N 1290)	56
33. Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) N 1138 rev).....	59
34. Manu National Park (Peru) (N 402)	63
35. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161).....	63
MIXED PROPERTIES	64
AFRICA	64
36. Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (C/N 39).....	64
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	71
37. Ibiza, Biodiversity and Culture (Spain) (C/N 417rev)	71
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	76
38. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)	76
CULTURAL PROPERTIES	82
AFRICA	82
39. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055).....	82
40. Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev).....	85
41. Aapravasi Ghat (Mauritius) (C 1227)	88
42. Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26).....	91
43. Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956 bis)	91
44. Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099)	94
45. Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173rev)	98
ARAB STATES.....	102
46. Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193)	102
47. Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565)	102
48. Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89).....	102
49. Petra (Jordan) (C 326).....	102
50. Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093).....	102
51. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)	105

52.	Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab) (Lebanon) (C 850)	105
53.	Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)	105
54.	Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 287)	105
55.	Ksar Ait-Ben-Haddou (Morocco) (C 444).....	105
56.	Historic City of Meknes (Morocco) (C 793).....	108
57.	Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) (C 1073)	110
58.	Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20)	110
59.	Archaeological Site of Carthage (Tunisia) (C 37)	112
60.	Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) (C 385).....	115
ASIA-PACIFIC.....		116
61.	The Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) (C 322).....	116
62.	Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia) (C 1224rev)	116
63.	Old Town of Lijiang (China) (C 811)	116
64.	Historic Centre of Macao (China) (C 1110)	119
65.	Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C 707 ter).....	121
66.	Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241)	124
67.	Taj Mahal, Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri (India) (C 252; C 251; C 255)	126
68.	Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India) (C 1101)	129
69.	Prambanan Temples (Indonesia) (C 642)	131
70.	Sangiran Early Man Site (Indonesia) (C 593).....	131
71.	Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (C 870)	133
72.	Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 481).....	136
73.	Melaka and George Town, Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca (Malaysia) (C 1223).....	136
74.	Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666 rev).....	136
75.	Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121).....	140
76.	Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)	142
77.	Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro (Pakistan) (C 138).....	145
78.	Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451)	148
79.	Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan) (C 602 rev)	148
80.	Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603 rev)	148
81.	Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam) (C 678).....	151
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA		152
82.	Historic Centres of Berat and Gjirokastra (Albania) (C 569 bis)	152
83.	Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784).....	155
84.	World Heritage properties of Vienna.....	157

85. Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh (Belarus) (C 1196)	161
86. Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 rev)	163
87. Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria) (C 217).....	166
88. Historic Centre of Český Krumlov (Czech Republic) (C 617)	166
89. Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616).....	169
90. Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia) (C 822)	171
91. Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay (France) (C 80bis).....	175
92. Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (France) (C 85) 178	
93. Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066).....	183
94. Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape (Hungary) (C 1063)	185
95. Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400 bis)	189
96. Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata (Italy) (C 829).....	193
97. Historic Centre of Naples (Italy) (C 726).....	193
98. Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania) (C 541)	195
99. Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994).....	199
100. Seventeenth-century canal ring area of Amsterdam inside the Singelgracht (Netherlands) (C 1349).....	199
101. Centennial Hall in Wroclaw (Poland) (C 1165)	201
102. Churches of Moldavia (Romania) (C 598 bis).....	205
103. Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslav (Russian Federation) (C 544)	207
104. Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540)	207
105. Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545).....	207
106. Ensemble of the Ferrapontov Monastery (Russian Federation) (C 982)	211
107. Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632).....	215
108. Tower of Hercules (Spain) (C 1312).....	215
109. Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320bis)	218
110. Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev).....	221
111. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)	221
112. Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral, Kiev Pechersk Lavra and Related Monastic Buildings (Ukraine) (C 527 bis).....	221
113. L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C 865)	227
114. Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488).....	229
115. Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom) (C 426bis).....	233

116. Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom) (C 373bis).....	237
117. Old and New Towns of Edinburgh (United Kingdom) (C 728).....	239
118. Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150).....	242
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	243
119. Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia) (C 567 rev).....	243
120. City of Potosi (Bolivia) (C 420).....	243
121. Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445).....	243
122. San Augustin Archaeological Park (Colombia) (C 744).....	246
123. Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526)	249
124. City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2)	252
125. National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180).....	255
126. Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129)	255
127. Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412)	258
128. Camino Real de Tierra Adentro (Mexico) (C 1351)	262
129. Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135).....	265
130. Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis)	269
131. Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru) (C 700).....	273
132. Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)	276
133. City of Cuzco (Peru) (C 273)	279
134. Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500bis).....	279
135. Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (C 747).....	282

I. INTRODUCTION

This document deals with reactive monitoring as it is defined in Paragraph 169 of the *Operational Guidelines*: "The reporting by the World Heritage Centre, other sectors of UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties that are under threat". Reactive monitoring is foreseen in the procedures for the inclusion of properties in the List of World Heritage in Danger (Paragraphs 177-191 of the *Operational Guidelines*) and for the removal of properties from the World Heritage List (Paragraphs 192-198 of the *Operational Guidelines*).

The properties to be reported on have been selected, among all those inscribed on the World Heritage List, in consultation between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. In making the selection, the following have been considered:

- Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger (see Documents WHC-11/35.COM/7A and WHC-11/35.COM/7A.Add);
- Properties for which state-of-conservation reports and/or reactive monitoring missions were requested by the World Heritage Committee at previous sessions;
- Properties which have come under serious threat since the last session of the World Heritage Committee and which require urgent actions;
- Properties where, upon inscription, follow-up was requested by the World Heritage Committee.

As since the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007), the draft decisions prepared by the World Heritage Centre, jointly with the Advisory Bodies, reflect an attempt, wherever possible, to establish a two-yearly reporting cycle for most of the World Heritage properties under consideration. This would reduce the number of state of conservation reports to be examined by the World Heritage Committee (which this year number 169 in total, including 34 on the List of World Heritage in Danger), providing States Parties, among other things, a more realistic timeframe to report on progress achieved on the Decisions by the World Heritage Committee. Exceptions to this approach have been made when special circumstances demanded an annual review. This approach for a 2-year cycle has also been strongly recommended by the experts meeting on the decision-making procedures of the statutory organs of the *World Heritage Convention* (Manama, Bahrain, 15-17 December 2010), presented in Document WHC-11/35.COM/12B.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have also studied the possibility of setting-up a regional review of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties on a regular basis (taking into account the Periodic Reporting process). This would allow the identification and consideration of properties which have never been subject to the reporting process, or which have not been considered for many years, and the possible "phasing-out" of others, as appropriate.

The World Heritage Centre (often in collaboration with UNESCO Field offices and other Sectors) and the Advisory Bodies review throughout the year a considerable amount of information on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. At their bi-annual meetings (September and January) critical cases are reviewed and a decision is taken as to whether a report should be provided to the World Heritage Committee. In many cases a report is not required, as issues can be reviewed with the State Party concerned, or through expert advice provided on a specific project, following the submission of material in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. In some cases States Parties

request that experts visit the properties to review a specific issue through an advisory mission.

It is important that States Parties are provided with adequate and timely advice on the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. To ensure that the conservation of World Heritage properties for future generations is a core activity under the 1972 *Convention* and plays a key role in its implementation, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are at the disposal of States Parties, and their local authorities and site managers, to assist in protection and conservation processes through all means at their disposal, including written advice, advisory missions (missions at the request of States Parties and financed by them) and international cooperation projects.

Finally, it is important to clarify the nature of the different types of missions referred to in the state of conservation reports. Whereas all missions conducted to World Heritage properties and mentioned in the reports should be considered as “official” UNESCO missions, they can be grouped in various categories as follows:

- Reactive monitoring missions requested by the World Heritage Committee, which are carried out jointly by World Heritage Centre or UNESCO staff and representatives of the Advisory Bodies;
- Missions conducted within the framework of the Reinforced monitoring mechanism on selected properties;
- Monitoring or advisory missions carried out by UNESCO staff, consultants or experts from the Advisory Bodies in the framework of projects or requested by States Parties;
- Visits to World Heritage properties by UNESCO staff on the occasion of workshops, conferences or other events.

ELABORATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS

Once the list of properties subject to a state of conservation report for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its next session has been decided, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies start compiling all information available: state of conservation report submitted by the State Party, information received by NGOs, individuals, press articles, replies by the State Party, mission reports, comments on these by the State Party, etc...

The major source of information are the state of conservation reports submitted by the concerned States Parties, before the statutory deadline of **1 February** of any given year, following a request by the World Heritage Committee (Paragraph 169 of the *Operational Guidelines*) or a request for information on specific issues by the World Heritage Centre (in the case the property was not subject to a report to the World Heritage Committee previously). This report is the opportunity for a State Party to bring all relevant information to the attention of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, in reply to specific requests by the Committee. States Parties can also (and are encouraged to do so) submit detailed information on development projects to inform the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also receive information from other sources than the State Party (NGOs, individuals, press articles, etc.). In such case, they communicate with the State Party to ascertain the information and get clarification on the specific issue.

The World Heritage Committee also, in some cases, requests a reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property and the status of the threats. Such missions are usually conducted by representatives of both the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Following completion of the fact finding mission, the mission

members prepare jointly a report, which is sent to the State Party for comment and correction of eventual factual errors, hence, improving the accuracy of the final state of conservation report.

The preparation of the first drafts of the state of conservation reports should normally be carried out by the Advisory Bodies. However, when the World Heritage Centre has a strong technical engagement with a particular property, or has recently been on mission, it often takes the lead on drafting. The World Heritage Centre also revises all the reports to integrate elements from projects, international assistance and ensure consistency in the drafting.

The first draft is then circulated several times between the relevant Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre until the report is agreed upon and reflects a joint position. It is then integrated into the main document on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties (Documents WHC-11/35.COM/7A, WHC-11/35.COM/7A.Add, WHC-11/35.COM/7B and WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add), for examination by the World Heritage Committee.

Therefore, in order to ensure accuracy of the state of conservation reports, States Parties have already several “entry points”:

- the State Party’s report on the state of conservation to be submitted by 1 February to the World Heritage Centre,
- the State Party’s reply to World Heritage Centre’s letter(s) regarding specific information received through other sources,
- the information submitted by the State Party in application of Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*,
- the information provided by the State Party during a reactive monitoring mission,
- the reply by the State Party to the reactive monitoring mission report.

NEW, CONTINUING AND EMERGING ISSUES

There remain a wide range of challenges facing World Heritage properties that result from diverse pressures. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note a number of specific points that require additional consideration by the World Heritage Committee.

Mining and mineral exploration, and oil exploration and exploitation

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the increased number of cases where properties are threatened by planned or existing mining as well as oil exploration and exploitation projects. This trend appears to be especially notable with regard to natural properties in Africa. In this report, mining and oil related issues are considered in a large number of properties (including Mount Nimba (Côte d’Ivoire/Guinea); Virunga National Park (DRC); Lagoons of New Caledonia (France), Virgin Komi Forest (Russian Federation) and Belize Barrier Reef (Belize)). While some concerns are raised because of mining or oil projects in the vicinity of the properties, which might impact on their Outstanding Universal Value, a range of projects are located within the boundaries of World Heritage properties. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the World Heritage Committee has established a clear practice and considers that these activities are not compatible with the World Heritage status and therefore, should not take place inside properties. When such activities are planned in areas adjoining to World Heritage properties, it should be ensured that the Outstanding Universal Value is not impacted. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recall that this policy approach has been endorsed by leaders in the respective industries, such as the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) (see World Heritage and Mining workshop, 2000 and ICMM Position Statement on Mining and

Protected Areas 2003 available at <http://www.icmm.com>) or Shell and that these industry statements represent a benchmark of practice for all actors in the public and private sectors. Their support for the position of the World Heritage Committee represents a very significant achievement of the *World Heritage Convention*. IUCN will be coordinating, with a range of industry partners, and with the support of the World Heritage Centre, a project to review the current industry commitments, and to recommend how to move forward to strengthen conservation actions. The results of this review will be reported to the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the increasing trend shown above should be a matter of the utmost concern for the World Heritage Committee. They note that States Parties appear to continue to pursue these projects, in spite of the position of the World Heritage Committee and considering the impacts that such projects have on the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties. They note that experience shows that, often, licenses have been attributed by Ministries in charge of oil or mining, without the Ministry in charge of the properties being informed, and sometimes in spite of the conservation legislation governing the property. There appear to be serious issues of policy, capacity and governance that need to be addressed in many States Parties. The approach taken by the World Heritage Committee and by States Parties also needs to take full account of the lessons that have been learned by the most responsible private sector operators. Those companies making conservation commitments to World Heritage properties need to be supported, and that by supporting World Heritage properties, they do not find that States Parties allow other companies with lower standards to operate in World Heritage areas.

In addition to mining or oil operations, some properties are confronted with planned oil or gas pipelines (e.g. Donana National Park (Spain), Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation)) or other related developments (such as a liquefied natural gas plant in the case of Great Barrier Reef (Australia)).

The potential disastrous impacts related to industrial activities were again recently demonstrated by a toxic spill of waste from a chemical plant in Hungary in October 2010, which affected World Heritage properties along the Danube, including the Danube Delta (Romania). The Hungarian authorities worked closely with UNESCO (both Science and Culture Sectors) to ensure transparency of information. In April 2010, an explosion on an offshore oil drilling platform led to a devastating oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, further illustrating the widespread impacts that can result from such developments.

The issue of shipping routes close to terrestrial or marine sites is also of concern. In March 2011, a cargo vessel ran aground in the vicinity of the World Heritage property of Gough and Inaccessible Islands (United Kingdom) causing an oil spill with potential impacts on the marine ecosystem in the area. A number of major shipping routes pass close to marine or terrestrial sites. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that in several cases, the World Heritage Committee requested the application of "particularly sensitive sea area" (PSSA) status from the International Maritime Organization for the seascape close to the property. They also note the importance of oil and chemical pollution preparedness as a key issue for marine, and other World Heritage properties, and consider capacities should be increased in this area.

Dams and other energy related megaprojects

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note an apparent increase in the number of properties which could be potentially affected by major dam projects: Ashur (Iraq), Niokolo Koba National Park (Senegal), Selous Game Reserve (Tanzania), Durmitor National Park (Montenegro), Rio Platano (Honduras), Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China), Talamanca/La Amistad (Costa Rica and Panama), Dong Phrayayen (Thailand), Lake Turkana (Kenya) and others. While in many cases, the proposed dams are outside the

property and sometimes situated at considerable distance, even in neighbouring countries (for instance the Gibe III Dam in Ethiopia which might affect Lake Turkana in Kenya), downstream and upstream effects on the watersheds can be highly significant, causing flooding or water scarcity and resulting in significant impacts in World Heritage properties situated in these watersheds. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that dam projects in the past have had major effects on some properties (Djoudj in Senegal or Ichkeul in Tunisia) and led to the inscription of these properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Costly infrastructure interventions were needed to artificially bring back the former hydrological regimes. They note that the impacts of some of the megadam projects currently under discussion would be difficult, or impossible, to mitigate and would lead to irreversible losses of the Outstanding Universal Value of these properties. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee establish a clear policy on dams, as was done with mining and oil development, highlighting the clear criteria to be used for financing, impact assessments and follow-up of megaprojects. In this respect, the existing guidance developed by the World Commission on Dams (www.dams.org) may be taken note of.

Impact Assessments

The above types of development illustrate a broader issue regarding the need to make effective use of Environmental and Heritage Impact Assessments, in relation to projects that could affect World Heritage properties. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that while impact assessments are usually conducted for these projects, they frequently do not consider the Outstanding Universal Value of the affected properties nor the provisions of the *World Heritage Convention*. Furthermore, States Parties are requested to submit impact assessment reports to the World Heritage Centre for review, normally undertaken by the Advisory Bodies, before a decision on the project is taken, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. National legislation often allows only a limited time of public consultation and do not foresee the timelines needed for such a procedure. The increased number and complexity of projects and the impact assessment reports also puts forward a critical question of the capacity in the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to review these assessments. This issue was also discussed during the expert meeting on the global state of conservation of World Heritage properties held in Dakar in April 2011 (see Document WHC-11/35.COM/INF.7C) and will need further reflection by the World Heritage Committee in the future. In 2010, ICOMOS prepared a *Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties*. This publication is accessible on-line at: [http://openarchive.icomos.org/266/1/ICOMOS Heritage Impact Assessment 2010.pdf](http://openarchive.icomos.org/266/1/ICOMOS_Heritage_Impact_Assessment_2010.pdf)

IUCN is developing good practice advice in this area and recalls that all environmental assessments of proposals affecting World Heritage properties should, at a minimum: i) assess the likely impacts of the proposal on the property's Outstanding Universal Value and integrity, based on the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value; ii) consider and assess feasible and less environmentally damaging alternatives to the proposal and may include alternative energy production/efficiency options at national level and iii) undertake adequate stakeholder consultation in line with international best-practice principles. Best practice Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) principles and assessments can be accessed at <http://www.iaia.org/publications/>.

Natural disasters and impacts on World Heritage properties

Natural disasters have a tremendous detrimental impact on efforts at all levels to protect and manage World Heritage properties. The impact of disasters remains a significant challenge

to sustainable development, more specifically, protection and preservation of the built and natural environment, including the World Heritage properties.

During 2010 and 2011, a number of natural disasters occurred. These include: flooding in Pakistan (August 2010) affecting the Moenjodaro and Thatta World Heritage properties, a major volcanic eruption of Mt. Merapi in Java, Indonesia (October 2010) affecting Borobudur Temple Compounds and Prambanan Temple, recurring typhoons affecting the Great Barrier Reef (Australia) and also causing extensive landslides in the Philippines (October 2010: extensive damages to the Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras) and the most recent devastating earthquake and tsunami that hit northeast and east Japan, causing human losses and material damages.

In this context, the World Heritage Committee approved in its Decision **31 COM 7.2** “a *Strategy for Risk Reduction at World Heritage properties*” with its prioritized list of actions”. It also “encouraged States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to implement the Strategy for Risk Reduction within their spheres of activities”. Further, the World Heritage Committee also recommended that a risk management component be incorporated in the Management Plan for World Heritage properties in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre has been dealing with this emergency situation more frequently with very limited human and financial resources. To further implement the Strategy adopted by the World Heritage Committee, there is an urgent need to enhance the capacity so as to respond to the emergency situation of disaster-prone developing countries, the least developed countries and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in particular, to reduce the impact of natural disasters through strengthened national efforts and enhanced bilateral, regional and international cooperation, including through technical and financial assistance.

During 2010, several natural disasters also occurred in the Latin America and the Caribbean Region. In addition to the unfortunate loss of lives and damages in several countries, some World Heritage properties were severely affected. The World Heritage Centre undertook missions and coordinated emergency actions with the States Parties concerned to address the conservation actions needed. Three Emergency Assistance requests related to the natural disasters were approved, one of them (Chile) during the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010). The total amount provided by the World Heritage Fund was USD 236 592. The three International Assistance requests approved are: USD 49 300 for the Post Earthquake Technical Assistance of the National History Park-Citadelle, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) as a response to the earthquake on 12 January 2010; USD 140 688 for the Emergency repairs of the Matriz Church and other Buildings in Valparaiso (Chile) due to the earthquake that occurred on 27 February 2010 and USD 46 604 for the impact of the Agatha Tropical Storm in Quirigua (Guatemala) on 29 May 2010. Besides, other coordination activities and fund raising was undertaken to address the impact of the torrential rains that affected Machu Picchu (Peru) in January 2010, flooding and torrential rains in Tlacotalpan (Mexico) during September 2010 and Mompox (Colombia) in December 2010.

Space technology

Following Decision **34 COM 7C**, UNESCO inter-sectorial cooperation on the use of space technologies for World Heritage continued. With over 50 space partners, the UNESCO “Space for Heritage” programme located at the Natural Sciences Sector supports World Heritage activities. With the assistance of Belgium funds, a project to assess the state of conservation of all “tropical forest” World Heritage properties is starting. Support to the Silk Road nomination for Central Asia is being provided. A successful exhibition “Satellites and World Heritage sites, partners to understand climate change” was shown to the public during the UN Conference on Climate Change (COP-16). The establishment of a dedicated Category-2 Centre in China is now finalized.

Buffer zones

Buffer zones are an important tool in the protection and management of World Heritage properties. At the request of the World Heritage Committee a document (see Document WHC-11/35.COM/7.1) has been prepared concerning the follow-up to the Expert Meeting on Buffer Zones (Davos, 2008).

Capacity Building

An analysis and summary of annual state of conservation reports provides a quick snapshot of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties across the globe. They illustrate both the issues faced by site managers, as well as the requests made by the World Heritage Committee. The results of this analysis highlight the need for improving the capacities of States Parties to undertake the required measures, not just at the professional level, but also at the institutional level and for a variety of other stakeholders.

Furthermore, the analysis of state of conservation reports reveals new themes which are emerging as key areas for the future. For example, at the state of conservation reports this year show that the theme of Heritage Impact Assessment is becoming important for the work of the World Heritage Committee. There is a need to identify this and other key themes and ensure that the capacity exists in States Parties to be able to deal with them properly. The World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy (see Document WHC-11/35.COM/9B) proposes using the state of conservation process as one means of identifying key capacity building needs, with the aim of proposing activities and workshops to help increase the capacity of States Parties to carry out the necessary work as required by the World Heritage Committee.

STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT

Decision **27 COM 7B.106.3** requested

“...that the reports are categorized as follows:

- a) Reports with recommended decisions which, in the judgment of the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, require discussion by the World Heritage Committee,
- b) Reports which, in the judgment of the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, can be noted without discussion”

During the coordination meeting between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies (UNESCO Headquarters, 17-19 January 2011), the selection process for the properties to be discussed by the World Heritage Committee has been refined taking into account the procedures and statutory deadlines as set out in the *Operational Guidelines*, the different monitoring tools at the disposal of the Committee and the ever growing number of properties to report on at World Heritage Committee sessions within Agenda item 7B (147 in 2009, 116 in 2010, 135 in 2011).

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have agreed that the following properties would be brought to the Committee's attention for discussion:

- **if the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger is proposed,**
- **if the property is subject to the Reinforced monitoring mechanism,**
- **if significant new information regarding the property has been received after the document was issued, requiring a revision of the draft Decision,**

World Heritage Committee members can still decide to discuss in detail a state of conservation report which is submitted for adoption without discussion, providing a written request is made to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee **strictly prior to 5 June 2011**. In agreement with the Chairperson, it will not be possible to request the opening of new items after this deadline.

To facilitate the work of the World Heritage Committee, a standard format has been used for all state of conservation reports. This format has been adapted taking into account Decision **29 COM 7C** as well as Decision **27 COM 7B.106** para 4:

"Invites the World Heritage Centre to present all information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in the following manner:

- a) the report on each property should start on a new page,
- b) the identification number of the property allocated at the time of its nomination should be used in the document,
- c) an index of all properties should also be included,
- d) the decisions should have a standard layout, draft recommendation, and should be concise and operational; "

Therefore, the standard format includes:

- a) Name of the property (State Party) (ID number);
- b) Year of inscription on the World Heritage List;
- c) Inscription criteria;
- d) Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger ;
- e) Previous Committee Decisions;
- f) International Assistance;
- g) UNESCO Extra budgetary Funds ;
- h) Previous monitoring missions ;
- i) Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports ;
- j) Illustrative material;
- k) Current conservation issues;
- l) Conclusions;
- m) Draft Decision.

As indicated above, the most important source of information is the state of conservation report submitted by the concerned States Parties, which according to the *Operational guidelines* need to be submitted before the statutory deadline of **1 February**. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies point out that the respect of this deadline is important to allow for a professional assessment of the reports by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre and avoid delays in the preparation of working documents for the World Heritage Committee. Delayed reports inevitably will lead to more properties being included in the Addendum documents.

Therefore, in spite of the major efforts made this year to include even reports which were delayed in documents WHC-11/35.COM/7A and WHC-11/35.COM/7B, and considering the further delays due to late missions or late receipt of complementary information, an important number of reports (77) are included in the Addendum documents (7A.Add and 7B.Add).

In this document, the state of conservation reports of World Heritage properties will be presented in English alphabetical order by region, as follows: Africa, Arab States, Asia-Pacific, Europe and North America, and finally Latin America and the Caribbean. For practical and environmental reasons, as in previous years, each report will not start on a new page. However, each region will start on a new page.

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

1. Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1987

Criteria
(ix) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.5 ; 33 COM 7B.1; 34 COM 7B.1

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 112.200 for 6 international assistances : 1999: USD 5.000, conservation, workshop for World Heritage and Biosphere Reserves site managers (1134) ; 1997: USD 29.900, conservation, sub-regional workshop conservation (820) ; 1996: USD 22.500, conservation, individual grants for fauna and flora specialists (992) ; 1992: USD 20.000, conservation, training workshop on site management (2248) ; 1989: USD 4.800, conservation, contribution to field training (397) ; 1987: USD 30.000, conservation, contribution to the draft of a management plan (320)

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 60.000, UNESCO FIT Netherlands. USD 193.275 and USD 118.725, respectively in 2008 and 2009, in the frame of the Central Africa World Heritage Forest Initiative (CAWHFI).

Previous monitoring missions

March 1998 : UNESCO monitoring mission ; June 2006 and December 2009: joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring missions.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of entire approval and implementation of management plan
- b) Mining exploitation project close to the property
- c) Industrial agriculture in the buffer zone
- d) Threats exerted by bushmeat and deforestation around the park

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/407>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report consists of a logical framework for conservation activities in the property, but it is unclear if this logical framework was developed as an emergency plan, which was requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Decision **34 COM 7B.1**). It provides information on measures taken to define a zoning system and develop ecotourism activities, in order to support the development of local communities as well as on measures put in place to establish a monitoring system for the property, and develop

research in order to assist its management, installing a surveillance system. It also provides information on the development of partnerships between the managers of the larger transboundary forest landscape called TRIDOM protected areas (covering Dja, Boumba Bek, and Nki protected areas in Cameroun, Odzala National Park in Congo and Minkébé/Ivindo National Parks in Gabon as well as their forested interzones), as a part of the WWF Tri-National Dja-Odzala-Minkebe Project, to support the development of an environmental monitoring system and research necessary for the management of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the State Party's efforts to implement these measures. The report does not provide information on the current status of the major threats to the property, in particular the mining project and poaching.

a) *Mining activities by the GEOVIC Company on the periphery of the property*

The mining concession for the cobalt mining company GEOVIC Cameroon PLC covers an area of more than 150,000 ha, some 40 km east of the property. The 2009 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission concluded that the mining project could result in negative direct impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and therefore the Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) urged the State Party to suspend the implementation work for the GEOVIC mining activities until the conclusion of a new Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), and to inform the World Heritage Centre prior to 1 December 2010. No new ESIA was transmitted to the World Heritage Centre but the State Party report notes that a document on the potential impacts of the mine on biodiversity has been completed and validated.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned about reports which state the mining preparation activities appear to continue in spite of the fact that no new ESIA was submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review and reiterate that all mining activities should be immediately halted until a new ESIA documents the potential impact on the OUV and integrity of the property and define the mitigation measures that should be taken.

b) *Poaching to supply the bushmeat and ivory markets*

The State Party notes that an anti-poaching strategy has been developed and is supported by supplementary patrols of surveillance inside the property. The State Party reports that 95% of the area of the property has been covered during 4 campaigns and that collection of biological data for ape's, bongo and bat populations are either completed or ongoing. The report notes that analysis of these data suggest that the current populations densities of flagship species are comparable to population densities at the time of property's inscription, but does not provide any data to support this statement. The 2009 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission noted that there were many indications of an important decline in wildlife populations and a significant increase in bushmeat and ivory trade. They also recall that the 2009 mission noted poaching would probably further increase as a result of the human population explosion following the installation of the GEOVIC mine.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN therefore consider that there is no sufficient detailed information for accurate comparison with the time of inscription. They welcome the introduction of a biological monitoring system and the realization of surveys and consider the State Party should provide detailed information on the results of these surveys, on the design of the monitoring system implemented, including relevant wildlife indicators to be used. An International Assistance request was submitted by the State Party on 5 April 2001. The request proposes the reinforcement of institutional stakeholders and civil society capacities (local NGOs) in the co-management of fauna and flora resources protection in the North and the East of the reserve. The main objective of this International Assistance is to maintain the density of the reserve flagship species by increasing the control and the repression in areas highly subjected to poaching activities. The main proposed activities are to maintain the

density of Gorillas, Chimpanzees, and Elephants, to harmonize the level of information on methodology and procedures of anti-poaching activities, to establish co-management anti-poaching platforms and conduct anti-poaching patrols, to realize maps of pressures on natural resources, and to improve the biological knowledge of the reserve fauna.

c) *Industrial agriculture and forestry exploitation in the periphery of the property*

The State Party notes that the boundaries of the property will be demarcated through the implementation of signs in areas for which natural features cannot be used. The formalization and effective control and patrolling of the property's limits is an important step to monitor and prevent agricultural encroachment and illegal logging in the property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN take note of the logical framework submitted as the State Party report. They welcome that certain activities target some of the issues requested by the Committee in its Decision **34 COM 7B.1** but note that many other important issues are not reflected. They reiterate the need for an emergency plan, which addresses all issues highlighted in the above mentioned decision.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also take note that a request for International Assistance has been submitted by the State Party for the reinforcement of institutional stakeholders and civil society capacities (local NGOs) in the co-management of fauna and flora resources protection in the North and the East of the reserve.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain concerned about the ongoing mining activities in the GEOVIC concession area and the fact that no new ESIA was submitted, including an assessment of the potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the proposed mining activities on the property's OUV. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the information provided in the report stating that populations of flagship species are comparable to the time of property's inscription is in contradiction with the 2009 mission report which mentioned that large mammals species are severely threatened by poaching activities, also note that not enough detailed information has been provided to support this statement, and consider that the State Party should submit the data on which this affirmation is based. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that threats from mining and poaching could represent an ascertained danger to the property's OUV, in line with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines* and consider that the follow-up monitoring mission to be conducted in 2011, as requested by the Committee in Decision **34 COM 7B.1**, should assess the current status of the threats mentioned above, and make a recommendation in regards to a possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.1

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.1**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),

3. Welcomes the development of activities which target some of the identified objectives by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), but regrets that many other important issues are not taken into account;
4. Takes note of the affirmation by the State Party that populations of flagship species have not declined since the time of property's inscription and requests that the State Party should submit the supporting data for this statement before the joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission;
5. Expresses its utmost concern about reports that mining preparation activities in the GEOVIC concession area appear to be ongoing and that no new Environmental and Social Impact Assessment was submitted to the World Heritage Centre, as requested at its 34th session in 2010 ;
6. Urges the State Party to immediately halt all mining activities until a new Environmental and Social Impact Assessment including an assessment of the potential direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the proposed mine on the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property is conducted and validated by all relevant stakeholders;
7. Reiterates its request to the State Party to develop an emergency plan based on the management plan, which addresses all objectives highlighted in Decision **34 COM 7B.1** in order to address the urgent threats to the outstanding universal value of the property;
8. Recalls that in the absence of urgent and decisive responses to these threats, the property could meet the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in accordance with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines;
9. Requests the forthcoming joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission to assess the current status of threats from mining, poaching, industrial agriculture and forestry exploitation and evaluate the status of the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property;
10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including a copy of the new Environmental and Social Impact Assessment for the proposed GEOVIC mine, as well as progress achieved in the definition and implementation of the emergency plan as well as available data on wildlife populations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012, **with a view, in the absence of substantial progress, to considering the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

2. Mount Kenya (Kenya) (N 800)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1997

Criteria
(vii) (ix)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.4; 32 COM 7B.1; 33 COM 7B.3

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 25,000 for Technical cooperation to prepare a management plan

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2003: joint UNESCO / IUCN monitoring mission ; October 2008: joint UNESCO/ IUCN monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal forest resource extraction;
- b) Community-wildlife conflict;
- c) Poaching;
- d) Excisions from the property.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/800>

Current conservation issues

On 28 January 2010, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property together with a copy of the management plan 2010-2020 for the Mount Kenya ecosystem, the EIA for the proposed electric fence and associated civil works, the survey of the boundary delineation of plantation and indigenous forests and a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). This report provides an update on the implementation of the key recommendations made by the 2008 World Heritage Centre/IUCN joint reactive monitoring mission, namely: i) completing the EIA for the fence between local community cropland and the property; ii) formalising management arrangements between the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) and the Kenya Forest Service (KFS); iii) finalising the alignment, documentation and on-the-ground demarcation of the proposed internal boundary between forestry plantation zones and natural forest; iv) finalising the Mount Kenya Management Plan; and v) maintaining and enhancing protection activities to address poaching, logging and forest fires within the property. However, no information is provided on the implementation of the other 2008 mission recommendations, as requested in Decision **33 COM 7B.3**.

a) *Fencing of the property to address the community-wildlife conflict*

The State Party reports that the EIA for the fence between local community cropland and the forest reserve was undertaken in March 2009. This proposal aims at establishing 397 km of additional electric fence to mitigate human-wildlife conflict. A fencing work plan, sponsored by IFAD/ GEF through the Mount Kenya East Pilot Project for Natural Resources Management (MKEPP), was jointly developed by the fence management committee, comprising KWS, KFS, the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), and local and other stakeholders. The State Party reports that a total of 305 km have already been built. The fencing EIA, for the first phase of additional fence construction of 50 km, concludes that the fence should be aligned along the forest reserve boundary, and that a combination of comprehensive fence (6 strand) along community farm borders and semi-comprehensive elephant-barrier (2 strand) along plantation boundaries should be built. However, the EIA does not specifically assess the likely impacts of this proposal on the OUV of the property. The State Party also notes that an elephant corridor connecting Mt. Kenya and the northern rangeland through the Lewa Wildlife Conservancy (LWC) has been marked and completed.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the finalisation of the EIA for the fence, as requested in Decision **33 COM 7B.3** and, support its conclusion that future fencing phases should be reassessed in separate EIAs. They stress that any future EIAs should specifically consider the likely impacts of additional fencing on the property's OUV, and note that the long term effectiveness of fencing as a deterrent to wildlife, particularly elephants, is contingent on ensuring meticulous routine maintenance. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further welcome the completion of the elephant corridor LWC but also support the EIA's recommendation that additional wildlife corridors should be developed in order to mitigate any likely adverse impacts of the fence on wildlife populations.

b) *Other conservation issues – poaching, logging and forest fires*

The State Party reports on its progress in addressing poaching, illegal logging and forest fires within the property and adjacent reserves. With regards to poaching, quarterly joint patrols and ongoing surveillance (by KWS, KFS, community scouts and other stakeholders) have reportedly resulted in more arrests and reduced poaching incidents. However, no data on this is provided. The State Party also reports that additional surveillance equipment and infrastructure was acquired and training provided to over 60 rangers in their use. The MKEPP, through the KFS, has continued to address illegal logging by sensitizing community forest associations (CFAs) through the development of participatory forest management plans. The State Party notes that 6 KWS officers were trained in Austria on mountain rescue and fire management techniques, and a scoping workshop is planned in the near future on fire fighting in the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the State Party's efforts to maintain and enhance protection activities, as requested by Decision **33 COM 7B.3**. However, IUCN has received reports that the levels of illegal logging and poaching within the property have increased and are under-reported, partly due to the relatively low number of rangers patrolling Mount Kenya. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the ecological monitoring programme established by the new Management Plan should provide data on this and recommend that these data should be submitted as part of the next report.

c) *Management Planning*

The State Party reports that the Mount Kenya Management Plan 2010-2020 was finalised and approved in August 2010, in consultation with key stakeholders. This plan also mentions that Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) are planned between KWS, KFS and LWC, which will define their roles and responsibilities with regards to the management of the property, as recommended by the 2008 mission. The State Party considers that plantations and indigenous forests are clearly documented, and reports that all forestry plantation zones have now been mapped in relation to indigenous forests and plantations. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the replacement of the physical boundary signs has yet to be addressed, as recommended by the 2008 mission.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that while the management plan identifies climate change as a major threat to the property, no clear strategy to address the issue is included. They recall that the 2003 and 2008 mission recommendations concerning the extension of the property to include as much lower altitude undisturbed forest and wildlife corridors as possible in order to increase its resilience to climate change. In line with the mission recommendations, the State Party submitted in 2010 a proposed extension for the property to include the Ngare Ndare Forest and Lewa Conservancy. This dossier was incomplete and did not proceed to evaluation by IUCN. They recommend that the Committee encourage the State Party to resubmit an extension proposal as early as possible, and invite the State Party to seek support from the World Heritage Centre and IUCN in advance of any future submission to ensure that the dossier is complete and can be evaluated.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the completion of the management planning process as requested by Decision **33 COM 7B.3**, which began in 1999 with support from the World Heritage Fund. While there has clearly been considerable progress in implementing effective management, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain concerned about reports received from local stakeholders concerning the inadequacy of KWS's management budget, the relatively small number of rangers patrolling the property and the rising threats of illegal logging and poaching. They note that efficient cooperation between KWS and KFS will be crucial to ensure the conservation of Mount Kenya, and request the State Party to clarify KWS's management budget and its plans to secure sustainable funding for the property in light of the fact that the MKEPP will end in 2012. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the ongoing collaboration between Parks Canada and the Kenya Wildlife Service on training in support of Kenya's conservation efforts, and recommend that the Committee encourage both State Parties to explore opportunities for capacity building initiatives in Mount Kenya, including with regards to the proposed extension.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the State Party's progress in addressing the key recommendations of the 2008 mission, and in particular the adoption of the Management Plan and the completion of the EIA for the first construction phase of the fence intended to minimise community-wildlife conflict. However, they note that the boundary between plantation zones and natural forest has not yet been fully demarcated and that the management agreement between the KWS and KFS has yet to be formalised. They therefore recommend that the State Party prioritise the implementation of these two actions.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note the reports received about illegal logging and poaching, the challenges faced by the Kenya Wildlife Service with regards to management financing, and the relatively small number of rangers patrolling the property. They remain concerned about Mount Kenya's long-term viability in a rapidly changing climate and reiterate the importance of the extension of the property to include lower altitude undisturbed forest and wildlife corridors in order to increase its resilience.

Draft Decision: **35 COM 7B.2**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.3**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Commends the State Party's progress in addressing the key recommendations of the 2008 mission, and in particular the adoption and implementation of the Mount Kenya Management Plan 2010-2020 and the completion of the Environmental Impact Assessment for the first construction phase of the fence intended to minimise community-wildlife conflict;
4. Requests the State Party to fully implement the remaining recommendations including the demarcation of the boundary between forestry plantation zones and natural forest, the establishment of wildlife corridors in order to mitigate any potential adverse impacts from the fence on the property's wildlife populations and the adoption of a management agreement between the Kenya Wildlife Service and the Kenya Forestry Service;

5. *Notes with concern the reports on rising levels of illegal logging and poaching within the property, and the challenges faced by the Kenya Wildlife Service with regards to management financing and the relatively small number of rangers patrolling the property;*
6. *Remains concerned about the long-term impacts of climate change on the property, and encourages the State Party to resubmit a proposal for its extension in order to preserve as much lower altitude undisturbed forest and wildlife corridors as possible, and increase its resilience to climate change;*
7. *Notes the ongoing collaboration between Parks Canada and the Kenya Wildlife Service on training in support of Kenya's conservation efforts, and also encourages both State Parties to explore opportunities for capacity building initiatives in Mount Kenya, including with regards to the proposed extension;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the 2008 mission, developing wildlife corridors, and the status of poaching, logging, and management financing, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

3. Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

4. Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal) (N 25)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1981

Criteria
(vii) (x)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
1985-1988 and 2000-2006

Previous Committee Decisions
30 COM 7A.11; 31 COM 7B.7; 33 COM 7B.4

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 278,567 for Emergency Assistance, Technical Assistance and Training. 2001: USD 20,000 for conservation, regional workshop on invasive species; 2000: USD 130,475 for Emergency Assistance, fight against *Salvinia molesta* in the river delta; 1998: USD 20,000 for conservation, Second International Conference on Wetlands and Development; 1992: USD 10,000 for Emergency Assistance, purchase of wood and material to repair the park fences; 1988: USD 20,000 for conservation and contribution to repair work; 1982: USD 29,132 for conservation, and equipment for biological research.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

September 2000: UNESCO/IUCN/Ramsar mission; April 2004: UNESCO and IUCN participation in a multi-stakeholder workshop; May 2005: UNESCO/IUCN monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Invasive species;
- b) Integrated water management system not operational;
- c) Lack of hydrological monitoring;
- d) Soils salinity;
- e) Cattle grazing;
- f) Hunting;
- g) Lack of management plan and sustained funding;
- h) Poor management capacity and constant changes in staff;
- i) Poor visitor management.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/25>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. The report provides general guidelines relating to the populations of migratory and resident birds, the hydrological condition of the Park, the improved performance of management tools, the control of invasive plant species, the development of technical and tourist facilities, the sustainable management of natural resources, and the promotion of income-generating activities.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2000 because of increasing problems with the invasive *Salvinia molesta* species blocking the open water channels in the property, thereby threatening the waterfowl populations. In addition, the construction of the Dama dam had permanently halted infiltration of salt water into the property, thus altering the hydrology. This further enabled the spread of invasive species and reduced food availability for birdlife. Hydrological changes led to the soils salinity due to the lack of flushing, reduced water levels, decrease in colonies of certain species of birds and the disappearance of some others. The property was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2006, as the *Salvinia molesta* problem was mastered by biological control, and following the establishment of a water management system and a conservation action plan and the restoration of the ecological characteristics of the property.

a) Trends of the resident and migratory bird populations

The State Party recalls that the Senegal River Delta is a site where the annual international count of waterfowl has been regularly performed from 1989 to 2010 (last count was held 15 January 2010). It reports that: (i) the colony of white pelicans remains stable and reproduction has been relatively successful due to improvements made to the nesting site, and to the surveillance and proper management of water bodies, (ii) 17 species of *anatidae* are regularly counted during the winter season, totalling more than 500,000 individuals (2000), mainly concentrated in the Djoudj National Park Bird Sanctuary, and (iii) the most abundant wintering waterfowl are the Summer Teal, Pintails and Whistling Ducks. The State Party also recalls that the Sanctuary works in tandem with the Diawling National Park in Mauritania, which is contiguous with the property, and that periodic fluctuations noted in one of the sites are thus partially offset by increased numbers in the other.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the report of the State Party does not provide information on trends of resident and migratory bird populations, as requested by the Committee in its Decision **33 COM 7B.4**. The data provided dates from 2000. They encourage the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with detailed data on bird

population trends in the Sanctuary between 1989 and 2010, and to ensure that the monitoring programme for birds and other wildlife take account of the conservation status of the outstanding universal value of the property.

b) The hydrological status of the property

The State Party notes that during the 2009-2010 season, the water level in the bodies of water was relatively sufficient, allowing for the stationing of migratory birds, especially ducks. The report indicates that the water level is regularly monitored by gauge scales, and that the proliferation of aquatic plants in the Park is controlled via a system for lowering and raising the water level of the water bodies, which increases the salinity, thereby periodically eliminating this vegetation. In addition, some channels are cleaned manually with the help of the local population. The Programme for the Integrated Management of Coastal and Marine Resources (GIRMAC) also participated in the clean-up operations of the hydraulic channels, which has improved the water flow of the Park.

c) Progress in implementing the Action Plan, including ongoing ecological activities of restoration and monitoring

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the report does not provide a detailed assessment of progress made in implementing the 2006-2008 Action Plan. However, the report notes some progress in the strengthening of management tools, controlling invasive plant species, the development of technical and tourist facilities, the sustainable management of natural resources and the promotion of income-generating activities. Some important results are the finalization and validation of the 2010-2014 Management Plan, the ongoing work of controlling *Tamarix senegalensis* and *Typha australis*, regular maintenance of the nesting sites of the white pelican, reinforcement of the dams on the Gorom River and the efforts towards better management of the flow of water into this part of the Park.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN regret that the State Party's report does not provide a detailed evaluation and accurate information on the evolution trends of the bird populations, and on progress made in the implementation of the 2006-2008 Action Plan and its impact on the rehabilitation of the outstanding universal value. In addition, pressures on the property, especially livestock grazing within the property, and threats posed by invasive plant species will require ongoing management.

Conclusions

In the absence of a detailed assessment of progress in implementing the 2006-2008 Action Plan and the lack of data on trends of resident and migratory bird populations, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that it is not possible to assess the rehabilitation of the property's outstanding universal value. They consider that the State Party should submit this information to the World Heritage Centre before its 36th session. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that the property was removed from the Montreux Record of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands in September 2009. They recommend that the Committee welcomes the ongoing work by the State Party and its partners to restore and rehabilitate the property and improve its management.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.3

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,

2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.4**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2010),
3. Recognizes the efforts made by the State Party and its partners to restore the property's outstanding universal value and improve its management, and notes that the Djoudj National Park Bird Sanctuary has been removed from the Montreux List of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands in September 2009;
4. Considers that without detailed data on the trends of resident and migratory bird populations, it is not possible to assess the rehabilitation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and urges the State Party to provide such data and submit this information to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2012**;
5. Regrets that the State Party has not submitted a detailed assessment of progress made in implementing the 2006-2008 Action Plan, as requested at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009);
6. Requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the 2010-2014 Management Plan for consideration by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the status of outstanding universal value of the property, particularly on trends of resident and migratory bird populations, and the results of the implementation of the Action Plan on the rehabilitation of the Outstanding Universal Value and especially the integrity of the property.

5. Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N 1162)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

6. Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1982

Criteria
(ix) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 7B.3; 33 COM 7B.8; 34 COM 7B.3

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 60.480: 1987: USD 50.000, conservation, equipment for anti-poaching activities; 1984: USD 10.480, conservation, purchase of a vehicle.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2007 and November 2008: World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Poaching;
- b) Reduction of elephant populations;
- c) Insufficient funding;
- d) Mineral and hydrocarbon prospecting and mining;
- e) Tourism management and development;
- f) Potential and proposed dam development.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/199>

Current conservation issues

On 2 February 2011, the State Party submitted a comprehensive report on the state of conservation of the property. This report provides an overview of the status of various proposed developments, including the Stiegler's Gorge/ Kidunda dams and the Mukuju River uranium mine, as well as the implementation of the 2007/2008 mission recommendations. The key conservation issues currently affecting the property are discussed below.

a) *Proposed dams – Stiegler's Gorge and Kidunda*

The State Party report acknowledges that while no decision of building a dam in Stiegler's Gorge has been taken, the feasibility of the project is being assessed. The State Party notes that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has been recommended for this project and that the World Heritage Centre will be informed about any project developments. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the 2008 mission's conclusion that a dam at Stiegler's Gorge, which is situated in the middle of the property, would have serious impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), and in particular the integrity of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that major dam projects are not appropriate developments inside natural World Heritage properties. Flooding, as a result of dams, is specifically noted as an example of ascertained danger to OUV of such properties in paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*. They therefore consider that the State Party should reconsider this project in line with its commitments under the *Convention*. They further recommend that the Stiegler Gorge dam SEA consider using past data and research on this proposal, including the detailed feasibility study funded by the Norwegian government in the 1980's, which could provide important baseline data and information.

The State Party report notes that a new Environmental Impact Assessment is underway for the re-designed Kidunda Dam, planned at the edge of the property. However, no information is provided if the new design will flood part of the property or affect the Gonabis wetland, an important area for many of Selous' large mammals on its boundary. They recall that the 2008 mission recommended that any review of the Kidunda dam design should prioritise alternatives outside the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that all environmental assessments for proposals affecting World Heritage properties should meet international best-practice standards and at minimum: i) assess the likely impacts of the proposal on the property's OUV and integrity, based on the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (SoOUV); ii) consider and assess feasible and less environmentally damaging alternatives to the proposal, which in the case of the Stiegler Gorge dam may include alternative energy production/ efficiency options at national level; and iii) undertake adequate stakeholder

consultation at both the scoping and environmental report stage in line with international best-practice principles. The State Party should also consider using recommendations from the World Commission on Dams available at <http://www.internationalrivers.org/dams-and-development-new-framework-decision>

b) *Proposed Mukuju River uranium mine*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party submitted a minor boundary modification request to exclude the Mukuju River uranium mine concession area from the property, which will be considered separately under item 8B at its 35th session.

The State Party submitted the ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) for the proposed Mukuju River uranium mine to the World Heritage Centre for review. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reviewed the ESIA and provided their assessment to the State Party on 8 March 2010. In their assessment, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN noted that in its current design the uranium mine would be partly located within the property and reiterated that this would be a clear basis for recommending the inscription of Selous Game Reserve on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in line with the Committee's position that mineral exploration, mining, oil exploration and exploitation are incompatible with World Heritage status, as well past Committee decisions and the findings of the 2007 and 2008 World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring missions.

They further noted that the ESIA does not assess the likely impacts of the proposal on the property's OUV and integrity, and therefore cannot form the basis of a decision on whether or not to grant a license for uranium mining even if the mine would be adjacent to the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Government of Tanzania revise the assessment and resubmit the ESIA taking into account World Heritage Centre/IUCN's comments. In the meantime, they consider that the State Party should not grant the exploitation permit.

c) *Weakening of the property's legal protection and mineral / oil exploration*

At the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010), the World Heritage Centre and IUCN highlighted that the 2009 revision of the Wildlife Act significantly weakened the legal provisions for protection that were in place at the time of inscription of the property by legalizing mineral and oil exploration and exploitation within game reserves. In its report, the State Party acknowledges that mineral and oil exploration and exploitation may undermine the OUV of World Heritage properties but considers that the revised Act addresses this issue by requiring that any development in Game Reserves undergo an EIA; and developments commence only once an EIA certificate is issued by the Ministry responsible for Environment. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN point out that the legal protection regime of Selous Game Reserve at the time of inscription did not allow for oil exploration or exploitation, which is no longer the case as a result of the 2009 Act. They therefore consider that the current legal protection is insufficient for a World Heritage property. The report did not provide details on the current status of the oil exploration project. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN wish to highlight that there exist proposals for hydrocarbon prospecting within the property, and recall the clear policy position of the World Heritage Committee oil exploration are incompatible with World Heritage status.

d) *Poaching*

The State Party notes that it shares the Committee's concern about the estimated 44% decline in the property's elephant population between 2006 and 2009. The Tanzanian Wildlife Research Institute is in the process of establishing the cause of this decline, which in the State Party's view may be due to a number of causes aside from illegal killing. Moreover, the State Party considers that a trans-boundary census including the Niassa Game Reserve is needed given the link between its elephant population and Selous'.

IUCN notes that it has received reports of ongoing poaching in the northern sector and along the Mozambique boundary, including in the area of the Mukuju River uranium exploration concession. IUCN has also received reports that field rangers and game scouts have insufficient funds to conduct regular patrols within Selous Game Reserve (SGR) to address the increase in poaching. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the severe poaching problem in Selous can only be addressed by urgently restoring its management capacity, as discussed below. They emphasize that the maintenance of the Selous-Niassa wildlife corridor is important to preserve the integrity of the property over the long-term. They remain concerned about the fragmentation of this corridor due to encroachment from subsistence agriculture fields and development pressures including uranium exploration, and strongly encourage the Government of Tanzania to consider including this strategic corridor within the property.

e) *Deterioration in management capacity*

The State Party reports on the progress achieved in implementing the 2007/ 2008 mission recommendations, in particular through the on-going establishment of a new Wildlife Authority, the establishment of 8 Wildlife Management Areas around the property, the recruitment of 40 additional employees in February 2010, and that the procurement of 4 new vehicles. However, the State Party also acknowledges that several recommendations so far have not been implemented as a result of limited financial means. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that while some progress has been made, it has been insufficient to restore SGR's management capacity. IUCN notes that it has received a number of reports concerning the property's deteriorating management standards and increasing corruption, including insufficient capacity and funding for anti-poaching activities as noted in point d) above. IUCN also has received reports that the spread of invasive alien species is accelerating, including *Mimosa pigra*, *Lantana camara* and *Pistia stratiotes*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that Decision **34 COM 7B.3** welcomed the State Party's intention to create an autonomous Wildlife Authority which will automatically reinstate revenue accrual and significantly increase the property's human and financial resources. They wish to point out that the Authority has not yet been created and consider that in the mean time the Revenue Retention Scheme should be reinstated.

Given the State Party's request for technical and financial management support, they recommend that the Government of Tanzania undertake a Management Effectiveness Evaluation for Selous Game Reserve, in line with the "Enhancing Our Heritage" methodology, with technical support from IUCN and encourage the State Party to request International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund to do so. This would also be an opportunity to convene a workshop to address the implementation of the 2007/ 2008 missions, as repeatedly requested by the Committee at its 33rd and 34th sessions.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN wish to highlight the weakening of SGR's legal protection status and the different development projects (Stiegler's Gorge dam, Kidunda dam and Mukuju River uranium mine and oil exploration) which are being considered but are incompatible with the World Heritage Status of the property and could potentially endanger the property's OUV. They consider that a decision to go forward with these projects would create the conditions for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Deteriorating management standards, escalating poaching, and potential hydrocarbon prospecting are also of serious concern. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that decisive action is urgently needed to address these issues, in line with the actions listed in Paragraph 4 of the draft Decision below.

Draft Decision : 35 COM 7B.5

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.3**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Reiterates its utmost concern about the weakening of the legal protection status of the property, the different development projects (Stiegler's Gorge dam, Kidunda dam and Mukuju River uranium mine and oil exploration) which are being considered, ongoing wildlife poaching and the evident deterioration in the management of the property;
4. Urges the State Party to implement the following actions in order to protect the property's outstanding universal value:
 - a) Finalize the creation of the autonomous Wildlife Authority and reinstate the Revenue Retention Scheme,
 - b) Abandon plans for the different development projects which are incompatible with the World Heritage Status of the property, in particular the Stiegler's Gorge dam, uranium mining and oil exploration inside the property, in line with its commitments under the Convention,
 - c) Ensure that the design of the Kidunda dam will not affect the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property and avoid flooding part of the property or key wildlife areas on its boundaries,
 - d) Enact specific legislation to prohibit prospecting and mining within Selous Game Reserve on the basis of its World Heritage status,
 - e) Develop and implement an emergency plan to strengthen anti-poaching activities in the property in order to cope with the alarming increase in poaching,
 - f) Revise and resubmit the Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed Mukuju River uranium mine in line with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommendations prior to granting exploitation permits;
5. Reiterates that any decision to go forward with oil exploration, mining or dam construction inside the property would constitute a clear case for inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;
6. Strongly encourages the State Party to provide an appropriate protection status to the Selous-Niassa corridor for inclusion as this corridor within the property is vital to the long-term integrity of the property and is progressively fragmented;
7. Recommends that the State Party undertakes a Management Effectiveness Evaluation for Selous Game Reserve, with the assistance of IUCN, and to convene a workshop to address the implementation of the 2007/2008 mission recommendations to develop a plan to implement a full and effective set of conservation actions, and also encourages the State Party to request International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund for these activities;
8. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the requests set out in Paragraph 4 above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

7. Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the Environmental Impact Assessment)

8. Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas (Zimbabwe) (N 302)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

ASIA-PACIFIC

9. Purnululu National Park (Australia) (N 1094)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2003

Criteria
(vii) (viii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
27 COM 8C.11; 29 COM 7B.11; 32 COM 7B.8

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Mining,
- b) Adequacy of funding and staff,
- c) Land tenure.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1094>

Current conservation issues

On 28 January 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides information on land tenure and management issues raised during previous reporting cycles, and refers to correspondence between the World Heritage Centre and the State Party regarding the threat of Cane Toad to the property.

a) *Land tenure and cultural values*

The State Party, in 2005 and 2008, reported its commitment to extend the Purnululu Conservation Reserve (PCR), to the north and west of the property, by adding 61,817 ha of pastoral lands upon expiration of pastoral leases in 2015. In its current report, the State Party confirms that 46,875 ha have been incorporated and are now managed by the Western Australian Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) in line with the objectives of the PCR. Another 15,583 ha of pastoral lands are scheduled to be incorporated in 2015. Hence, a total of 62,458 ha will be added to the PCR. The State Party also reports that 1,318.8 ha were excised from the Ord River Regeneration Reserve (ORRR) to serve as living areas for local Aboriginal communities.

The State Party reports that the indigenous cultural values of the property will be an important part of its new management plan. Completion of the new management plan is taking longer than expected due to the complexity of the property's values, its remoteness, and the legal and administrative requirements of an on-going native title case, as part of which the property's indigenous cultural values are documented. The State Party emphasizes that native title cases in Australia can extend for many years, due to the

complexity of issues involved. It reports that the timeframe for the property's native title case is uncertain, and expresses its intention to report to the World Heritage Centre when the case is resolved.

b) *Adequacy of funding*

The State Party acknowledges that Purnululu National Park is not funded to the same level as other World Heritage properties on its territory. This is attributed to the resilience of the geological and aesthetic values of the property and the low level of visitation. In line with Committee's Decision **32 COM 7B.8**, the State Party considers that in the above context, the sustainable finance for the management of the property and its surrounding areas is adequate. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that it is not possible to assess the adequacy of funds allocated to the property in the absence of information on the budget.

c) *Other conservation issues*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note with concern the statement on Tusk Mining's website (<http://www.tuskmining.co.za>) that the company has applied for mining rights near Purnululu, and proposed to develop an opencast coal mine only six kilometres from the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN urge the State Party to ensure that any proposed mining activities within or adjacent to the property are subject to the application of the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act and the highest standards of environmental assessment. They highlight the need to ensure that any mining operations adjacent to a World Heritage property should not impact its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

They welcome reports from the State Party that the DEC, since taking over management of the ORRR in 2006, has taken action to reduce threats to the property's integrity by applying prescribed fires to reduce hot fires at the end of the dry season, and has been actively reducing the population of feral cattle.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received reports that the property's traditional owners are increasingly concerned about a lack of regulation of tourist access to culturally significant sites, and that tour operators do not always seek appropriate permission to enter such sites. The State Party is urged to address traditional landowners' concerns by considering potential stricter regulations on tourism access to these sites in the new management plan.

They have also received reports that the threat of invasion of Cane Toad is imminent. They note that Cane Toad invasions have already affected other World Heritage properties in Australia, including Kakadu National Park, and that this invasive species is increasing its range towards western Australia. The World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party, dated 26 October 2010, requesting more information, to which the State Party responded in a letter dated 3 November 2010, noting that the Australian Government Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities is developing a national threat abatement plan for Cane Toad. Furthermore, the Western Australian Government is implementing a strategy to minimise the impact of cane toads and provide long term management solutions.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that fire, tourism and Cane Toad invasion could affect the wilderness values that are relevant to the property's OUV in relation to criterion (vii). They welcome the State Party's efforts to manage fire, and encourage the State Party to address traditional landowners' concerns regarding inappropriate tourism access to culturally significant sites. They note that NGOs have expressed their interest in collaborating with the State Party to explore and enhance Cane Toad response strategies, and encourage the State Party to seek this collaboration.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the World Heritage Committee should commend the State Party for its progress in addressing land tenure issues by extending the Purnululu Conservation Reserve with 46,875 ha of pastoral lands, thereby increasing the size of the property's buffer zone. They also note that the State Party has taken steps to support traditional Aboriginal communities in this buffer zone. Despite the complexity of the issues involved in native title cases, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the finalization of the new management plan should be a priority, in order to give due consideration to the property's indigenous cultural values. Traditional landowners' concerns could be addressed by imposing strict regulations on tourism access to culturally significant sites. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee welcome the State Party's efforts to manage fire and feral cattle populations and also urge the State Party to collaborate with local NGOs in identifying Cane Toad response strategies. Furthermore, they note that any mining proposals adjacent to the property should be subject to the highest standards of environmental assessment, including consideration of the likely impacts of these activities on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.9

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.8**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Commends the State Party for the progress made in addressing land tenure issues by integrating pastoral lands into the buffer zone, thereby enlarging it and increasing the protection of the property, and notes the steps taken to support traditional Aboriginal communities within this buffer zone;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to develop an interim management plan, in order to give due consideration to the property's indigenous cultural values while the native title case is ongoing, and to address traditional landowners' concerns, by considering potential stricter regulations on tourism access to culturally significant sites;*
5. *Also notes that there are a number of threats, including fire, feral cattle and invasive species, that could potentially impact wilderness values that are relevant to the property's Outstanding Universal Value in relation to criterion (vii), and requests the State Party to address these issues by continuing the application of prescribed fires to reduce hot fires at the end of the dry season, continuing to actively reduce the population of feral cattle, and collaborating with NGOs to explore and enhance invasive species response strategies;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to ensure that only mining operations adjacent to the property should be subject to the highest standards of environmental assessment, including consideration of the likely impacts of these activities on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.*
7. *Also requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed on the progress made in implementing the above.*

10. Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of complementary information from the State Party)

11. The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) (N 798)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

12. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Area (China) (N 1083 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2003

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions
30 COM 7B.11; 32 COM 7B.11; 34 COM 8B.44

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
2006 UNESCO/IUCN joint mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Dams;
b) Boundary modifications;
c) Mining;
d) Signage.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1083>

Current conservation problems

On 31 January 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. This report provides an overview of the status of dam related projects and the removal of mining threats from the property, as requested in Committee Decision **32 COM 7B.11**.

a) *Issues related to planned dam building*

The State Party reports that the planning and approval of dams and hydropower plants on the Nujiang, Jinsha and Lancang river basins was suspended in 2008. However, a dam was approved outside the property in the middle reaches of the Jinsha River, between Yulong County and Ninglang County, about 30 km from the buffer zone of the Haba Snow Mountain sub-unit of the property. The Government of China emphasizes that plans and Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) for approved dams will be submitted to the World Heritage Committee for review and evaluation.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the potential serious cumulative impact of the many proposed dams on the property, and recall that 9 of the 13 dams proposed for the Nu River are located close to its boundaries. IUCN notes that there are serious seismic risks in this region: the Nu River itself sits on an active fault line which could experience severe earthquakes. The construction of dams in this area could also lead to more frequent mudslides, which could have negative impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), as noted in the report on the '*Risks of intensification of hydropower development in south-western China: urgent issues to be addressed*' submitted. Moreover, the relocation of villages uphill from dam sites could also increase human pressures on the property's biodiversity values.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that in January 2011, the Deputy Head of the New Energy and Renewal Energy Division of China's national energy administration publicly declared dam development on the Nu River "a must", which strongly suggests that these dams are likely to go ahead. IUCN has received reports concerning unapproved construction at the Liuku dam on the Nu River (outside the property), which appears to have resulted in the displacement of the Lisu people and the construction of new roads adjacent to the property. Media reports also indicate that surveying for four projects - Maji, Yabilou, Liuku and Saige – is underway, including drilling and road construction. IUCN has also received reports that there are active applications for dams at Ludila and Longkiakou on the Jinsha River. To date, the World Heritage Centre has not received notification from the State Party on any dam related projects and no Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) have been submitted. The World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State party on 15 April 2011 requesting further information on the above. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN strongly recommend that a Strategic Environmental Assessment be carried out of all proposed dams, and ancillary development, which could affect the property in order to inform decision-making and identify and avoid any adverse effects on the property's OUV.

b) *Mining*

The State Party reports that following the World Heritage Committee's approval of a minor boundary modification in Decision **34 COM 8B.44**, the mining areas in the Hongshan sub-unit have been excluded from the property and that, at present, there are no existing mining operations within the property. The State Party commits to not approving any new mining operations within the property or its buffer zone, and to enforcing strict control of existing mining operations in areas adjacent to the property and in its buffer zones. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that mining operations adjacent to the property remain a significant threat to its OUV and recommend the same level of assessment for mining projects as for the proposed dams.

c) *Management Planning*

The State Party reports that it is securing funding to revise the master plan for the property in order to better coordinate the protection and management of its serial components, which include both national scenic areas and nature reserves. It is also currently reviewing and approving a number of management plans for subunits whose boundaries were adjusted. The State Party in its report clearly notes its intention to scientifically assess the proposed dam projects adjacent to the property in order to ensure that they do not have a negative impact on the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN commend this intention and recommend that this assessment take the form of a Strategic Environmental Assessment and consider the potential cumulative impacts of the proposed dams, and any ancillary development, on the property, as noted in section a) above.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that the key issue affecting the property remains the potential impacts of the many proposed dams adjacent to the property. They recall that 9 of the 13 dams proposed for the Nu River are located adjacent to the property. Cumulatively, these dams could constitute a potential danger to the property's OUV as defined in Paragraph 180(b)(ii) of the *Operational Guidelines*. Though a holistic approach to assessing dam proposals in the Three Parallel Rivers area is welcome, they reiterate their recommendation that this assessment take the form of Strategic Environmental Assessment of all planned and potential dams, including an evaluation of the potential cumulative impacts of these dams and any ancillary development on the property's OUV. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN underline the importance of obtaining a detailed list and map of all proposed dams that could affect the property, and to promptly submit EIAs on active proposals prior to their approval, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.12

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision 32COM 7B.11, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes with concern reports that unapproved construction has begun at the Liuku dam on the Nu River outside the property, which appears to have resulted in the displacement of the Lisu people and the construction of new roads adjacent to its boundaries, and notes reports that surveying for four projects - Maji, Yabilou, Liuku and Saige, outside the boundary – is underway, including drilling and road construction;
4. Also notes the State Party's report that a dam has been approved outside the property on the Jinsha River, 30 km from the buffer zone of the Haba Snow Mountain sub-unit, as well as reports of active applications for dams at Ludila and Longkiakou on the Jinsha River, and regrets that no Environmental Impact Assessment has been submitted to the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;

5. *Considers that the many proposed dams could cumulatively constitute a potential danger to the property's Outstanding Universal Value, as defined in Paragraph 180(b)(ii) of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit a detailed list and map of all proposed dams and mines that could affect the property to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2012, and to submit to the World Heritage Centre the Environmental Impact Assessments for any such dam and mining proposals, prior to their approval, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in undertaking a Strategic Environmental Assessment of all the proposed dams and ancillary development that could potentially affect the property's Outstanding Universal Value, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

13. Kaziranga National Park (India) (N 337)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

14. Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

15. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late finalization of the mission report)

16. Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

17. Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) (N 653)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1993

Criteria

(vii) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.16; 31 COM 7B.20; 33 COM 7B.18

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 148,484 for Preparatory, Training and Technical Assistance.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

December 2007: World Heritage Centre mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Over-exploitation of marine resources;
- b) Illegal and destructive fishing;
- c) Oil exploration

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/653>

Current conservation issues

On 20 January 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report gives a detailed overview of the implementation of the recommendations adopted by the World Heritage Committee at the time of the property's extension at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).

a) *Illegal fishing*

The State Party reports that the Tubbataha Management Office (TMO) has increased cooperation with government authorities in adjacent provinces, in order to more effectively reduce the use of fish aggregation devices located in the buffer zone of the property, which currently falls outside the jurisdiction of the TMO. The Tubbataha Reefs Natural Park Act of 2009 was enacted in April 2010, addressing issues relating to law enforcement, including prosecution of illegal fishing cases. The State Party notes that the prosecution process and the decision timeframe of environmental cases throughout its territory, including illegal fishing within the property, has shortened since the New Rules on Procedures of Environmental Cases took effect in April 2010. It also notes that intensive Information, Education and Communication (IEC) campaigns implemented in the local communities, where most apprehended illegal fishers are based, have greatly contributed to enhancing compliance with the 'no-take' status of the property, as the low number of illegal fishing related arrests made in 2010 shows.

Though the reported progress is encouraging, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the TMO's budget for patrols is small in relation to the property's area. Without an adequate, stable patrolling budget, it will remain difficult to effectively protect the property from those illegal fishers that cannot be deterred by IEC campaigns.

b) *Designation of the Sulu Sea as a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA)*

The State Party reports that two proposed Archipelagic Sea Lanes overlap with approximately 70% of the property and notes that the designation of the Sulu Sea as a PSSA would enhance the protection of the property. However, the State Party also notes that the lack of information on the volume, origin and destination of ships passing the property, as well as the nature of their cargo, has been a major obstacle to applying for this designation. While the TMO has undertaken efforts to obtain this information, it has encountered a lack of cooperation from the captains and crews of passing vessels.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the apparent blockage of PSSA status over what appears to be a resolvable technical issue. Advice from the International Maritime Organization's Marine Environment Division should be sought, and if necessary, request International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund to help overcome the blockage.

c) *Ecological monitoring, particularly related to climate change*

The State Party reports that the Technical Working Group of the Tubbataha Protected Area Management Board (TPAMB) drafted a research plan for the property in 2006, which included research to assess the condition of the marine ecosystem as well as evaluate management effectiveness. This plan was recently updated to include research on divers' impacts, potential impacts of future tourism products, climate change impacts, and impacts of solid and other waste on the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the Committee's request that the State Party put in place a programme of ecological monitoring of the property, with an emphasis on the effects of climate change on sea surface temperature, coral bleaching, storm frequency and other factors that could be related to climate change. They regret that the State Party did not report on progress achieved in this regard, and urge the State Party to put in place a programme for ecological monitoring, with an emphasis on climate change.

d) *Tourism management*

The State Party and other stakeholders recognize the lack of tourism impact monitoring on the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) as a management gap that needs to be filled. The State Party reports that it has included studies on tourism impacts in the revised research plan as a response to this need. In addition, the State Party notes the intention of TPAMB and TMO to put in place an accreditation system to regulate dive masters, crew and boat operators, in order to promote conservation awareness among tourism businesses. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider the establishment of an accreditation system a positive step, but suggest that this system alone will not fill the management gap, and that a comprehensive tourism management plan is urgently needed to ensure that tourism pressures are addressed.

e) *Need for sustainable financing*

The State Party reports that the amount of unfunded activities and unmet target deliverables has been reduced in 2010, as a result of financial contributions from a number of agencies, including the National and Provincial Governments, NGOs and other external grants. In an effort to further ensure sustainable funding for TPAMB operations, the State Party has identified three strategies, namely i) establishing a fund for online donations; ii) exploring alternative tourism activities, and iii) local, national and international marketing through the tourism network. The State Party further reports that the 2011 Management Plan for the property strongly invokes Section 16 of the Tubbataha Reefs Natural Park Act (2009), which states that the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and the Palawan Council for Sustainable Development should cooperate to provide technical and financial assistance to the property, and that the DENR has already taken steps to allocate funds to the property in their 2012 budget.

f) *Other conservation issues*

The State Party reports increasing population trends amongst certain species of sea-birds and starfish that may be a cause for alarm, as the species in question have the potential to

displace others. The State Party notes that it is taking all possible precaution to avoid adverse impacts from these species on the property's OUV.

Under the recently enacted Tubbataha Reefs Natural Park Act (2009), a 10-nautical mile buffer zone was established around the property, which by law is defined outside its boundaries. However, the jurisdiction of the TPAMB and TMO is limited to the property, which makes their jurisdiction over the buffer zone unclear. The State Party notes that various national agencies with authority over the rest of the Sulu Sea can continue to enforce environmental laws in the property's buffer zone, until the issue has been clarified. The current jurisdictional ambiguities within the newly declared buffer zone should be resolved to the satisfaction of World Heritage interests, either by extending the mandate of the TMO to this area, or by finding other suitable arrangements.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note with concern the State Party's report of the build-up of non-biodegradable waste in the property, which it speculates to originate from passing vessels or be carried by ocean currents from other islands. The State Party notes that, due to the magnitude of the problem, no immediate solution to this threat could be identified, except to cooperate with national and international agencies concerned and to collect and properly dispose of as much of the garbage as possible.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the progress made by the State Party in the implementation of the recommendations of Decision **33 COM 7B.18** (Seville, 2009), particularly those related to the control of illegal fishing. They recommend that the Committee welcome the efforts of the State Party, and particularly the Tubbataha Management Office, to obtain the information needed for PSSA designation and suggest that all efforts be made to overcome the current difficulties in completing the necessary procedures. They also recommend that the State Party be encouraged to resolve current jurisdictional ambiguities within the newly declared buffer zone to the satisfaction of World Heritage interests, either by extending the mandate of the TMO to this area, or by finding other suitable arrangements. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note the State Party's strong focus on tourism as a strategy to generate more funds, and consider that the Committee should urge the State Party to develop a comprehensive tourism management plan prior to implementing such strategies.

Draft Decision: **35 COM 7B.16**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.18**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Commends the State Party for its progress in implementing the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), particularly in relation to illegal fishing;*
4. *Urges the State Party to expedite the application for the designation of the Sulu Sea as a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area, and encourages it to obtain the necessary expert advice in order to complete the process and to consider requesting an International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund to this end;*

5. Also encourages the State Party to expediently resolve jurisdictional ambiguities within the newly declared buffer zone to the satisfaction of World Heritage interests, either by extending the mandate of the Tubbataha Management Office to this area, or by finding other suitable arrangements;
6. Also urges the State Party to develop a comprehensive tourism management plan for the property before implementing strategies to increase funding through tourism;
7. Takes note of the diverse ecological monitoring activities taking place in the property and further urges the State Party to ensure that the results of these activities are made available, and contribute substantially to management planning;
8. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress made in the implementation of the above.

18. Central Highlands of Sri Lanka (Sri Lanka) (N 1203)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

19. Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2005

Criteria
(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.22; 32 COM 7B.17; 34 COM 7B.18

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Road expansion,
- b) Forest fragmentation and need for ecological corridors,
- c) Agricultural encroachment

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, a succinct report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides a brief overview of current conservation issues, including the expansion of Highway 304, tourism management, and the State Party's participation in the Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) Partnership. The State Party refers to an attached progress report on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) conducted for the highway expansion. However, this attachment was not included in the submitted report. The World Heritage Centre contacted the State Party on 1 March 2011 and on 9 March 2011 to request this attachment, but at the time of writing this report a reply had not yet been received.

a) *Road expansion*

The State Party reports that its Department of Highways (DoH) is currently undertaking an EIA for the expansion of Highway 304, which traverses the property from north to south between Khao Yai National Park and Thap Lan National Park. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received reports that the widening of the highway has already commenced, resulting in increasing traffic levels. They note that noise from large trucks can reportedly be heard up to 5 km from Highway 304, and that this distance would increase if the highway is elevated. They recommend the immediate suspension of Highway 304 expansion work until the EIA has been completed and effective wildlife corridors to mitigate the impacts of this expansion have been identified. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN regret that the progress report of the EIA was not received, and urge the State Party to submit the EIA progress report to the World Heritage Centre as a matter of urgency.

b) *Management issues*

The management plan for the property includes three strategies for promoting tourism and recreation in the property, which include the development of the tourism route network and eco-tourism activities, as well as encouraging local communities and entrepreneurs to have a pro-active role in tourism services. The management plan notes a range of obstacles for the management of the property, which include the lack of a clear long-term management policy. The plan also notes that the management is mostly based on short-term or ad hoc policies created to solve particular problems. The plan further notes that there are three alternative management structures and administrative schemes, but does not clarify which of those alternatives is currently in place. The plan emphasizes the effective management of the property is further impeded by a lack of implementation, support and participation, and organizational and personnel development.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the number of tourist visits to the property had doubled from 700,000 in 2001 to 1.4 million in 2006, and note that such high visitor levels could seriously affect the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property and should be managed through appropriate visitor use planning, based on a careful assessment of the property's capacity. They urge the State Party to develop a comprehensive tourism management plan for the entire property, as was recommended in the IUCN evaluation, with a view to identifying, avoiding and mitigating the potential negative impacts of tourism on the property's OUV. Considering the acknowledged shortcomings to the effective management of the property, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the State Party revise the management approach of the property and develop a clear long-term management policy. They encourage the State Party to request International Assistance to support this process. They note reports of a sister-parks proposal that would twin Khao Yai National Park with a park in the United States of America, and encourage both States Parties to consider this proposal as an opportunity for capacity building initiatives.

c) *Agricultural encroachment*

The State Party reports that it is negotiating a REDD Partnership. It has identified Thap Lan National Park (TLNP) as a priority site for the implementation of the REDD programme, which could help to mitigate the encroachment that is occurring at the north boundary of TLNP. The State Party also notes that it is considering expanding TLNP by incorporating some contiguous forest areas. However, IUCN notes that it has received reports that large-scale encroachment along the northern boundary of TLNP has significantly increased as a result of local community efforts to prevent this land, for which they claim ownership, from being designated as a National Park. A letter has been sent to the State Party on 8 April 2011, enquiring about this situation.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the State Party's decision to join the REDD programme and implement it as a priority in TLNP. They note that agricultural conversion within the property, in the north and north-west of TLNP, had already occurred at the time of its inscription, and that these areas are now reported to have been fully converted to farmland. They recall that the State Party, in its supplementary information to the nomination of the property, expressed its commitment to a boundary adjustment of TLNP by 2007, excluding 437.73 km² of inhabited and degraded land and incorporating 176.27 km² of National Forest Reserve. They encourage the State Party to expedite the adjustment of TLNP's boundary. They recommend that ongoing encroachment be halted, and that land sales and related activities in Wang Nam Khieo be strictly regulated so as to avoid potential adverse impacts on the property's OUV and integrity.

d) *Other conservation issues – dams and cattle grazing*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the status of the Huay Samong Dam be clarified and all construction work be halted until an EIA is undertaken to assess its potential impacts on the property's OUV, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

IUCN has also received reports that large areas in the Soung Sang Area of TLNP have been converted to pasture for domestic cattle. The World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party on 8 April 2011 asking for information on these matters, and on agricultural encroachment, as noted in point c) above.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the State Party's progress in undertaking the EIA for the expansion of Highway 304, but are concerned by reports that construction works may already be underway prior to the finalisation of the EIA. They are also seriously concerned by reports of escalating threats to the property's Outstanding Universal Value from encroachment, a proposed dam, cattle grazing, and inadequate funding. They therefore recommend that the Committee request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property prior to its 36th session in 2012 in order to assess the potential impacts of these threats on the property's OUV and to make recommendations regarding the management of Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex. They also recommend that the Committee encourage the State Party to revise the management approach of the property and develop long-term management policies, and to consider submitting an International Assistance Request to support this process. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further recommend that State Party be encouraged to consider applying to the Committee for a boundary modification of Thap Lan National Park in order to better address forest conservation and encroachment issues in this area. The status and precise location of the Huay Samong Dam also needs to be clarified, and construction work halted until an EIA is undertaken to assess its likely impacts on the property's OUV, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.18

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling its Decision **34 COM 7B.18**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Notes the State Party's statement that it is conducting an Environmental Impact Assessment for the expansion of Highway 304, and expresses its concern over reports that highway expansion works are already underway;
4. Also expresses its concern about reports of escalating threats to the property's Outstanding Universal Value from encroachment, the proposed Huay Samong Dam, cattle grazing, and ineffective management;
5. Urges the State Party to rapidly halt any ongoing encroachment and cattle grazing affecting the property, and requests that all construction work on the Huay Samong Dam be halted until the World Heritage Committee has had the opportunity to review a completed Environmental Impact Assessment and assess its potential impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
6. Encourages the State Party to consider submitting a boundary modification request to the World Heritage Committee for Thap Lan National Park in order to better address forest conservation and encroachment issues in this area;
7. Also encourages the State Party to revise the property's management approach, and to develop long-term management policies, as well as a comprehensive tourism management plan;
8. Invites the State Party to submit an International Assistance Request to support this process, and further encourages the States Parties of Thailand and the United States of America to consider the sister-parks proposal as an opportunity to explore capacity-building initiatives;
9. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission to the property prior to its 36th session in 2012, in order to assess the potential impacts of encroachment, the Huay Samong Dam, cattle grazing, and the expansion of Highway 304 on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, and to review its management and financial plans;
10. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including information on the status of the Highway 304 Environmental Impact Assessment and the Huay Samong Dam, the progress achieved in halting any large-scale encroachment and cattle grazing, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

20. Ha Long Bay (Vietnam) (N 672bis)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

21. Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of complementary information from the State Party)

22. Lagoons of New Caledonia: Reef Diversity and Associated Ecosystems (France) (N 1115)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

23. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

24. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)

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
32 COM 7B.25; 33 COM 7B.29; 34 COM 7B.24

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
April 2008: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission; May 2009: High-level visit by the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee; May 2010: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of management plan ;
- b) Weakening of conservation controls and laws;
- c) Impacts of proposed tourism infrastructure development for Olympic Games;
- d) Road construction;
- e) Deforestation.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/900>

Current conservation issues

On 3 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides information on progress in the implementation of the 2010 monitoring mission recommendations, as adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010).

- f) *Development of tourist facilities and infrastructure, related or not to the 2014 Winter Olympics*

The State Party reports that the development of an ecological monitoring system for Sochi National Park and adjacent territories is being completed, and that it is expected to be implemented from April 2011 onward. The State Party also states that at present the integrity of the property is intact, and that no plans for the development of infrastructure and other facilities within the boundaries of the property have been approved. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN however continue to receive reports from NGOs on a number of other planned and on-going infrastructure developments within the property, including a road to Lunnaya Polyana, a road and power lines from Guzeripl to Lagonaki Plateau, the development of a ski resort at the Biosphere Scientific Centre in Lunnaya Polyana, and the reinforcement of the banks of the Achipse and Laura rivers, which may threaten spawning grounds for brown trout. The 2010 mission already expressed concern about some of these developments and considers the State Party should provide information on each of these specific cases.

In addition, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received reports that the President of the Russian Federation announced the planned construction of a number of ski resorts across the Russian Caucasus, including the Lagonaki Plateau within the property. The World Heritage Centre requested additional information from the State Party in a letter dated 16 July 2010 and 10 January 2011. While no reply was received to these letters, the State Party report acknowledges that a series of documents related to the social and economic development of the Northern Caucasus have been adopted by the Government which could affect the integrity of the property but stresses so far no decision has been taken to allow developments inside the property. The report notes that the Ministry for Natural Resources is monitoring this issue closely. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are very concerned about the reports on continuing infrastructure developments inside the property and about the announced possible new development of a ski resort in Lagonaki. They reiterate that all construction works within the boundaries of the property should be halted immediately as requested by the Committee at its 34th session. They further consider that Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) should be submitted for all developments within and adjacent to the property to the World Heritage Centre, including an assessment of their potential impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and integrity prior to a decision on these developments.

- g) *Progress in the implementation of the other recommendations of the 2010 monitoring mission*

The State Party reports the following progress in the definition of the geographical coordinates and legalization of the boundaries: as already mentioned to the 2010 mission, the definition of the boundaries and their registration of the portion of Caucasus Strict Nature

Reserve (CSNR) that falls within the Karachayevo-Cherkessian Republic and the Krasnodar Territory has been finalized. However court cases continue over the ownership of the portion of the CSNR that falls within the Adygeya Republic. In addition work on the boundaries of the the Bolshoi Tkhach Nature Park (BTNP) was also finalized and is currently in progress on the Buiny Ridge Nature Monument, the Tsitsa Headwaters Nature Monument and the Pshekha and Pshekhaskha Headwaters Nature Monument (PPHNM), all components of the property. Although the State Party notes that an updated map of the property's boundaries was submitted to the World Heritage Centre, this was unfortunately not received. The report provides no information if the buffer zone along the southern boundary of the property has been approved by the Ministry of Natural Resources, as was announced during the 2010 mission. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the progress made on this important issue, request that the map is submitted as soon as possible and consider that the lack of clarity about the boundary of CSNR in the Adygeya Republic should be resolved as soon as possible.

The report provides no information on the requested halting of logging activities and on efforts to rehabilitate the logged areas. IUCN received reports of continued logging in the portion of the CSNR that falls under the jurisdiction of the Adygeya Republic, as well as in the PPHNM. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate that logging is incompatible with the maintenance of the integrity of the property.

On the requested upgrading of the protection status of the above mentioned natural monuments included in the property, the report notes that the Department of Natural Resources of the Republic of Adygeya approved their "passports", which under Russian Law defines their protection regime. However, no information is provided on which activities are allowed, so it is not clear if the protection provisions are in line with the World Heritage Status of the property. The State Party reports that a decision was taken to form a state institution for the Bolshoi Tkhach Nature Park (BTNP), and that research was conducted on the capacity of BTNP and PPHNM for recreational use. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the need to ensure that the protection regime of these components is in line with their World Heritage status.

The report further notes that the State Party is assessing the feasibility of the creation of a coordination body for the implementation of the management plan, which was recommended by the 2010 mission. In response to the request to develop an overall sustainable tourism strategy for the property, the State Party notes that the Ministry developed a concept for development within Strict Nature Reserves, which foresees the development of educational tourism in these reserves. However, the report does not provide any information on the recommended development of an overall tourism strategy for the property.

h) *Legal protection of the property*

The State Party further reports that its Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology has developed a draft of the Federal Law, which aims to establish the concept of natural heritage sites in the Law of the Russian Federation. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome this initiative, but note that it is not clear from the report if the proposed law will address the issue of the overall management of natural World Heritage properties on the State Party's territory.

IUCN notes that it has received reports that a draft law (N^o 97705-5) proposes a number of changes to the Federal Law "About Specially Protected Natural Territories", which would reportedly facilitate the changing of the boundaries of State Nature Reserves, as well as the weakening of their protection regime by allowing their protection status to be changed to that of a National Park under Russian legislation. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned about these proposed changes as they could potentially weaken the level of protection of more than half of the natural World Heritage properties on the State Party's territory, including the Western Caucasus, and consider the State Party should provide more information on the proposed law and ensure that the appropriate legal measures are taken to

maintain a high level of protection for all World Heritage properties, in accordance with Paragraph 15(f) of the *Operational Guidelines*.

i) *Possible extension of the property*

The State Party notes that following the legal establishment of a protected corridor to Teberdinsky Strict Nature Reserve (TSNR) in May 2010, the State Party announces plans to extend CSNR in the Krasnodar Territory and the Adygeya Republic by 2012. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome this proposal and note that it would be important to clarify which areas are considered for inclusion in the Reserve. They also note that the announced development of ski resorts in the Caucasus will also affect TSNR, which has been suggested for inclusion in a potential future extension of the property.

Conclusion

While the World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress in implementing some of the recommendations of the 2010 monitoring mission, they remain concerned about continuing reports of infrastructure developments within the property, as well as the announcement of a possible new ski resort, and reiterate that these developments are not in accordance with the World Heritage status of the property. They also express concern about reports on proposed changes to the Federal Law “*About Specially Protected Natural Territories*”, which would significantly weaken the level of protection of State Nature Reserves and therefore potentially affect more than half of the Russian natural World Heritage properties, including the Western Caucasus. As a strategic action related to the issues facing the property, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN also recommend that the World Heritage Committee invite the International Olympic Committee and the International Ski Federation to develop and implement an agreement regarding sporting events and World Heritage properties, in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to avoid any inappropriate sport facilities developments within World Heritage properties.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.24

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.24**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Welcomes the progress made by the State Party in implementing some of the recommendations of the 2010 monitoring mission defining the boundaries of the property;*
4. *Requests the State Party to submit as soon as possible:*
 - a) *The updated map of the boundaries of the property as well as the areas proposed for future inclusion in the Caucasus Strict Nature Reserve,*
 - b) *Information on the activities allowed in the Nature Monuments which are part of the property following the approval of the “passports”, which under Russian Law define their protection regime;*

5. *Notes with serious concern the continued reports of infrastructure developments within the property as well as the announcement of a possible new ski resort on Lagonaki plateau;*
6. *Urges the State Party to rapidly implement all recommendations of the 2010 monitoring mission in order to protect the property's Outstanding Universal Value, and in particular immediately halt the development of infrastructure and tourism facilities within the property as well as logging activities and rehabilitate the damaged areas;*
7. *Also urges the State Party to submit copies of Environmental Impact Assessments to the World Heritage Centre conducted for all proposed developments which could affect the property, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, including an assessment of their potential impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value;*
8. *Also notes with concern the reports on proposed changes to Russian Federal protected area's legislation, which could significantly weaken the level of protection of State Nature Reserves and affect the protection regimes of more than half of the Russian natural World Heritage properties, including the Western Caucasus, and also requests the State Party to provide more information on the proposed law and take all appropriate legal measures to maintain a high level of protection of natural World Heritage properties on its territory, in accordance with Paragraph 15(f) of the Operational Guidelines;*
9. *Invites the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to approach the International Olympic Committee and the International Ski Federation with a view to putting in place an agreement regarding sporting events and World Heritage in order to ensure that sport facilities developments do not adversely affect the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties;*
10. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress in the implementation of the remaining 2010 reactive monitoring mission recommendations, as well as the information requested in the above paragraphs, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

25. 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
22 COM VII.27; 33 COM 7B.31; 34 COM 7B.25

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Changes to the boundaries of Yugyd Va National Park;
- b) Proposed gold mining.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/719>

Current conservation issues

On January 31 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. A joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the Virgin Komi Forests, from 3-11 October 2010, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). The mission focused on the questions of boundary changes and mining in Yugyd Va National Park (YVNP), the northern component of the property. The full mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM/>.

While the mission team considered that the forest ecosystem for which the Virgin Komi Forests was inscribed on the World Heritage List is overall in good condition, it noted a number of important conservation issues:

a) Boundary changes to Yugyd Va National Park (YVNP)

The mission found that four areas have been excised from YVNP: a 19.9 square km proposed gold mining site at Chudnoe, existing quarries at Zhelannoe (quartz) and Obeiz (granite), and the existing SRTO-Torzhok gas pipeline. As noted by the State Party in its report, these excisions followed a land registration exercise carried out by the Russian Cadastre Agency in 2008. However, no request for a boundary modification of the World Heritage property was submitted to the Committee before the changes to the boundaries of YVNP were made. The mission concludes that the boundary changes are in clear contravention with Paragraphs 163 – 165 of the *Operational Guidelines* which clearly require that any boundary change be approved by the Committee. As no boundary change was approved by the World Heritage Committee, the areas excised from YVNP are still to be considered part of the inscribed property. The mission noted that the excisions remove the legal protection status of these parts of the property, therefore jeopardising the protection status of the property, which is a key requirement of its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) in accordance with Paragraph 78 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The mission also noted that the boundary changes are the subject of a legal challenge at the national level.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that that Paragraph 180(b) (i) of the *Operational Guidelines* clearly states that the modification of the legal protection status of a property constitutes a potential threat to its OUV and integrity and therefore consider the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger are fulfilled. They also consider that the boundary change to YVNP should be immediately reversed and that no boundary change to YVNP should be implemented prior to approval by the Committee.

In its report the State Party expresses its intention to submit a minor boundary modification request to the Committee. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that this boundary modification is motivated by a proposed mining operation at Chudnoe (see below). IUCN considers that the boundaries of World Heritage properties should not be modified with the primary objective of facilitating mining, as this would not be in line with the policy not to mine within World Heritage properties. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further consider that

given the potential impact of the proposed mining operation on the OUV of the property, as described below, such a request for boundary modification should be considered as a '*major boundary modification*' and therefore would require a re-nomination of the property, in line with Paragraph 165 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

b) Mining within YVNP

The mission noted two active quarries within the property at Zhelannoe (quartz) and at Obeiz (granite). The mission acknowledged that both operations predate the property's inscription on the World Heritage List and appear to have limited impact on the property's OUV. The mission recommends that these activities are phased out and the areas affected restored and that in the interim an environmental management plan is developed and implemented to minimize the environmental impacts of these activities.

In addition, the mission was informed that the State Party has given a licence to the Russian company Gold Minerals, for a proposed gold mine at Chudnoe, one of the areas excised from YVNP but part of the property. The mission noted that this proposed mine is not comparable in scale and impacts with the existing quarries and that it is likely to have significant negative impacts on the property's OUV and integrity, including contamination of the Kozhym River, construction of substantial infrastructure within the property and increased heavy traffic. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that allowing mining within the property is contradictory to the case law established under the Convention that mineral exploration and exploitation are not acceptable within World Heritage properties. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the fact that a licence for these extraction activities within the property was already given by the State Party should also be considered as a case of potential danger to the OUV of the property in line with Paragraph 180(b) (ii) of the *Operational Guidelines*, fulfilling the conditions for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. They consider that unless a boundary modification is requested by the State Party and approved by the Committee, and until it is demonstrated that the impacts of the Chudnoe mining project will not affect the OUV of the property, all mining activities (including preparatory activities) should immediately be halted and the licence revoked or frozen.

c) Protection status of the property and adjacent areas

The mission noted the lack of buffer zone on the eastern boundary of the property and recommended that this buffer zone be created. The mission also recommended providing a protection status to the Upper Illych Basin forest, situated between YVNP and the second component of the property, the Pechoro-Illychsky Strict Nature Reserve (PISNR), given the importance of this forest block for the long-term integrity of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that in its report the State Party acknowledges the importance of upgrading the protection status of the Upper Illych Basin, and states that work is under progress to include the area in YVNP. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider this as a very positive development.

d) Geological prospecting

The mission was informed about ongoing geological prospecting on the eastern boundary of the property, hence the importance of instating the eastern buffer zone. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further received reports in early 2011 that the Russian Ministry of Natural Resources approved geological prospecting within PISNR. They recall the Committee's position that mineral exploration is incompatible with World Heritage status.

e) Other issues

The mission also considered a number of other issues including hunting and poaching, logging, the SRTO-Torzhok pipeline, the Pdocherie-Vuktyl drinking water pipeline, forest fires, the potential for tourism development, as well as management planning, staffing and budgets. The mission made detailed recommendations on a number of these issues which are included in the mission report.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the removal of the protection status of part of the Virgin Komi Forests World Heritage property and the approval of the Chudnoe gold mine inside the property are to be considered as potential threats to the OUV and integrity of the property. They consider that the conditions for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger are fulfilled in line with Paragraph 180(b) (i) and (ii) of the *Operational Guidelines*. They consider that the State Party should be urged to immediately reverse the boundary changes made to the property and to halt the gold mining project. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further welcome the planned inclusion of Upper Illych Basin forest, situated between the two components of the property, but note their concern about reports that the Russian Ministry of Natural Resources approved geological prospecting within the southern portion of the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.25

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.25**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Expresses its utmost concern about the boundary changes made to the northern component of the property, Yugyd Va National Park (YVNP), which removes the protection status of these areas, and about the approval of a gold mine within the property at Chudnoe;*
4. *Considers that the excisions made to the property and the approved gold mine at Chudnoe represent a clear potential threat to the property's Outstanding Universal Value and integrity, as defined in Paragraphs 180(b) (i) and (ii) of the Operational Guidelines;*
5. ***Decides to inscribe the Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;***
6. *Urges the State Party to immediately implement the following corrective measures proposed by the 2010 mission to remove the potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value:*
 - a) *Reverse the boundary change to Yugyd Va National Park,*
 - b) *Immediately halt the gold mining project at Chudnoe, including all preparatory activities, and revoke or freeze the exploration and exploitation license already granted;*
7. *Requests the State Party to implement the other recommendations of the 2010 World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission, in particular:*

- a) *Develop a strategy to phase out the Zhelanoe and Obeiz quarries and develop environmental management plans for the quarries and the SRTO-Torzhok pipeline to minimise their environmental impacts,*
 - b) *Establish a buffer zone with adequate protection status along the entire eastern boundary of the World Heritage property, in consultation with neighbouring regions,*
 - c) *Upgrade the protection status of the Upper Illych Basin by including it either within the Yugyd Va National Park or the Pechoro-Illychsky Strict Nature Reserve, and of the PL 350 enclave by designating it as a regional protected area, and*
 - d) *Strengthen the financial resources and staffing of the two components of the property in order to ensure that management can effectively conserve the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
8. *Commends the State Party for undertaking an upgrade of the protection status of the Upper Illych Basin, located between the northern and southern components of the property, by integrating it within Yugyd Va National Park;*
 9. *Notes the State Party's intention to submit a minor boundary modification request to the World Heritage Committee, and also considers that since this boundary modification is motivated by a proposed mining operation it should be considered as a 'major boundary modification' and, if proposed, will require a new nomination, in line with Paragraph 165 of the Operational Guidelines, and further considers the boundaries of World Heritage properties should not be modified with the primary objective of facilitating mining;*
 10. *Also notes reports that the Russian Ministry for Natural Resources has approved mineral exploration within the southern component of the property, the Pechoro-Illychsky Strict Nature Reserve (PISNR), and recalls its position that mineral exploration and mining is incompatible with World Heritage status, in line with the international policy statement of the International Council of Minerals and Metals (ICMM) of not undertaking these activities in World Heritage properties;*
 11. *Also requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, to develop a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and to provide a draft proposal for the Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger on the basis of the above corrective measures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee;*
 12. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, describing the implementation of the corrective measures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

26. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation (N 768rev))

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late request of information to the State Party)

27. Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685bis)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

28. Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1032)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late request of information to the State Party)

29. Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205bis)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late States Parties' reports on the state of conservation)

30. Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

31. Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late finalization of the mission report)

32. 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
32 COM 8B.17; 34 COM 7B.35

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2011 Joint WHC/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal logging;
- b) Growth in human population;
- c) Tourism pressures associated with growth in visitor numbers and heavy concentration in specific areas;
- d) Agricultural advances;
- e) Forest fires.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1290>

Current conservation issues

On 1 January 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides detailed information on the financial resources attributed to anti-logging activities, and the current state of illegal logging in the property, as well as other conservation issues and recent tourism developments. From 10-14 January 2011, a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the property. The mission report is available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>.

a) *Illegal logging*

The State Party reports that from January to July 2010, the incidence of illegal logging within the property has diminished by approximately 90% in comparison with previous years, due to anti-logging activities undertaken by the State Party's National Commission for the Protection of Natural Areas (CONANP), in collaboration with State Governments, NGOs and local communities. The State Party reports that in the period 2009-2010, only 1.56 hectares of forest were lost from the property as a result of illegal logging. In contrast, the State Party reports that a total of 117.09 hectares of forest was lost from the property during the same period, mainly as a result of extreme weather events. The joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission notes that while all logging is banned in the core zone of the property, sustainable logging is allowed in the buffer zone, which means that control of legal and illegal timber production will always remain a challenge, as preventing illegally cut logs from entering the legal stream of forest products requires a rigorous chain of custody tracking systems. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the mission's recommendation that the excellent and very important efforts in place to control illegal logging as well as fires and other types of habitat conversion should be maintained.

b) *Tourism pressure*

The State Party reports that, under the Strategy for Sustainable Development of Tourism and Recreation in Mexico's Protected Areas, a Public Use Programme and a Sustainable Tourism Development Programme are being implemented at the property. The State Party states that these programmes aim to control and mitigate negative visitation impacts to the biophysical, social, cultural and administrative environment of the property, as well as to promote natural resource conservation by providing alternative livelihoods to local communities. The State Party notes that a number of tourism infrastructure development projects have been implemented between 2008 and 2010, and states that a series of mitigation measures are taken to limit the potential negative impacts on the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the State Party's efforts to promote alternative

livelihoods for local communities, and note the mission's recommendation that non-butterfly related tourism opportunities be developed, and efforts to improve the visitor experience further strengthened through appropriate signage on hiking trails, trail maintenance, and signage at hibernation viewing points to explain the World Heritage status of the area and the Outstanding Universal Value of the Monarch butterfly migration phenomenon. They also note that any discussion of tourism development should put the needs of the butterflies first, considering that high tourist numbers and poorly regulated visitation could potentially pose a threat to the butterflies by causing the degradation of their overwintering environment. They further note that the mission also recommends that the State Party develop a clear and transparent benefit-sharing mechanism, in order to ensure that any tourism revenue is distributed more equitably, and to clarify how all communities located within the property and its buffer zones are compensated for their efforts to conserve the property.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the reported progress made in controlling illegal logging, the main direct threat to the property's Outstanding Universal Value. The promotion of alternative livelihoods and the strengthening and diversification of tourism activities are also critical in addressing the root causes to deforestation threats. In this regard, the development of a clear and transparent benefit-sharing mechanism to clarify how all communities located within the property and its buffer zones are compensated for their efforts to conserve the property, and to ensure that any tourism revenue is distributed more equitably would be useful. Finally, efforts at further improving the visitor experience through appropriate signage along hiking trails, trail maintenance, and signage at hibernation viewing points to explain the World Heritage status of the area and the Outstanding Universal Value of the Monarch butterfly migration phenomenon would maximize visitor engagement.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.32

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.35**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Commends the State Party for the progress achieved in reducing illegal logging in the property, and encourages the State Party to continue its actions to control illegal logging, as well as fires and other types of habitat conversion;
4. Welcomes the State Party's efforts to promote alternative livelihoods for local communities, and requests the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 2011 reactive monitoring mission, in particular:
 - a) *Develop a clear and transparent benefit-sharing mechanism to clarify how all communities located within the property and its buffer zones are compensated for their efforts to conserve the property, and to ensure that any tourism revenue is distributed more equitably,*
 - b) *Further improve the visitor experience through appropriate signage along hiking trails, trail maintenance, and signage at hibernation viewing points to explain the*

World Heritage status of the area and the Outstanding Universal Value of the Monarch butterfly migration phenomenon,

- c) *Explore options for the development of non-butterfly related tourism activities;*
5. *Notes that any discussion on tourism development should deal with the conservation of butterfly populations as a priority, considering that high tourist numbers and poorly regulated visitation could potentially pose a threat to the butterflies by causing the degradation of their overwintering environment;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2015, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including information on progress achieved in the development of a benefit-sharing mechanism, the improvement of the visitor experience, and the development of non-butterfly related tourism activities.*

33. Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) N 1138 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2005

Criteria
(ix) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
29 COM 8B.13; 33 COM 7B.38

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount provided to the property: USD350,000 (Management planning, installation of mooring buoys for diving boats, working with local communities, capacity building, public use planning, improved stakeholder understanding of legal protection measures)

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Continued and growing presence of cattle

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/1138>

Current conservation issues

On 15 February 2011 the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. This report provides an overview of progress made in finalizing and implementing a management plan for the Special Zone of Marine Protection, establishing a formal policy on the development and conservation of the coastal zone opposite the property, and removing

cattle from the property, as requested by the Committee in Decision **33 COM 7B.38**. On 9 December 2010, the State Party submitted the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for review but it was considered incomplete.

a) *Management planning, fisheries management and governance*

The State Party reports that the Management Plan for the Special Zone of Marine Protection (SZMP) and associated fisheries regulations have yet to be finalised and approved, as urged by the Committee in Decision **33 COM 7B.38**. No clear fisheries monitoring system for the property has been developed, as recommended by IUCN in its evaluation. The State Party notes that the National Fisheries Agency has established a satellite monitoring system for fishing vessels in all Panamanian jurisdictional waters, and that baseline data is available for geo-referenced fishing grounds, which should enable monitoring of the impacts of fishing activities on the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the development of a satellite monitoring system. They consider that coordinated communication between ARAP and the National Environmental Agency (ANAM) will be crucial to enable effective surveillance and control of illegal fishing. However, IUCN notes that it has received worrying reports about a marked increase in commercial, artisanal and sports fishing within Coiba National Park (NP) and its SZMP. This increase is reportedly linked to the delayed implementation of the Coiba NP Management Plan over the last three years, the continuing lack of a Management Plan for the Special Zone of Marine Protection, the poor capacity of the management agency, and other related governance issues. These reports are substantiated by a letter from the Scientific Committee of Coiba NP addressed to the Park's Board of Directors, dated 17 February 2011, which proposes a number of potential solutions to accelerate the implementation of Coiba NP's Management Plan. Furthermore, it appears that Montuosa Island within the property has been partly cleared for housing and banana plantations and has been used as a base for carrying out sports fishing, illegal shark fishing and turtle harvesting.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are seriously concerned by the reported increase in commercial, artisanal and sports fishing within the property. Unless the Coiba NP and the SZMP Management Plans are urgently finalized and properly implemented, as requested by the Committee in Decision **33 COM 7B.38**, the integrity of the property risks being seriously compromised. They also emphasize the importance of ensuring that the property's Management Plan's provisions and fishing regulations are adequately publicised amongst local communities, commercial operators and other park stakeholders and effectively applied by the authorities.

b) *Coastal development*

The State Party reports that it has not established a formal policy on the development and conservation of the coastal zone opposite the property, and emphasizes that existing environmental legislation and development plans provide considerable protection for the property. The Panamanian Tourism Authority has developed a Master Plan for Sustainable Tourism for Coiba (2007-2020), which includes strategic guidelines for tourism management. However, further details on these guidelines are not provided. The State Party notes that the Master Plan does not include infrastructure or high-impact development on the coast nearest to the property. A number of investment projects are planned for 2010-2011 outside the property, including tourist wharves, visitor reception centres and a theme park, as well as sanitary facilities for visitors on Coiba Island.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain seriously concerned about the growing potential for coastal development on the shores opposite the property. They recall that coastal development could exacerbate recreational and sports fishing pressures and

significantly increase water pollution, and consider that existing environmental legislation and other development control mechanisms are insufficient to safeguard the property's Outstanding Universal Value. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN strongly recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to i) undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the coastal zone's development potential, and ii) develop and implement a coastal zone development and conservation policy on the basis of this assessment to ensure that the cumulative development impacts to the property's Outstanding Universal Value are foreseen and effectively averted.

c) *Continued presence of cattle*

The State Party reports that it plans to remove 500 of the estimated 1,500 wild cattle within the property by 30 April 2011, and that most of the remaining pasture on Coiba Island has been fenced, with the exception of the San Juan River area. ANAM, which is now responsible for the removal of cattle, has prepared terms of reference for a private company to undertake the removal of 500 animals to the mainland. The State Party also reports that many cattle are dying of malnutrition and disease.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the State Party's efforts to remove wild cattle from Coiba Island, but remain concerned that none have been removed to date and that they continue to negatively affect the property's terrestrial and marine ecosystems through soil erosion and the resulting siltation of its coral reefs. They recall that the State Party submitted an International Assistance Request in March 2010 for a project to remove cattle from Coiba Island. IUCN at the time noted that the proposed methodology - round up and live removal of cattle - would be extremely challenging given the island's rugged terrain, and recommended that the State Party also consider other options, such as hunting (as has been successfully implemented in the large goat eradication project in Galapagos, Ecuador) to ensure the complete removal of cattle from Coiba Island. Advice should be sought on other potential methods for the permanent removal of cattle from Coiba Island, with the support of IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas.

d) *Construction of a naval station on Coiba Island*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received reports that a naval station is under construction at the former site of the Coiba Island prison. A letter to the State Party was sent on 9 April 2010, indicating concerns over the potential impacts of this development and requested further information, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. A second letter was sent on 22 March 2011. To date, no response has been received. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned over the potential impacts of such a military base on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, namely that:

- The base does not become a source of introduction of new species (e.g. biosecurity measures should be put in place);
- Personnel be well informed against trafficking of wildlife;
- Personnel do not engage in agricultural productions;
- Boundaries be very clearly marked, ideally with a fence, and as small as possible, with restrictions on movement of people beyond those boundaries;
- Shore facilities be built and managed in such a way as to not destroy sea bottoms, and contribute to erosion;
- The airport not be permitted to contribute to development pressures, such as tourism and hotels.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that the main conservation concerns regarding this property remain poorly addressed. The delayed implementation of the Coiba

NP Management Plan and the continued absence of a Management Plan for its Special Zone of Marine Protection remain to be addressed, several years after inscription. The absence of clear regulations specific to the requirements of this property appears to be contributing to the reported increase in incompatible activities within the property, particularly in regards to commercial and sports fishing. The decision to build a naval station on the property raises serious concerns over the State Party's commitment to conserving its Outstanding Universal Value, particularly in its lack of response to the World Heritage Centre's letter in this regard. The cattle removal effort is turning into a costly effort with few results to date, notwithstanding the reported death of cattle by disease and starvation. Unless the property's management capacity is significantly strengthened, there is concern over the State Party's ability to counter the growing threats highlighted in this report. Under these circumstances, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend the application of a Management Effectiveness Evaluation for the property, in line with the Enhancing Our Heritage toolkit, in order to provide an informed analysis of management needs.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.33

The World Heritage Committee

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.38**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Regrets that the management plan for the Special Zone of Marine Protection has yet to be finalised or adopted, as previously urged by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **33 COM 7B.38**, and considers that the property's lack of management capacity, if not addressed, could pose a potential threat to its Outstanding Universal Value,*
4. *Requests the State Party to urgently finalise the Management Plan for the Special Zone of Marine Protection, and to undertake an independent Management Effectiveness Evaluation, in line with the Enhancing Our Heritage toolkit, in order to inform the effective implementation of the management plans and fishing regulations for both Coiba National Park and its Special Protection Zone;*
5. *Reiterates its request that the State Party develop and implement a coastal zone development and conservation policy in order to ensure that cumulative development impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value are effectively addressed, and encourages the State Party to develop this policy on the basis of a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the coastal zone's development potential;*
6. *Notes that the State Party submitted an International Assistance Request for the removal of wild cattle from Coiba Island in March 2010, and strongly encourages the State Party to re-submit a revised request in line with the recommendations made by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN at the time of submission;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a revised retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, for review by the Advisory Bodies;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made*

on the issues above-mentioned, including increased fishing pressures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

34. Manu National Park (Peru) (N 402)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late finalization of the mission report)

35. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of complementary information from the State Party)

MIXED PROPERTIES

AFRICA

36. Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (C/N 39)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1978 and 2010

Criteria

(iv) (vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

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

1984-1989

Previous Committee Decisions

33 COM 7B.2, 34 COM 7B.4; 34 COM 8B.13

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 177,102, 9 assistances, 2009: USD 29,920, preparation for the evaluation of a management plan (including Kilimanjaro National Park); 2004: USD 19,294, preparatory assistance for the nomination under cultural criteria, 2001: USD 10,000, conservation, scientific study in the crater; 1990: USD 49,782, conservation, purchase of a Land Rover and equipment for the paleontological site of Olduvai; 1988: USD 50,000, conservation, purchase of 2 vehicles; 1988: USD 10,000, conservation, contribution to the purchase of vehicle material; 1987: USD 2,000, conservation, additional costs for equipment; 1986: USD 20,000, equipment for the protection of the site; 1979: USD 5,400, conservation, consultancy for an architect for the presentation of prehistoric sites.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

April 1986: IUCN mission; April-May 2007: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission; December 2008: World Heritage Centre /IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Increased human pastoral population;
- b) Poaching;
- c) Spread of invasive species;
- d) Tourism pressure;
- e) Encroachment and cultivation.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/39>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, which provides an update on the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 monitoring missions to the property. However, the report does not provide information on the implementation of the recommendations included in Decision **34 COM 8B.13** following the inscription of the property under cultural criteria.

As requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session, a World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS joint reactive monitoring mission visited the property from 6-12 February 2011 to follow up on the conservation issues raised following its inscription under cultural criteria. As requested in Decision **34 COM 7B.4**, the World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to Serengeti National Park also met with the Ngorongoro Conservation Area

Authority (NCAA) to discuss the progress achieved in implementing the 2007 and 2008 monitoring mission recommendations. A report on this meeting is included in annex to the mission report on Serengeti. Both reports are available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM/>.

a) *Implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 World Heritage Centre and IUCN monitoring missions*

i) *Pressure from tourism development and associated infrastructure*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that two of the traffic congestion Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) recommendations have been implemented: the increase of user fees to USD 200 per day and the introduction of vehicles with 8-10 instead of 4 passenger capacity. The State Party notes that it intends to implement two other recommendations on half-day crater visits and a crater booking system. NCAA informed the World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission that the number of vehicles now dropped to below 100 per day and that no new lodges or camps have been approved for construction since the 2008 mission. The large gravel pit near Sopa Lodge also has been closed. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that it is unclear whether all lodges have completed the environmental audit, as recommended by the 2007 mission. The State Party reports also notes that it has extended several roads to enable tourists to visit other areas and constructed 8 nature trails to divert pressure away from the crater.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome these measures but consider it is important to implement all the recommendations of the traffic congestion EIA as recommended by the 2007 and 2008 missions. In particular the crater booking system is essential to control the traffic congestion problem in the crater.

An NCAA delegation visited the World Heritage Centre in December 2010 to discuss road maintenance challenges in the property. In particular the maintenance of the main road from Lodoare to Nabi gates is a concern, not only as a result of the costs involved but also because of diminishing sources of gravel. One option considered is to harden selected roads. At the meeting, the State Party also submitted an EIA on the hardening of the ascending and descending roads into and out of Ngorongoro crater. The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies reviewed this EIA and concluded that the proposed works are unlikely to adversely impact the natural values for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List, with the proviso that the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 missions relating to traffic congestion are fully and effectively implemented.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further recommended that the wider issue of the long-term maintenance of the road network should be subject to a thorough consultancy study undertaken by a team of two consultants: one engineer with experience in establishing rural roads in Africa and one ecologist with experience in park roads. Ideally, this study should take the form of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the NCA road network, consult all major stakeholders and feed into a clear 'road strategy' for both Ngorongoro and the Serengeti.

The study should consider, inter alia, the impacts that the development of tarmac roads would have on human-wildlife collisions (reportedly already very high in the Serengeti), the barrier effect tarmac roads could have on several smaller species, and on changed drainage patterns, and review the impacts on cultural heritage assets. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that there is a need to develop a sustainable tourism strategy for the entire Serengeti Ecosystem and for the Ngorongoro cultural landscape in collaboration with Tanzania National Parks in light of the numerous tourism management issues the property will continue to face.

ii) *Increasing human pastoral population and associated encroachment and cultivation*

NCAA noted that as part of the voluntary relocation programme, an alternative site to accommodate the immigrant families has been identified near Loliondo, with adequate water and pasture. To date 50 have been moved to the new site. The NCAA states that it is confident that others will relocate soon, especially given that agriculture is no longer permitted inside the NCA. It reports that it is actively looking for more land outside the Ngorongoro district for relocation. NCAA confirmed that agriculture in the NCA had been banned since 2009. As an alternative it is promoting a livestock development programme to improve cattle breeds. No information is provided in the State Party report on whether a new census and carrying capacity study is planned. On the issue of relocation of staff outside the property, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN were informed that the construction of flats outside the NCA had been interrupted due to the main contractor pulling out of the project. The NCAA is now seeking a new contractor and this is likely to lead to further delay. The NCAA also noted that the encroachment by cattle and people in the crater has been reduced by 75% since 2008 as a result of the provision of alternative sources of water and salt on the crater rim.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the progress reported by the State Party and consider that the issue of human population impacts are complex and can only be addressed through dialogue with the local communities and will require a long term approach. They welcome the decision by the State Party to ban agriculture in the property, and note that a livestock development programme is proposed as an alternative. They note the importance of taking into account the carrying capacity of the property in setting stocking numbers and consider more information should be provided by the State Party on this new approach.

iii) Invasive alien species

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN were informed that the biological control of *Azolla filliculoides* is proving problematic and efforts to remove it from the crater have so far not been successful. They note that a new invasive species, particularly the aggressive and toxic weed *Parthenium hysterophus*, has recently been discovered on the crater rim. The NCAA invasive species unit has started education programmes to raise awareness of the species to aid detection and eradication.

b) Management

The 2011 mission noted that the current management is more geared toward the conservation of natural resources, tourism and land use issues related to the Maasai people, than to the conservation of cultural resources, as also noted at the time of the property's inscription under cultural criteria. In order to bring about a more equitable balance between the management of natural and cultural heritage, there is a need to finalise and operationalise the Memorandum of Understanding between the Antiquities Division and NCAA. This could pave the way for an integrated and efficient management of both natural and cultural heritage and unlock both financial and human resources to support this process.

There is also a need to provide resources for the immediate revision of the integrated management plan as an overall framework for the conservation, protection and management of both the cultural and natural attributes at the property.

The State Party reports that the NCAA has instituted a mechanism of land use planning, budget management and development activities with the involvement of the local community and considers that this initiative is progressing well. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN were provided with the latest audited NCAA accounts showing the detailed breakdown of expenditure. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the NCAA for the improved transparency.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that an 'Enhancing our Heritage' workshop will take place in the NCA in March 2011, and request that the outcomes of this management effectiveness evaluation are communicated to the World Heritage Centre.

c) *Results of the 2011 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission*

i) *Olduvai Gorge*

The 2011 mission noted with concern the progressive deterioration of the fabric of the FLK-Zinjanthropus excavation site. There is a need to stabilise the erosion at this site and also at all excavations conducted in Olduvai Gorge and elsewhere within the NCA. To ensure that future research does not contribute to the problem, stabilisation of excavations should be included in research guidelines. The mission observed large herds of Maasai livestock in the Gorge. They considered that these pose threats to the archaeological resources and should be limited through a participatory approach with the pastoral communities.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that an overall pastoralism strategy should be developed that includes the provision of watering holes outside the Gorge and/or the identification of areas within the Gorge that are less sensitive to erosion by livestock.

The mission was informed that the plans for a construction of a podium at the FLK-Zinjanthropus site are outdated. However, the mission team was informed of other plans to construct a research station at Olduvai Gorge. Given the extreme sensitivity of this area, the mission considered that any potential plans for construction at Olduvai Gorge should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

ii) *Nasera Rock Shelter*

The mission noted that the Nasera Rock Shelter is still being used as an enclosure for a herd of Maasai goats and that camping takes place at the site. The mission considered that the shelter should be protected from livestock by installing an appropriate barrier that patrols need to be organized, that the impacts of vegetation (trees and shrubs) on the archaeological deposits need to be minimised, and that the significance of the site needs to be explained to the pastoral communities.

iii) *Laetoli footprint trackway*

The mission coincided with the re-excavation of a 3 x 4 metre section of the Laetoli hominid footprint trackway by the State Party. This partial reopening was conducted by the Department of Antiquities in collaboration with a team of national and international experts. The formal excavation protocol was not made available to the mission. The mission was informed by the State Party that the results of the re-opening will be used as a basis for a decision on the best approach for conserving and presenting the footprints. Potential options include, but are not limited to (1) reburial, (2) physically removing the trackway tuff and transporting it to a secure location, and (3) permanently opening the trackway. Option 3 would include the construction of an exhibition centre to be built on top of the footprint trackway so that it would be exposed and presented to the public. The mission noted that an existing site museum near the Laetoli site includes an architectural concept design for such an exhibition centre. The mission received information that the construction of this exhibition centre has the support of the highest levels of Government, although its approval is subject to recommendations of a meeting with the Antiquities Department on 7 February 2011.

The mission expressed its concerns at the proposal to permanently opening the trackway without in-depth study and evaluation of the techniques to be used. Any decision needs to take into account not only the feasibility of constructing an exhibition building that would guarantee the conservation of the footprint trackway, but also the short, medium and long-term financial and human requirements for its effective maintenance and operation. Additionally, the integrity of the landscape needs to be taken into account for any major infrastructure development at this unique location. Recent history provides abundant examples of the devastating effects of improper maintenance of fossil footprint trackways

elsewhere and some of these are detailed in the mission report. The mission recommended that all precautionary measures should be taken to ensure that the Laetoli footprint trackway is conserved in a manner that best ensures its protection and sustains its contribution to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the State Party should submit as soon as possible a comprehensive report on the partial excavation, and on the protocols followed, to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, for evaluation and review before the next 36th session of the World Heritage Committee. Any proposed plans for the presentation of the trackways, including the construction of buildings, should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, before any commitment is made.

iv) Mapping the paleo-anthropological resources, including specific boundaries for Laetoli, Lake Ndutu, Nasera and the Ngorongoro Burial Grounds

No progress has been made with the mapping of the paleo-anthropological resources or the establishment of site boundaries in the NCA, as requested by the Committee. The mission, however, did note the willingness of the University of Colorado Denver, USA, to partner with the Department of Antiquities to produce GIS based maps based on existing information before the end of this year.

v) Overall state of conservation of paleo-anthropological sites

The mission expressed great concern at the absence of conservation plans for all paleo-anthropological sites in the NCA as requested by the Committee, as this lack may threaten the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the State Party should try to engage external technical support for this process, given the apparent lack of capacity and skills within the current establishment at the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note that the State Party did not provide any details of sensitive archaeological landscapes throughout the property, or of the location of finds from all paleo-anthropological sites, both of which were requested by the Committee.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress reported by the State Party in addressing some of the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 missions. They welcome the progress made in addressing the issue of human pressure at the property, and in particular the ban on agriculture. They note the shift towards a strategy to improve livestock in the property but consider that this strategy should consider the carrying capacity of the property and cultural heritage. They also deem that the State Party should provide more information on threats to the property's OUV from tourism and a growing resident population. They also consider that efforts should be continued to implement the 2007 and 2008 mission recommendations.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to highlight that the State Party report did not address the recommendation made by the World Heritage Committee in 2010 relating to cultural parameters. To reflect the new mixed status of the property, they note the need to finalise and operationalise the Memorandum of Understanding between the Antiquities Department and NCAA to pave the way for an integrated and efficient management of both the natural and cultural attributes. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note that progress needs to be made with mapping the archaeo-anthropological sites, with developing conservation plans for individual sites, with identifying sensitive archaeological landscapes throughout the property, and with recording the location

of finds from all paleo-anthropological sites, all of which were requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further note the mission's expressed concern about the overall conservation of the property, including erosion at Olduvai and lack of protection at Nasera.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note the degree of uncertainty over plans for the protection of the Laetoli footprints. They consider that any plans for their presentation and protection need to be based on a scientific assessment of the State Party's report on the recent reopening of parts of the footprints. They further consider that, given the extreme fragility of these footprints, and their high profile within the palaeo-anthropological scientific community, that the assessment needs to be made by a specially convened international committee that draws together experts in conservation and palaeontology. They consider that any proposals for the protection and presentation of the Laetoli footprints must be considered by the World Heritage Committee before any commitment is made and must be based on the highest conservation standards and on adequate resources for their long-term protection, and needs to recall the concerns of the World Heritage Committee at the time of its inscription.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.36

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **34 COM 7B.4** and **34COM 8B.13**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note of the progress reported by the State Party in addressing the 2007 and 2008 mission recommendations, and in particular the ban on agriculture and the shift towards a strategy to improve livestock in the property;*
4. *Considers that the work on livestock improvement should be part of a larger strategy on pastoralism for the property, which takes into account its carrying capacity and which respects both the natural and cultural attributes of its Outstanding Universal Value;*
5. *Also considers that despite the progress achieved, the property continues to face serious pressures from tourism and the growing resident population, and reiterates the importance of ensuring effective stakeholder involvement in land-use planning, the development of more transparent and effective benefit-sharing mechanisms as well as a realistic overall tourism strategy;*
6. *Requests the State Party to ensure that the proposals to upgrade the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) road network are subject to a proper Environmental Impact Assessment, including a Heritage Impact Assessment, and that a clear 'road strategy' for both Ngorongoro and the Serengeti is developed on the basis of this Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA);*
7. *Urges the State Party to implement all the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 monitoring missions to address the multiple threats affecting the natural values of the property, as well as the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee at its 34th*

session and the 2011 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, in particular:

- a) *to finalise and operationalise the Memorandum of Understanding between the Antiquities Department and NCAA to pave the way for an integrated management of both natural and cultural heritage and to unlock both financial and human resources for this process,*
 - b) *to provide details of the specific area and location of the palaeo-anthropological resources, including specific boundaries for Laetoli, Lake Ndutu, Nasera, and the Ngorongoro Burial Mounds, and for their sensitive settings, to ensure their protection; of sensitive archaeological landscapes throughout the property; of the location of finds from all palaeo-anthropological sites; of conservation plans for all palaeo-anthropological localities,*
 - c) *to develop and adopt formal research guidelines for the collection, reporting, curation, and conservation of archaeological and paleo-anthropological remains that are in compliance with Antiquities Act and other applicable international standards,*
 - d) *to submit a comprehensive report on the partial excavation of the Laetoli footprints, including any preliminary reports to the World Heritage Centre,*
 - e) *to submit any potential plans for construction at the Zinjanthropus site in Olduvai Gorge to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines,*
 - f) *to convene an international scientific committee that draws together experts in conservation and palaeontology, with the involvement of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to assess the report on the partial excavation of the footprints, in the context of future decisions on the protection and presentation of the Laetoli site;*
8. Also requests the State Party to halt any further action at the Laetoli site until this full scientific assessment has been considered by the World Heritage Committee;
9. Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to assess progress in the implementation of the mission recommendations and in particular in the development of integrated management of both natural and cultural heritage;
10. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including an update on the implementation of the 2007, 2008 and 2011 missions recommendations and the report of the international scientific committee on the Laetoli footprints, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

37. Ibiza, Biodiversity and Culture (Spain) (C/N 417rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

23 COM VIII B.1; 33 COM 7B.41; 34 COM 7B.41

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2009: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Large-scale port expansion
- b) Management, including visitor management and site presentation

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/417>

Current conservation issues

On 27 January 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. This report provides detailed information on the State Party's response to the recommendations made by the 2009 joint reactive monitoring mission, such as the activities undertaken to monitor and safeguard the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, including the Posidonia prairies. The report contains nearly 1000 pages of annexes, which are currently under review by the Advisory Bodies.

a) *Management, including visitor management and site presentation*

The State Party reports that the Technical Commission of the Ibiza World Heritage Consortium, which consists of representatives from all institutions with direct authority over the property, will prepare an integrated management plan during 2011. It also reports that the Visitor Interpretation Centre at Ses Salines Nature Park is about to be opened and that the presentation of Ses Feixes has been improved through a variety of measures including interpretation related to World Heritage status.

The State Party further reports that the Consell d'Eivissa intends to invest 1.9 million Euros this year in the recovery of the landscape of Ses Feixes and its integration into the landscape context of the town, as well as to raise the population's awareness of its values. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider positively these developments and recognise the significant investment in the Ses Feixes wetlands.

IUCN has received reports that the high number of recreational boats operating in the marine component of the property is having a negative impact on its Posidonia prairies, due to the cumulative impacts of waste water discharged directly into the sea, as well as the direct physical damage caused by anchors. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies therefore suggest that the State Party develops and implements an effective control mechanism for recreational boating, based on a careful assessment of its capacity.

b) *Natural heritage issues related to the port expansion*

The State Party provided a detailed report on the progress of the port expansion and associated activities, including dredging, as well as the mitigation and monitoring measures implemented to avoid any significant negative impacts on the OUV of the property. The State Party reports that the dredging works and the disposal of the dredged material in the designated marine area are expected to be finished by March 2011. It notes that a containment boom and silt curtain were installed to prevent pollution outside of the working area, and outlines its monitoring strategy in considerable detail, including a range of sophisticated techniques used and the modelling undertaken to avoid risks from disposal of dredgings. In line with the 2009 mission recommendation, the State Party investigated the possibility of using a pipe to discharge the dredged material directly onto the sea floor, but found this technique not to be feasible.

The State Party further reports that the quality of the dredged material was verified and the concentrations of heavy metals in the sediment were found to be below the limit values established by the Centre for Study and Experiments for Public Work (CEDEX). However, the State Party neither reports on the possible presence and levels of organic pollutants, nor on the procedures followed to monitor the contamination of the sediment throughout post-dredging phases of work. The State Party concludes that the discharged material is not affecting the property, including the Posidonia prairies that form part of its OUV.

The World Heritage Centre has continued to receive complaints from local NGOs expressing concern about the necessity and impact of the port expansion, as well as the ongoing dredging and disposal works. It was suggested that the size of the expansion could still be reduced, and that a study on the visual impact of planned buildings and other structures on the surrounding neighbourhoods be carried out, as well as a study on the impact of the port expansion on traffic in these neighbourhoods. NGOs further observed that dredging and disposal works are not suspended during unfavourable weather conditions, which increase the risk of dispersal of the disposed material to the property and could negatively impact its Posidonia prairies.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the State Party's efforts to monitor and control the impact of the discharged material. They urge the State Party to monitor the quality of the dredged material throughout all phases of work, to include testing for organic pollutants, and to suspend dredging and disposal activities during unfavourable weather conditions. There is a need to increase the monitoring of the invasive *Caulerpa racemosa* algae, which the State Party confirms to be present in the property, and to take appropriate action to eliminate this species and prevent its further growth and potential impacts on the property.

c) *Cultural heritage issues related to the port expansion*

In its report the State Party notes that no archaeological site has been identified in the area of the planned new esplanade and transverse docks at Botafoc, but remains (particularly weaponry) relating to a possible 16th-17th c. shipwreck were found opposite Illa Grossa so that dredging works were suspended in this area to permit detailed investigation when visibility improves. The archaeological monitoring on board the dredging ships is reported to be carried out by a team of archaeologists that is permanently on site. Recovered woodwork is being desalinated for later transfer to the Ibiza Archaeological Museum.

The State Party further reports that measures have been taken to minimize impact of light pollution during night time port operation works, respecting the existing regulations.

In view of the port activities, it is stated that the future Ferry Terminal building would respect height limits defined by “technical and functional conditions” as well as the previously established “aesthetic and landscape integration criteria”. The built structures of the extended port would not have any negative visual impact on the setting of the property of Dalt Vila and its buffer zone (Ses Feixes). The Infrastructure Master Plan has determined the minimum necessary capacity of the Port’s infrastructure to serve port operations, in accordance with projections of near zero annual growth. Further studies on load capacity for each constituent property are being carried out. The port activities are thus not expected to increase significantly after the port expansion; with respect to the marine property, the port re-organisation is not aimed at increasing the number of ships accessing the port but increasing the quality, efficiency and safety of their access.

d) *Other conservation issues*

The State Party notes that the competent authorities have responded positively to the other recommendations of the 2009 mission. It confirms its current priority is the development and implementation of the integrated management plan, and that any extension of the property would be a medium-term project. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the State Party’s positive response to these recommendations, and suggest that it also considers the inclusion of the Archipelago de Cabrera National Park in a serial extension of the property, in order to achieve a more complete representation of the variety of Western Mediterranean marine ecosystems, as was recommended by IUCN at the time of the property’s inscription.

IUCN has received reports that the conservation status of Posidonia prairies in the property appears to have continually declined since the property’s inscription. IUCN has received reports that besides the threat from *Caulerpa racemosa*, an invasive red alga *Lophocladia lallemandii*, is threatening the property’s Posidonia prairies. Furthermore, there have been reports that the waste water treatment facilities of Ibiza and Platja d’en Bossa have insufficient capacity to handle the flow of waste water during the peak tourist season, resulting in the discharge of insufficiently treated waste water in the sea, which has the potential to negatively affect the Posidonia prairies within the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall the 2009 mission recommendation that an integrated monitoring system for the natural values of the property should be developed and implemented, and consider that there is a need for the State Party to improve the control of invasive species. They also consider that the State Party should upgrade and improve the waste water treatment facilities of Ibiza and Platja d’en Bossa, and reuse treated waste water in the restoration of Ses Feixes wetlands.

Furthermore, the State Party reports that a tourism sustainability study is planned for review by the citizens of Ibiza and Formentera. It is also stated that the walled city currently does not have any overload problems, and that access to the archaeological sites is controlled.

Conclusion

In summary, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the State Party’s progress in implementing the 2009 mission recommendations relating to management, visitor management and site presentation. They suggest that the State Party develop and implement an effective control mechanism for recreational boats, based on a careful assessment of the property’s capacity. They further note the State Party’s efforts to monitor and control the impact of discharged material in relation to the port expansion project, but suggest that the State Party monitor the quality of the dredged material throughout all phases of work, and include testing for organic pollutants. It is also suggested that the State Party establish an integrated monitoring system for the natural values of the property, in order to

monitor threats to its Outstanding Universal Value, including invasive species and discharge of insufficiently treated waste water.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.37

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.41**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Notes the State Party's progress in implementing the reactive monitoring mission's recommendations of 2009 relating to management, visitor management and site presentation, and its efforts to monitor and mitigate the negative impacts of the port expansion on the property;
4. Also notes the efforts made to strengthen monitoring of archaeological remains and the recovery of what appears to be a sunken ship and related materials;
5. Urges the State Party to monitor the quality of dredged material throughout all phases of the port expansion, and to include testing for organic pollutants;
6. Also urges the State Party to immediately inform the World Heritage Centre of any unexpected or adverse impacts that occur during the port expansion works, and requests the State Party to continue undertaking and reporting on appropriate mitigation and monitoring measures during and after the works on the port in order to avoid any negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
7. Further notes that a high number of recreational boats is continuing to cause direct and cumulative negative impacts on the Posidonia prairies within and adjacent to the property, and further urges the State Party to develop and implement an effective control mechanism to mitigate the impacts from recreational boats on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, based on a careful assessment of the its capacity;
8. Urges furthermore the State Party to upgrade and improve the waste water treatment facilities of Ibiza and Platja d'en Bossa, in order to eliminate the discharge of insufficiently treated waste water into the sea;
9. Welcomes the State Party's intention to consider a possible future extension of the property, and encourages the State Party to consider the inclusion of the Archipelago de Cabrera National Park in such an extension, in addition to the areas identified by the 2009 reactive monitoring mission;
10. Reiterates its request that the State Party develop and implement an integrated monitoring system for the property's natural values, in order to monitor threats to its Outstanding Universal Value, including invasive species and discharge of insufficiently treated waste water;
11. Also requests the State Party in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines to provide detailed information about any facilities or structures proposed (such as the future Ferry Terminal) which could have negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;

12. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including the development of the state of conservation of the property's *Posidonia* prairies since its inscription, as well as a copy of the Management Plan upon its finalization, for review by the Advisory Bodies.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

38. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1983

Criteria

(i) (iii) (vii) (ix)

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

N/A

Reinforced monitoring mechanism applied to the property in 2008 (Decision 32 COM 7B.44) and discontinued in 2009 (Decision 33 COM 7B.42).

The World Heritage Committee noted that the State Party requested the re-application of the Reinforced monitoring mechanism (34 COM 7B.42).

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.44; 33 COM 7B.42; 34 COM 7B.42

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 103,825 for fire suppression equipment; Master Plan development; and consultancies, such as a stone specialist for assessment of restoration work required on the Intihuatana stone sculpture.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 15,000 for the social participation workshop requested by the World Heritage Committee (Decision 30 COM 7B.35).

Previous monitoring missions

October 1997: IUCN/ICOMOS mission; October 1999: World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS mission; February-March 2002: World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS mission; October 2003: World Heritage Centre visit; April 2005: World Heritage Centre mission; April, 2007: World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; January 2009: World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS reinforced monitoring mission; February 2010: World Heritage Centre technical emergency mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Delays in reviewing the Master Plan and developing detailed yearly operational plans, and inadequate budgetary support for effective implementation;
- b) No evaluation of transport options, related geological studies, or the impact of bus traffic on increasing the risk of landslides;
- c) Lack of impact studies related to the carrying capacity of the Citadel and Inca Trail;
- d) Delays in the development and implementation of a public use plan;
- e) Delays in implementing urban planning and control measures for Machu Picchu Village, the main point of entry to the property, which has impacted on the visual values of the property;
- f) Lack of effective management of the property;
- g) Lack of risk management plans related to natural disasters;
- h) Inadequate governance arrangements including lack of adequate coordination of activities between different institutions and stakeholders involved in site management;
- i) Uncontrolled visitor access to the western part of the Sanctuary, related to the construction of the Carrilluchayoc Bridge.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/274>

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/587/>

Mission report (February 2010, emergency technical mission): <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/274/documents/>

Current conservation issues

The State Party' state of conservation report was received by the World Heritage Centre on 14 February 2011, and an official letter sent by the Ministry of Environment was sent on 18 March 2011 with additional information.

a) *Governance and management arrangements for the property*

The State Party reports that management efficiency at the property was hindered in 2010 due to the state of emergency in the Cuzco region, coupled with political processes for district, provincial and regional offices. It considers that with a clear political situation for the next four years, the implementation of the 2011 Annual Operational Plan will be achieved.

The State Party also reports on the current proposal to restructure the Management Unit with a revised high-level hierarchical structure to allow greater efficiency in decision-making consistent with the responsibilities of all levels of the Peruvian Government (local, regional and national). The Board of Directors would be comprised of the Ministers of Culture, Environment and Tourism and the President of the Regional Government of Cuzco. The technical committee would be constituted by the Vice ministers of Cultural Heritage, Tourism, Natural Protected Areas, the Regional Manager from the Government of Cuzco for Natural Resources and for Tourism, the Director of Culture in Cuzco from the Ministry of Culture, and both site managers from culture and nature. The draft amendment of the Supreme Decree to modify the composition of the Management Unit is being discussed. Additional information submitted indicates that the Regional Government of Cuzco has already expressed concern about how the Management Unit will be composed and will be submitting comments for consideration.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the information provided about the re-structuring of the management unit. They consider that although having a high level Board of Directors can potentially enforce the political commitment to the conservation of the property, there are still gaps that have yet to be addressed in decision-making processes at the local level. Governance mechanisms have yet to be identified for the broad participation of the municipalities involved so that the current cycle in which decisions are perceived as impositions at the local level is overcome. They also express concern about the sustainability of the arrangements beyond the current stable political context.

As for the request regarding the implementation of workshops for conflict resolution, the State Party reports that the Machu Picchu District Municipality and the rural organizations of the Machu Picchu Historical Sanctuary signed a memorandum to create a technical committee to review existing problems in the district. No further information is provided on the function of the technical committee or how the results from discussions will be integrated for implementation.

b) *Implementation of a management effectiveness assessment and agreement of a three-year plan to address the improvement of its effectiveness*

The Management Unit has prepared the terms of reference to update the Management Plan, as requested by the World Heritage Committee in 2007. The State Party stated that the Management Plan will be revised only when the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) will be officially approved.

c) *Harmonization of existing legal frameworks and regulatory measures and definition of strategies for efficient implementation*

No information was provided by the State Party on this issue.

d) *Development of the Statement of OUV and Desired State of Conservation, through a participatory workshop*

The retrospective Statement of OUV was received by the World Heritage Centre on 21 June 2009 and sent to the Advisory Bodies for review. The Desired state of conservation was not submitted as requested in light of the concerns that have been highlighted in previous decisions by the World Heritage Committee.

e) Emergency Action Plan for risk reduction and disaster recovery

In response to the events which occurred at the property in January 2011, the Ministry of Culture, the National Service for Protected Areas of Peru (SERNANP) and the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism (MINCETUR) formed a working group for risk reduction, including the participation of the National Meteorological and Hydrology Service of Peru, the Ministry of Transport and Communication, Peru Rail, the National Citizen's Protection Institute, and the Cuzco Regional Chamber of Tourism. The working group will gather and monitor data from the nine permanent weather stations installed in the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu since 2010 and the three hydrological stations in the Vilcanota River to monitor climatic and hydrological conditions in the Sanctuary. This action aims to identify and take preventive measures when increased rainfall and flooding of the Vilcanota River could endanger the population and visitors to the property. The evaluation gave the opportunity to update the Action Plan for Disaster Mitigation in Machu Picchu Village, which is currently in the process of implementation.

As part of the risk reduction plan, MINCETUR and the government body responsible for tourism in Peru (COPESCO) signed an agreement with the Machu Picchu Municipal District on 28 December, 2010 for the implementation of an early warning system and an emergency plan for Machu Picchu Village. This continues to be in a planning phase.

An additional cooperation agreement has also been signed between SERNANP and the National Meteorology and Hydrology Institute (SENAMHI) for the operation and automatic exchange of climate and hydrological information within the Sanctuary to prevent natural disasters. This will include climate information to develop projects to prevent forest fires and the risks of landslides.

Despite the heavy impact of the torrential rains and lack of sufficient preventive measures in place, the State Party's evaluation of the natural disasters in the region classified the geodynamic processes as low risk. However, the submitted Technical Risk and Vulnerability Assessment Report of the Historical Sanctuary of Machu Picchu, developed in 2010 by SERNANP, identified several areas in imminent risk or with high vulnerability to natural phenomena. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider this revised assessment constitutes an essential tool to further develop a comprehensive risk management plan and encourage the implementation of its recommendations.

f) Definition of public use regulations

As indicated in previous Annual Reports, SERNANP and the Ministry of Culture are monitoring the western access using records of visitors through the checkpoint. Annual visitor figures to the Sanctuary in 2010 reflected an increase, which is significant in regard to the carrying capacity of the site considering that the access to the property was closed for two months as a result of the 2010 torrential rains.

Concerning the property's public use plan, on 11 March 2010 the Regional Government of Cuzco publicly announced the hiring of a consultant to prepare the Plan through Public Tender #005-2009/GR/Cuzco (the Public Use Plan for the Historical Sanctuary of Machu Picchu) and the Selection Process for Small Claims Adjudication #018-2010/GR/Cuzco, pursuant to national regulations for the access to the site. The Plan will only develop at this point the component pertaining to the Tourist and Recreation Use at a cost of USD 130,000.

A second component of this Public Use plan, the study for the Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) and limits of carrying capacity for the Inca Trail Network and the Citadel, has been developed and was included in the report. It was finished in December 2010 and is currently being evaluated by official governing bodies for approval and implementation. The report did

not analyze any of the issues related to the Western Access of the property. It identifies several factors affecting tourism use including unplanned and unregulated practices, the uncontrolled growth of human settlements (particularly along the Inca trail) and waste management among others. The report does not provide a strategic response to identified issues; recommendations are very limited and too generalised to allow for clear action. No indication is provided as to how the results will inform the Tourist and Recreation use plan or how they will be articulated with the Management Plan.

No information has been provided on the process for the development and timeframe of the other components of the Public Use Plan that include Education, Capacity building and communication as well as social participation and institutional relationships.

g) Western access to the Sanctuary

Due to the events of January 2010, by Ministerial Resolution #057-2010-MTC/02 the Ministry of Transport and Communications temporarily reclassified the Santa Maria – Santa Teresa – Hydropower Plant Road as part of the National Road Network, and on 16 September 2010, the Chief of Staff enacted Law #29584 declaring the construction of the Machu Picchu – Santa Teresa Road a public necessity and of immediate national interest. The Law will have to be approved by a Presidential Decree. Parts of these roads are within the buffer zone and in immediate proximity to the property and access to the Citadel.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies express their concern about the proposed construction of a major national road, to provide a second entrance to the Sanctuary which will support arterial transport links with the National Road Network. Although the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge that currently, the railway provides the only access to the Sanctuary, and since the illegal construction of the Carrilluchayoc Bridge, tourists and locals have no choice but to walk on the train tracks in a hazardous situation from Santa Teresa to the Sanctuary. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would welcome proposals for a safer alternative pedestrian access for visitors but consider that the current official proposals will impact adversely on the property and its setting.

h) Analysis of land tenure status and mapping of current uses to identify adequate measures to maintain the OUV and integrity of the property

In order to strengthen the protection of the natural and cultural heritage of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu, both the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Culture have appointed a State Prosecutor for crime prevention. The State Party reports that legal proceedings are currently underway in the Mixed Court of Urubamba to sanction illegal constructions in Machu Picchu Town, as well as other infractions including deforestation, fires, and trespassing in the Sanctuary.

By Supreme Resolution #121-2010-JUS, 21 June 2010, the Mayor of the Machu Picchu Municipal District proposed an Urban Land Registry Plan for Machu Picchu Village to the Ministry of Environment to begin implementation in 2011. No cadastral information on the property and buffer zone has been submitted. Land tenure is essential for a strategic response to sustain the OUV and integrity of the property, including the identification of potential safe access points and routes for visitation.

i) Visit of the Director General of UNESCO to the Sanctuary

On the occasion of the official visit of UNESCO Director-General to Peru (20 to 25 February 2011); the Director-General visited the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu. She discussed the concerns of the World Heritage Committee regarding the inadequate accessibility, the enormous damages incurred last year and the urgent need to implement the Emergency Plan. At a meeting held between the President of the Republic, the Minister of Environment, the Minister of Culture, and the regional authority of Cuzco, the Director-General reported that UNESCO, in cooperation with the National Authorities, is committed to finding a solution for the access to the Sanctuary, to identify a proper system of visitor management at the Citadel and ensuring the implementation of the Emergency Plan of the site.

The Minister of the Environment sent a letter to the Director of the World Heritage Centre on 22 March 2011, requesting, in accordance to Decision **34 COM 7B.42**, the application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism for the property. The letter confirmed the agreement of the Peruvian Authorities to establish an international support panel to provide technical advice and support to the National Authorities, to address governance, resource and finance issues, effective stakeholder involvement, and to seek the necessary support for the full implementation of the 2009 Action Plan.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain deeply concerned about the lack of adequate regulatory and conservation measures to maintain the OUV of the property and the extremely slow process of planning and implementing the necessary measures to address long-term concerns and provide the appropriate solutions. They consider that the threats to the property have increased since 1999 and that, despite the requests of the World Heritage Committee, issues such as governance, access and safety measures remain to be effectively addressed. This lack of adequate governance and planning has been demonstrated by the recent approval given for the construction of a new national road. This has been approved against previous recommendations of the Committee, and without any environmental and heritage impact assessments being considered. The construction of a substantial national road, will impact adversely on the property and exacerbate existing vulnerabilities such as the risk of landslides, and insecure and uncontrolled visitors access. Over the last ten years the World Heritage Committee has requested urgent actions to control and regulate access to the Sanctuary. This new road unfortunately will be counterproductive and will have the opposite effect. The project illustrates the lack of an overall management system for the property, and appears to demonstrate a priority to maximize visitor numbers rather than optimize conservation.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that, in the absence of confirmation from the State Party that the construction of the national road will be halted, and until an alternative access solution has been identified, the World Heritage Committee consider the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: **35 COM 7B.38**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.42**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided on the implementation of actions at the property, as well as the submission of the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, under revision by the Advisory Bodies;*
4. *Regrets that there has been no substantial progress in addressing threats to the property including the Western access, public use, governance and management arrangements, uncontrolled development at the Machu Picchu village and other threats identified in the 2009 Emergency Action Plan;*
5. *Welcomes the support of the State Party for the establishment of an international support panel to provide technical advice on the implementation of the Emergency*

Action Plan and requests the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to support the State Party in the identification of appropriate expertise and Terms of Reference, as well as in the organization of the first meeting of the panel;

6. Also requests the State Party to halt the construction of the Santa Teresa Road and to identify alternatives proposals for pedestrian access to the Sanctuary;
7. Considers that the State Party has not complied with all the requests expressed by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **34 COM 7B.42** to address threats to the property, and that therefore the property is in danger in conformity with Chapter IV.B of the Operational Guidelines, and decides to inscribe the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;
8. Also decides to apply the Reinforced monitoring mechanism to the property, for a period of one year, in order to complete work to address unresolved issues that constitute a danger to the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, with special attention to:
 - a) Updating of the management plan to define provisions to strategically address unregulated access to the site, public use and urban planning,
 - b) Definition of strategies to address Western access to the property and identify alternatives to the proposed Santa Teresa Road,
 - c) Risk reduction and disaster recovery plans, including a clear and precise course of action,
 - d) Harmonisation of legislative frameworks and enforcement of regulatory measures,
 - e) Inventory of land ownership of the property and in its immediate setting,
 - f) Strengthening of decision-making processes and governance at the property;
9. Further requests the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a proposal for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and a set of corrective measures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012;
10. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the above-mentioned recommendations and in particular the results of the first meeting of the international panel, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

39. 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
32 COM 7B.48; 33 COM 7B.44; 34 COM 7B.46

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 31 756: USD 6,932 for Technical Assistance for the rehabilitation of the Lamu Waterfront in 2004, USD 15 924 for the preparation of the nomination file, and USD 8 900 for Technical Cooperation to support the Management Plan.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2004: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission; May 2010: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of approved management plan and accompanying action plan;
- b) Lack of risk preparedness, especially in the case of fire;
- c) Lack of adequate sewerage, waste disposal, and overall infrastructure, and risk to limited fresh water supplies;
- d) Uncontrolled development
- e) Lack of resources;
- f) Urban and industrial development pressure, including possible new port and of oil exploration;
- g) Inadequate buffer zone.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1055>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report responding to issues related to the proposed port, water catchment area, boundaries and buffer zone, and other factors affecting the property.

a) *Proposed New Port in Lamu District*

The State Party reports that the Ministry of Transport has engaged a consultant, Japan Port Consultants, to carry out a full technical, economic, and financial feasibility study for the proposed Port of Lamu at Manda Bay, approximately 15-20 km to the north of Lamu, and for the Lamu-Addis-Juba-Kigali corridor development project. In addition, the consultant has been asked to advise on appropriate regulatory and institutional frameworks for support of the project and to develop at least three investment models for financing it. They have been

further asked to develop a Lamu Port master plan as well as detailed designs for the first three berths and associated infrastructure.

The National Museums of Kenya (NMK) was contacted by the consultant to obtain information about heritage sites in the area concerned, and the NMK stressed to the consultant the need for a comprehensive heritage, archaeological, and socio-cultural impact assessment. To this end, the Permanent Secretary, of the Ministry of National Heritage and Culture, has requested the Ministry of Transport, as a matter of urgency, to include heritage experts from the NMK as part of the team that will assess the overall Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and also as an integral part of the teams that undertake individual EIAs for project components. The report does not, however, indicate a response from the Ministry of Transport.

b) Development at the Shela Sand Dunes

The State Party reports that the NMK and the Water Resource Management Authority (WRMA) conducted a survey of the Lamu sand dune in February 2010, to map the 19 square kilometres proposed for gazettelement, including the fragile water source for Lamu town. In May 2010, the Chief registrar of Lands cancelled title deeds for the 21 plots illegally issued within the dune area. Currently the NMK and the WRMA are preparing documents to facilitate the gazettelement of the 19 square kilometres as a protected area. Further, the WRMA and the Lamu WHS and Conservation Office (LWHSCO) have established a water catchment management committee, which brings together stakeholders from the civil society.

c) Boundaries of the property and buffer zone

The State Party reports that it is developing a heritage map of all historical and archaeological sites within Lamu Island with the help of a local Geographic Information System (GIS) expert. This map will show the historical core of the Stone Town and the buffer zones. The NMK has initiated consultations with the District Development Committee and other stakeholders on the proposed extensions to the buffer zone, requested by the Committee.

d) Finalization of the management plan

The State Party reports that it has received International Assistance of the amount of USD 8,900 for the completion of the management plan. No plan, however, has been received by the World Heritage Centre.

e) Uncontrolled development

The State Party reports that the Lamu World Heritage Site Office (LWHSCO) is developing a strategic proposal for the improvement of the informal settlements surrounding the World Heritage property. This strategy will be incorporated into the 2010–2030 Lamu District Development Plan. Further, the chairperson of the NMK has requested the Minister of Local Government to include Lamu into an ongoing World Bank project, for upgrading of informal settlements in medium-sized towns.

f) Other issues

The State Party also provides information on a number of ongoing conservation and restoration projects, cultural festivals, and other heritage development projects.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the information provided by the State Party regarding the new port proposal for Manda Bay, north of Lamu. In the light of information that has appeared in the Kenyan press which indicates that the proposed port can be considered as a mega-project, and that the State Party formally invited bids for the first phase of construction in September 2010, they recommend the World Heritage

Committee to express its great concern, that the State Party has not provided the necessary basic details about the project as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010).

As it is difficult to make an assessment based solely on press reports, given that their accuracy cannot be confirmed, it is essential that the State Party provide the necessary information such as the scope of the project, its exact location and scale, the kind of development foreseen, including associated infrastructure, and the foreseen population growth, in order for the World Heritage Committee to understand its potential adverse impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

From the details in the press, there is a concern that this proposed major development might impact substantially on the morphology of a long part of the coastline, on tidal flows and on the formation of sandbanks over a wide coastal area, as well as on the socio-economic development of Lamu and its surrounding landscape.

The State Party mentions that the consultants are collecting information on the cultural and natural heritage near the port site and along the proposed transportation corridor. Given the potential extensive scale and extent of the port development, there is a need for any impact assessments carried out to include a heritage impact assessment on Outstanding Universal Value from a wide range of perspectives. Although the property is located some distance away, it could still suffer adverse impacts due to the construction of such a large infrastructure project and the resulting increase of population that might accompany it. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to highlight the efforts of the National Museums of Kenya to play an active role in the EIA process. They also stress, however, the need for this EIA process to incorporate a Cultural Heritage Impact assessment specifically for the property.

In regard to the water catchment area at the Shella Sand Dunes, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge the progress made by the State Party in dealing with this very delicate environmental problem. The revocation of the 21 land titles is a very positive step, and it is hoped that the process of gazettelement will be completed in the near future.

Likewise, the progress on the precision of the boundaries and buffer zone, and the development of the management plan, are noted, and it is hoped that these activities will be completed as soon as possible.

Finally, in regard to the uncontrolled development and informal settlements surrounding the Lamu World Heritage property, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider this issue to be of great importance, especially given the potential influx of additional population. Clear planning and control mechanisms need to be set up as soon as possible to avoid an even more difficult situation developing in the future.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.39

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.46**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Notes the information provided by the State Party on the proposed Port of Lamu at Manda Bay and the Lamu-Addis-Juba-Kigali corridor development project;

4. *Expresses its concern that basic detailed information on the project, such as its scope, exact location and scale, the projected kinds of development foreseen, and the projected population growth has not been provided by the State Party as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010);*
5. *Also notes that the details currently available in the public domain suggest that the port project could be considered a mega-project which could impact on the morphology of the coastline, on tidal flows, and on the formation of sandbanks over a wide coastal area, as well as on the socio-economic development of Lamu and its surrounding landscape;*
6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party for detailed information on the proposed Port of Lamu at Manda Bay and the Lamu-Addis-Juba-Kigali corridor development project to be provided as soon as possible, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and before any commitment is given;*
7. *Requests the State Party to confirm that the National Museums of Kenya will be fully involved in impact assessments of the Port project and that a Heritage Impact Assessment will be carried out to assess its potential impact on Outstanding Universal Value in line with "ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage properties";*
8. *Further notes the ongoing work on the gazettelement of the Shella Sand Dunes water catchment area, the mapping exercise for the boundaries and buffer zones, the preparation of the management plan, and the progress on the issue of uncontrolled development at informal settlements;*
9. *Also requests that the State Party provide the requested maps showing the precisely the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, and to finalise the management plan as soon as possible and submit it to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;*
10. *Further requests the State Party to complete the work on the gazettelement of the Shella Sand Dunes water catchment area as soon as possible;*
11. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and in particular on the issues mentioned above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

40. Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1988

Criteria
(ii) (iv) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
1990-2005

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.49; 33 COM 7B.45; 34 COM 7B.48

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: 1989: USD 5,500 Preparatory Assistance; 1991-1995-1996-2004-2006: USD 150,000, Technical Cooperation

UNESCO extra budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 100,000 (Italian Funds-in-Trust)

Previous monitoring missions

2002, 2004, 2005, 2006: World Heritage Centre missions; 2008, 2009 and 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Inappropriate design and scale of new Ahmed Baba Cultural Centre in the vicinity of the Sankoré Mosque; lack of detailed drawings supplied to the Committee;
- b) Inappropriate approaches to the restoration of the Djingareyber Mosque;
- c) Urban development pressure;
- d) Flooding and rubbish disposal;
- e) Lack of building regulations and land use plan;
- f) Lack of adequate maintenance of the buildings.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/119>

Current conservation issues

On 2 February 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. The report gives a brief overview of the ongoing conservation and management operations.

a) Conservation of the three mosques

The report provides an update of the current state of conservation of the three mosques, Sankoré, Djingareyber and Sidi Yahia. The *Sankore mosque* continued to be subject of special attention by the local community, the Imams and the guild of traditional builders. It also received technical support from the Italian Government and the World Heritage Centre. The report also provides information about a future urban rehabilitation in the framework of which the restoration of the mosque is an important component. The project, which is executed by the Aga Khan Trust for Culture (AKTC) is part of a cooperation agreement between the Aga Khan Development Network (AKDN) and the Government of Mali.

The restoration of Djingareyber mosque has been finalized in July 2010 with the completion of paving in the vicinity of the mosque, and the provision of toilet facilities. Concerning the World Heritage Committee's request for further information on the "*possible project to demolish ruined houses northwest of the Djingareyber Mosque*", the State Party prefers to include these buildings into a proposed '*pilot project for repairing and renovating houses*', although no details are provided. Only the restoration of the degraded structures of the *Sidi Yahia Mosque* remains for which architectural surveys have been undertaken in the framework of the same AKDN/Mali agreement.

The report does not provide information on the state of conservation of the 16 mausoleums, which form part of the property and are in need of urgent restoration works.

b) Conservation challenges of the urban context

The State Party notes the challenges to conserving the property in an urban environment: climate change and desertification, demographic change and visual influences of modern technology. The report mentions the development of detailed building regulations and a conservation manual, which are almost finalized. Also noted are development projects

initiated by the Malian government and partners (including a bitumen road), the additional storey on the Institute of Ahmed Baba building, uncontrolled Medina building works and general preservation concerns. The State Party notes that the situation in Timbuktu is similar to global issues common to all World Heritage city sites. In this respect, the State Party optimistically hopes there will be an international colloquium for dialogue and engagement of technical partners, local population, elected representatives, potential financiers, etc. The State Party report mentions several organizations that have been, or still are, active in preservation issues, led by efforts of the AKTC, such as the elaboration of a Master Plan for Timbuktu and the urban rehabilitation of Sankoré neighbourhood. However, no further details are provided.

Furthermore, no details are provided on the development of a land use plan for the Old City and its buffer zone. Nor are details provided on any plan to address the need for waste removal or the proposed pilot project for renovating houses in the Old City.

c) Implementation of corrective measures requested by the World Heritage Committee:

The State Party has responded to only one of the corrective measures, namely the development of a Master Plan for the Old City of Timbuktu. It has not responded to the following: re-location of the amphitheatre away from the Sankoré Mosque, creation of an inter-ministerial coordinating committee for Timbuktu, a land-use plan for the property and buffer zones, a plan for the participation of the population in matters of heritage, extension of the boundaries of the World Heritage property to cover the whole of the Old City, and implementation of the short and medium term actions envisaged in the management plan.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to highlight that the State Party's report only provides information on some of the corrective measures agreed by the Committee at its 32nd session and only partially addresses the measures agreed by the Committee at its 34th session. Furthermore, the information provided does not adequately address the fundamental threats facing the property. Overall, very little progress has been made in site conservation and management, and in particular in addressing the continued disuse of the Ahmed Baba Cultural Centre and priority repair actions for *Sidi Yahia Mosque*.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the proposed project with the AKDN and the Government of Mali that will encompass a Master Plan for Timbuktu and a project for rehabilitation of the Sankore neighbourhood, but considers that details of the project need to be provided to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.40

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.48**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Expresses its utmost concern that very little progress has been achieved in implementing corrective measures;

4. Regrets that the Ahmed Baba Cultural Centre built near the Sankoré Mosque remains unused and is deteriorating and encourages the State Party to address this as a matter of urgency;
5. Reiterates its request for the following corrective measures to be urgently addressed:
 - a) Create an inter-ministerial committee for Timbuktu,
 - b) Re-locate the amphitheatre away from the Sankore Mosque,
 - c) Finalize and adopt urban building regulations and develop a land-use plan for the Old City and its buffer zone,
 - d) Submit to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies a plan for the participation of the population in matters of heritage,
 - e) Develop proposals for an extension of the property to encompass the Old City,
 - f) Implement the short and medium term actions envisaged in the management plan;
6. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **31 October 2011**, for review by the Advisory Bodies, details on the proposed urban rehabilitation project of the Sankore neighbourhood and on the proposed Master Plan to be implemented in cooperation with the Aga Khan Trust for Culture (AKTC), in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and before any detailed plan is agreed;
7. Also requests the State Party to implement the priority actions for the repair work needed on the Sidi Yahia Mosque and to address the need for waste removal in the property;
8. Also encourages the State Party to attract the necessary resources to conduct a pilot project for repairing and renovating a dozen or so houses in the Old City with a training component for craftsmen;
9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, 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 37th session in 2013.

41. Aapravasi Ghat (Mauritius) (C 1227)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2006

Criterion
(vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
30 COM 8B.33; 34 COM 7B.49

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development;
- b) Restoration works;
- c) Visitor pressure.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1227>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report. The report provides the following information:

a) Halting of demolition of historic buildings in the buffer zone

Subsequent to Decision **34 COM 7B.49**, the Municipal Council of Port Louis, responsible authority for development controlling in the buffer zone, was requested by the Ministry of Arts and Culture, on 22 October 2010, not to allow any further demolition pending the coming into force of the Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) for the property. The report states that since then there has not been any demolition noted. Furthermore, all existing notices for pulling down buildings such as the Grade I building, commonly known as the WAQF building, have been halted.

b) Legal protection of the buffer zone and adoption of the Policy Planning Guidance

On 21 January 2011, the Government approved the request to amend the Aapravasi Ghat Trust Fund Act so as to provide a legal status to the property's buffer zones. In view of complying with the request by the World Heritage Committee, the Government instituted a seven-member Ministerial Committee and Technical Committee to finalize the existing draft PPG. On 28 January 2011, the Government approved the Ministerial Committee's recommendations and their issuance by the Ministry of Housing and Lands in accordance with Section 13(I) of the Planning and Development Act 2004. The PPG's purpose is to control development in the buffer zones of Aapravasi Ghat in order to protect the property's Outstanding Universal Value and to control, together with other existing tools, legitimate aspirations, development and change in the buffer zones. The report also states that the Technical Committee will primarily have the responsibility to assess all Heritage and Visual Impact Assessments as defined in the PPG. While the report informs that the PPG addresses in particular the issue of height restriction of future constructions, it also recognizes that the onus will remain on proponents willing to construct beyond the prescribed heights to demonstrate and substantiate the absence of negative impact by way of a full Heritage Impact Assessment. The PPG document was approved on 28 January 2011.

c) Preparation of the Management Plan for Aapravasi Ghat

The State Party informs that a Heritage Management Plan and a Conservation Manual are in preparation and would be ready by July 2011. These tools should facilitate the use of the PPG, guide the harmonization of the different systems of land use proposed in the PPG, set the institutional framework for a heritage-friendly management in the area, and guide interventions for the conservation and restoration of the historical buildings in the buffer zone.

d) Preparation of a tourism strategy

The report refers to the Visitor Management Plan of 2008 which will be reviewed in the course of the setting up of an interpretation centre. The centre is tentatively scheduled to open in November 2011. According to the report, the review of the Visitor Management Plan should include promotional and educational activities reflecting the objectives of the interpretation centre. The plan will be reviewed in close collaboration with the Ministry of Tourism and Leisure, and the Municipality of Port Louis.

e) *Research on Indentured labour and inscription of Aapravasi Ghat archives on the UNESCO's Memory of the World Register*

According to the report, the Aapravasi Ghat Trust Fund has sought the support of the Government to organize an international conference on indenture in December 2011, to help better understand the global impact of the indentured labour system. Regarding inscription on UNESCO's Memory of the World Register, the State Party mentions that all necessary information is being compiled to be submitted by March 2012.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge the approval of the PPG, yet remain greatly concerned that its enforcement may not succeed as it depends on the preparation and adoption of a comprehensive and integrated Management Plan.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the completion and approval of the PPG, which will have the effect of controlling the demolition of historic buildings within the buffer zone, a matter of concern since inscription. Nevertheless, they are greatly concerned that the PPG alone will not be sufficient to protect all aspects of the setting of the property without a management plan, requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), and specific conservation tools such as the Conservation Manual proposed by the State Party. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies therefore encourage the State Party to finalise and enforce these tools as soon as possible in the light of strong development pressures. In addition, there is a concern about the need for a structured system of coordination among key institutional stakeholders, which should underpin the delivery of the management plan.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.41

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.49**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note of the State Party's official adoption of the Planning Policy Guidance, the main purpose of which is to control, together with other existing tools, the development, legitimate aspirations and change in the buffer zone of Aapravasi Ghat in order to protect the property's Outstanding Universal Value;*
4. *Acknowledges the progress made in undertaking research on indentured labour;*
5. *Regrets that the State Party has not completed the Management Plan for the property which impedes the full enforcement of the Planning Policy Guidance, and urges for a finalization of the plan before **September 2011**;*

6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to prepare as a matter of urgency a structured system of coordination among key institutional stakeholders for the implementation of the Management Plan and the Conservation Manual in order to allow full enforcement of the Planning Policy Guidance;*
7. *Encourages the State Party to continue halting any demolition or any inadequate development in the buffer zone until the Management Plan and the Conservation Manual are prepared;*
8. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property, to assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the Planning Policy Guidance in sustaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

42. Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

43. Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2000, extension 2007

Criteria
(ii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 7B.53; 33 COM 7B.47; 34 COM 7B.51

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 11,500 for Preparatory assistance in 1997

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
Total amount provided to the property: USD 139,000 (France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement)

Previous monitoring missions
2006 : World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission ; 2007: France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement mission ; 2009: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Lack of monitoring and control mechanism;
b) The lack of a conservation and management plan;

- c) New construction and architectural modification and urban projects affecting authenticity and integrity;
- d) Inappropriate housing restoration;
- e) Environmental disorder due to the modification of the mouth of the Senegal River;
- f) Extremely poor state of conservation of numerous derelict buildings endangering occupants;
- g) Lack of a site manager.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/956>

Current conservation issues

On 29 January 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Centre on the following issues:

a) Lack of the conservation and management arrangements

The State Party reports that the municipality of Saint-Louis intends to set up a technical office for the management of heritage. Further, while the Safeguarding Committee is still planned, it has not been established yet.

b) Limited resources for effective operation of the Safeguarding Committee and for the office of the site manager

The State Party reports that it is in the process of borrowing a loan of approximately 12 million Euro from the French Development Agency to implement a project for "Tourism Development in Saint-Louis and its Region", aiming at supporting a sustainable conservation of the public and private heritage in Saint-Louis. The project is currently under development and the report states that it should be finalized by mid-February 2011. The project will be managed by the Municipality of Saint-Louis.

c) Lack of building control and building permits mechanisms

The State Party reports that there are four levels of control for building permits. The municipal urban planning service checks the conformity of applications with construction regulations, the Direction of the Cultural Heritage checks the conformity with heritage regulations, the municipality issues the permit, and the local Heritage Office monitors the building works, providing advice or alerting, if needed.

d) Lack of coordination amongst initiatives being developed at the property

The State Party reports that the proposed Safeguarding Committee will take charge of the coordination. However, this committee has not yet been established.

e) Lack of the management plan, taking into account conservation decisions, tourism plans and the local communities who are the major actors and beneficiaries of the implemented actions

The State Party reports that the above-mentioned tourism development project will contain an element for the development of a management plan thus integrating concerns for conservation, tourism and community needs.

f) Potential construction of a port at the south mouth of the Senegal River

The State Party reports that at present there is no official project or plan for a new port and that it will inform the World Heritage Committee before moving forward with any project for a new port.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note that the State Party is moving forward with the loan from the French Development authorities for a tourism project that will focus on the conservation of the heritage of Saint-Louis and consider that such a project shows the commitment of the State Party to the sustainable development of the property based on the need to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note that no Site Manager has been appointed yet by the State Party for the management of the property, and that the Safeguarding Committee has not yet been established. It is only through these mechanisms that the State Party will be able to control both the day-to-day activities at the property, as well as eventual work to be carried out as part of the project for "Tourism Development in Saint-Louis and its Region". The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies also emphasize the need for the State Party to submit any detailed proposals that are part of this tourism project to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, prior to their approval.

There also note that the national and municipal levels of government urgently need to establish clear and complementary responsibilities for the protection of the property.

They wish to draw the Committee's attention on the degradation of state of conservation of much of the historic urban fabric and the replacement of traditional buildings with new, non-conforming constructions.

Draft Decision: **35 COM 7B.41**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.51**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Welcomes the effort made by the State Party in securing resources for the conservation of the property through negotiating a 12 million Euro loan with the French Development Agency;
4. Expresses its strong concern about the ongoing degradation and collapse of historic urban fabric and the construction of non-conforming buildings, affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
5. Reiterates its request to the State Party to consolidate the conservation and management arrangements for the property, and in particular:
 - a) to enact a decree to establish the Safeguarding Committee so that it can start operations at the earliest possible opportunity,
 - b) to appoint the site manager for the property so that he/she can begin work at the earliest possible opportunity,
 - c) to ensure sufficient human, financial and technical resources for all of the necessary conservation and management activities at the property,
 - d) to implement building control and building permit mechanisms in coordination with the Municipality of Saint-Louis,

- e) to ensure adequate coordination amongst initiatives being developed at the property between different institutional stakeholders at the national, regional and local level;
6. Requests the State Party to ensure that the site manager and the Safeguarding Committee are a part of the decision-making structure of the project for "Tourism Development in Saint-Louis and its Region";
 7. Urges the State Party to immediately begin the preparation of the management plan in coordination with the municipality;
 8. Encourages the State Party to clarify through a Memorandum of Understanding or other means, the specific roles, responsibilities, duties, and capacities of governmental institutions at the national and municipal levels;
 9. Invites the State Party and the municipality to provide the World Heritage Centre with detailed information regarding any major projects foreseen on the Island of Saint-Louis and its buffer zone for review by the Advisory Bodies, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
 10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

44. Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2003

Criteria
(ii) (iii) (iv) (v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
34 COM 7B.52

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
2010: Joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a proper buffer zone (land tenureship issues)
- b) Lack of a management plan
- c) Mining activities
- d) Development pressure

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report. Between 15 and 19 November 2010 a joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), to consider the status of mining permissions in an area immediately to the east of the property. The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM/>.

a) *Status of mining licences and work of Vele colliery*

The State Party report stated that the permit granted by the Department of Mineral Resources allows Limpopo Coal to mine in an area immediately to the east of the property. This permit gives them sole and exclusive right to mine, recover and dispose of minerals in, on and under the mining area for a period of 30 years, unless the permit is cancelled.

Limpopo Coal plans to work two opencast pits and two underground mining areas. The overall total of the mining area is 3963,88 ha. Authorisation for two ancillary projects, a 9km tarred road and storage facilities, has been refused, and the Limpopo Coal Company (Pty) Ltd has appealed. The company has suspended their activities on site until the appeal is settled. During this process, the Limpopo Coal Company will be responsible for updating the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and subjecting it to public comment.

The State Party reports that mining licences are issued by Department of Mineral resources while World Heritage sites are administered by the Department of Environmental Affairs. However, infrastructure associated with mining is regulated in terms of the Environmental Impact Assessments Regulations of 2006. Furthermore, the National Environmental Management Protected Areas Act empowers the Minister of Water and Environmental Affairs, after consultation with the Minister of Mineral Resources, to review existing mining activities and prescribe conditions under which those activities may continue.

The mission report notes that the Minister and officials of Department of Mineral resources are required by Act 28 of 2002 to consult other relevant State departments on issues relating to the latter. This includes the Ministry of the Environment responsible for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention Act and the Ministry of Arts and Culture responsible for implementing the National Heritage resources Act (NAHRA). The mission noted that in the current case, such consultation had not been carried out.

The mission further notes that the EIA hardly focused on the cultural attributes of the inscribed property and not at all on its Outstanding Universal Value. Its emphasis was on the natural environment, except for the "local community" and "land claimants". Furthermore, the EIA had only focused on land to be used during the first phase of mining and not the second and third phases.

The mission was made aware that the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists had lodged an appeal in March 2010 opposing the granting of the mining permit as it did not address the full impact of mining on the cultural and natural environment. There is still no outcome concerning the appeal.

Taking on board the concerns by stakeholders, the mission reported that the mining company had been instructed by the State Party to cease all operations. A 'process of rectification as provided for by the National Environmental Management Act, Act 107 of 1998' (as amended) is underway. This entails the mining company revising the Environmental

Management Plan as well as proposing alternative mining methods to be considered by the Department of Environmental Affairs.

The mission reported that the State Party is committed to undertaking a peer review of existing specialist studies in order to obtain an independent view prior to any decision to allow mining operations to recommence. The peer review outcome will be included in the evaluation process of the rectification application.

The mission did also highlight the fact that the coal seam extends to the west of the mining area towards the property and that it had been reported to them that Universal Coal and Anglo-Coal had applied for mining rights within and around the buffer zone of the property.

The State Party reported that the nomination dossier and the 2003 ICOMOS evaluation report noted that the property is supported by a buffer zone of around 100,000 ha – although it was not mapped. The following have been identified as making up this buffer zone: Venetia-Limpopo Nature Reserve, Vhembe Nature Reserve, and Limpopo Valley Game Reserve. The buffer zone has been ‘proclaimed’ but not submitted to the World Heritage Committee for approval. The mission report noted the current delimitation does not surround the entire property as envisaged at the time of inscription. There is no buffer zone on the east in the “free zone” between the property and the current mining area or for the mining area. It was explained to the mission that negotiations will continue in order to enter into agreement with landowners to extend the buffer zone, which is required under South African legislation. The mission recommended that the delimitation of the buffer zone should be reviewed as a matter of urgency in order to ensure that it surrounds the property completely.

b) *Status of the Trans-Frontier Conservation Area (TFCA)*

The State Party reports that a memorandum of understanding has been signed with Botswana and Zimbabwe for the development of the TFCA and that the intention is to try and extend it to cover the areas between the mining site and the property.

The mission report noted that the TFCA, as now envisaged, does not include the area to the east of the property, including the mining area, and therefore does not protect in an effective way the property’s Outstanding Universal Value, as envisaged at the time of inscription.

c) *Status of land claims*

The State Party reports that land claims for restitution of land are bound by a standing parliament decision and that land claims affecting conservation land should not result in a change of land use. The mission emphasised the need for the land claim process to be transparent and inclusive and underscored the need to build trust among all stakeholders, including the international community.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain extremely concerned at the potential impact of opencast and underground mining operations on the Mapungubwe cultural landscape property. Although the mining site is some 7 km from the boundary, the property appears to be downwind from the proposed mining site and in an area of high archaeological significance that is related to the property. Furthermore, in terms of what was presented to the Committee at the time of inscription, the mining area is within the buffer zone of the property and in the middle of the proposed TFCA. Thus, if an appropriate EIA, which takes into account the impact on cultural heritage and the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, had been carried out, a mining permit should not have been granted. They

also note that other mining companies are apparently seeking permission to mine in other parts of the buffer zone.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party acknowledges that the mining licence appears to have been issued without appropriate consultation with relevant ministries and that work has been suspended while a 'process of rectification' is undertaken that will entail the mining company carrying out a further impact assessment which must include impact on the cultural attributes of the property and its setting.

They further note that the buffer zone envisaged at the time of inscription to protect the boundary within South Africa, has not been fully promulgated nor submitted to the World Heritage Committee, while the boundaries of the TFCA that at the time of inscription were shown as surrounding the property and seen as a further protective layer, have now been amended to exclude an area to the east of the property including the mining area. It is essential that the immediate setting of the property is protected by a buffer zone approved by the Committee and that the TFCA offers further protection.

They welcome the measures taken to halt the mining and undertake further assessment, but remain concerned at the position of the current EIA that states that no negative impacts on cultural heritage assets are envisaged. It is crucial that a revised EIA is undertaken on the basis of proper data on the value of the landscape area where the mining is proposed, on the landscape between the mining areas and the property and on the Outstanding Universal Value and attributes of the property itself and that the EIA acknowledges that the mining area is within what was envisaged as a buffer zone and is within what at the time of inscription was part of the proposed TFCA.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies stress the need for a reform of the legal framework on mining in order to ensure that applications for mineral prospecting and mining respect the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property and its setting.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.44

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.52**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Reiterates its deep concern at the potential adverse impact of the approved mining site on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and at the fact that other mining companies have applied for mining rights nearby;*
4. *Recalls the World Heritage Committee's position on mining and World Heritage and the policy statement of the International Council of Mining and Metals (ICMM);*
5. *Notes that the State Party has halted mining operations at the mining site 7 km from the property boundary while further impact assessments are carried out;*
6. *Also notes that the State Party has acknowledged that the processes whereby the mining licence was issued were flawed as they failed to involve consultation with all the appropriate ministries and in particular the Ministry of the Environment;*
7. *Expresses its concern that the buffer zone envisaged at the time of inscription to protect the boundary within South Africa has only been partly promulgated and has not*

been submitted for approval by the World Heritage Committee, and that the boundaries of the proposed Trans-Frontier Conservation Area, envisaged to offer further protection of the property, has now been amended to exclude the mining sites and the area between them and the property, thus leaving the area to the east of the property and the mining site unprotected;

8. Requests that the Environmental Impact Assessment process, which should thoroughly assess the potential impact of the mine on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, be completed in accordance with the highest international standards and also requests that the Terms of Reference for this additional work follow ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage properties be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for evaluation by ICOMOS;
9. Calls upon the State Party to continue halting the mining operations until the World Heritage Committee has had the opportunity to consider the new impact assessment and urges it to refrain from issuing other mining licences in the immediate setting of the property;
10. Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, in order to assess the progress made in implementing the 2010 mission's recommendations, in particular the additional Environmental Impact Assessment and issues related to clarifying the boundaries of the property's buffer zone
11. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, including the Environmental Impact Assessment, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012, **with a view to considering, in case of resumption of mining activities, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

45. Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (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

31 COM 7B.49; 32 COM 7B.54; 34 COM 7B.54

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 24.000 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 mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Development pressures;
- b) Environmental pressures in relation with the Malindi port project;
- c) Natural disasters and lack of risk-preparedness;
- d) Visitors/ tourist pressures;
- e) Lack of resources;
- f) Lack of legal framework;

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/173>

Current conservation issues

A report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party on 1 February 2011. From 23 to 31 January 2011, an ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>.

a) Malindi Port

The State Party reports that works have now been completed and the Port is fully operational. Problems have arisen due to the lack of completion of the passenger terminal, which causes congestion, and the landing of craft at the Shangani Beach. It notes that this will be addressed by using another area within the Port for landing. The Zanzibar Port Corporation has agreed to carry out the environmental auditing, using the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the Sea Wall extension as baseline documentation, but the State Party notes that funding might be requested from the World Heritage Centre to implement it. It is not clear how the results from the environmental audit will be used to put in place a 3-5 year monitoring project for the port area as requested by the World Heritage Committee. No timeframe has been provided for the implementation of this request.

The mission states that the monitoring of the project will be carried out by the Zanzibar Port Corporation and the first report is expected by March 2011, based on which the number and timescale of other reports will be defined. It notes that some environmental changes, like the increase in wave height, have been observed but these have yet to be monitored.

b) Sea Front Project Phase II

An Environmental and Social Impact Assessment on the planned Sea Front Project was submitted to the World Heritage Centre in July 2010 for review. The project, planned to begin in early 2011, will refurbish infrastructure for services (water and storm sewers, electricity and telecommunications) below Mizingani Road, resurface the road itself, and create a pedestrian area. The project is likely to receive financial support from the World Bank and the Aga Khan Development Network.

The mission evaluated the proposal and noted that there is a need to harmonise future refurbishment projects at open spaces to ensure that visual harmony is maintained in consideration to the historic attributes of the property.

c) Management system and legislative arrangements

The State Party reports a new Act for the Stone Town Conservation and Development Authority (STCDA) was passed in July 2010 and this is expected to significantly improve the conditions of the property by providing additional funding, capacity for enforcement of

regulations and application of sanctions and the creation of a stakeholder's forum to broaden consultation in regard to interventions at the property.

The mission noted that due to the recent approval of the new arrangements, it is difficult to ascertain at this point how efficiently they operate. It underscored that cooperation between key institutions exists but communication can be improved. Human and financial resources remain limited for ensuring effective and sustainable implementation of the Heritage Management Plan.

d) *Current conservation conditions*

The State Party reports that work has continued on the implementation of the Heritage Management Plan; a series of goals have been identified for the preservation of built heritage and the historical environment and also to address tourism development pressures; a traffic management plan has been developed and is currently under review prior to implementation. No precise information is provided on the actual implementation of actions prescribed in the Heritage Management Plan.

The mission noted a series of factors that currently affect the property and which need to be adequately monitored. The monitoring process is expected to improve by implementing a Geographic Information System (GIS). Factors include pressures to meet the demands of tourism development, poverty and living conditions of the Stone Town inhabitants, over-occupation of buildings due to limited housing opportunities, changes in land uses, traffic congestion and management of waste. The mission also noted that decay of the historic fabric continues given the limited interventions carried out to date. Illegal constructions have also continued to affect the overall setting of the property. Further, the control and regulations in the buffer zone have yet to be fully addressed. The mission also noted that there are several planned projects for the property including the reorganisation of the northern part of the port and development for commercial activities, as well as interventions in the House of Wonders and at the Tippu Tip House. Because these projects entail major interventions, they need to be submitted for review prior to their approval and implementation, as per paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

As for new constructions, the mission expressed concern regarding a proposal by the Kempinski Group to build a hotel using in part the Mambo Msiige historic building and the adjacent designated public space. As per letters dated 19 January 2011, and 8 March 2011, the World Heritage Centre alerted the State Party to the potential risk of Danger Listing as the proposed development could fall under conditions set out in Paragraphs 178 and 179 of the *Operational Guidelines* and requested the Government's position in this regard. At the time of writing this report, no response has been received.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made by the State Party in improving the management system for the property and welcome the participatory nature of these efforts. However, they note the lack of significant progress made in addressing long-standing issues such as the general state of conservation of the built fabric.

They recommend the World Heritage Committee to express its extreme concern at proposals to build a large hotel complex on a designated public space and adjoining the Mambo Msiige building, one of the most emblematic buildings of the property. This proposal could pose a serious threat to the authenticity and integrity of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note that the State Party has not provided any information on this project in spite of the requests made by the World Heritage Centre.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.45

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.54**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Acknowledges the efforts made by the State Party in implementing the requests made by the World Heritage Committee and urges it to secure resources for the operation of the Stone Town Conservation and Development Authority and the sustained implementation of the Heritage Management Plan;
4. Notes the results of the January 2011 ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and endorses its recommendations;
5. Also urges the State Party to:
 - a) Carry out/update a comprehensive condition assessment of the property and identify priority measures for intervention, including required resources for implementation,
 - b) Establish an effective monitoring system to control and enforce sanctions on illegal construction and evaluate the adequacy of proposals for new construction and development, both at the inscribed property and within its buffer zone,
 - c) Further develop the tourism development plan to effectively contribute to poverty alleviation and improvement of socio-economic conditions of the local population;
6. Further urges the State Party to reverse its commitment to allow the construction of a hotel in a designated public space and next to the Mambo Msiige building as this will have a serious impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
7. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies technical specifications on planned projects relating to the reorganisation of the northern part of the port, interventions in the House of Wonders and at the Tippu Tip House, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, for consideration and review before any commitment is made to implementation;
8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, 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 36th session in 2012, **with a view to considering, if the hotel project at Mambo Msiige is not halted, the possible inscription of the property on the World Heritage List in Danger.**

ARAB STATES

46. Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

47. Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

48. Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

49. Petra (Jordan) (C 326)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late mission report)

50. Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2004

Criteria
(i) (iv) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.57 ; 32 COM 7B.59 ; 33 COM 7B.56

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 18,750 for Technical cooperation (only 10,863 USD implemented)

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 6,000 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust

Previous monitoring missions

March-April 2005: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; November 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; March 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; July 2008: World Heritage Centre expert mission for the Stylite tower.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Unstable structures and lack of security;
- b) Lack of comprehensive conservation plan;
- c) Lack of management structure and plan;
- d) Important tourism development project with new constructions.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1093>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report as well as a detailed report on the restoration of the Stylite Tower, in response to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). The report provides information on the following issues:

a) Road system

Despite the objections pointed out by the reactive monitoring mission of March 2008, the State Party reiterates the need for the road that has been built between the Stylite tower and St Stephan Complex for maintenance and monitoring activities. In order to mitigate its impact, the Department of Antiquities decided to hide the existing asphalt by covering it with local soil.

b) Technical documents on works

The State Party provides detailed documentation of the initiatives described in its state of conservation reports of 2008 and 2009, and gives information on the conservation initiatives carried out in 2010. The report contains photographs and lists of works undertaken to address hazards and threats inside the property, including consolidation and restoration work. Deep holes were refilled, cisterns along the visitor trail were rehabilitated and several walls restored. Consolidation and restoration works were carried out at the Villa, maintenance, monitoring and rehabilitation works are ongoing at the Churches Complex. Mosaic floors are being documented and restored by experts from the Institute for Mosaic Art and Restoration of Madaba, and shall be covered with soil for protection until appropriate shelters are built.

c) Stylite tower

International Assistance was granted to the State Party in 2009 for investigations and emergency measures for the restoration of the Stylite tower, which was to be used by the Department of Antiquities to undertake some emergency measures, such as installing a stable scaffolding, shoring of the tower and dismantling instable stone structures; conduct a thorough investigation, in particular the structural instability and other forms of deterioration; and prepare a conservation and restoration plan. The State Party utilised only part of the funds. Its report includes a photographic record, structural drawings with explanatory photographs, an analysis of the deformation along the facades and information on the monitoring system and on the geological setting. It also includes a study of material with laboratory testing, implementation of some emergency measures (new scaffolding, shoring, removal of the fallen vault stones), and recommendations for the conservation of the tower.

d) *Management plan and structure*

The report indicates that a team is working on the development of the management plan and that it should be finalized by the end of 2011. Nevertheless, activities are already carried out within its framework, such as conservation and presentation activities.

- *Administrative structure:* The Um er-Rasas Office employs three specialists and six guards and is responsible for conservation, preparation of the management plan, monitoring, cleaning and preparing lectures and workshops for local communities. The Tourism Office's three employees provide information to visitors.
- *Boundaries:* The State Party reports working on the appropriation issues between the main archaeological areas and should submit to the World Heritage Centre a final delineation of the property by April 2011. The fence around the property itself has been completed.
- *Awareness-raising activities:* The Um er-Rasas Women's society runs cultural activities, produces handicrafts and sells them at the Visitor Centre to benefit the local community. On the other hand, the Um er-Rasas Society for Conservation raises awareness on the values of the site. In addition a Post Office, a Health Centre and a Tourism Police Office have been established within the property. The close-by Municipality regulates building construction in the buffer zone.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the information provided by the State Party but note that no progress has been made on the elaboration of a comprehensive management plan, which should include a conservation plan, an archaeological research policy and provisions for public use. The current focus on visitors' facilities, although understandable, should be secondary to the overall conservation of the property, to which most resources should be devoted. Although progress has been made for the conservation of the Stylite tower, they nevertheless wish to underline the lack of a holistic conservation and restoration project which would ensure the long term protection of this important attribute of the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.50

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.56**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Requests the State Party to finalize a scientifically and technically sound conservation and restoration project for the Stylite tower and to submit it as soon as possible to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, prior to implementation;*
4. *Urges the State Party to complete the management plan for the property, including a comprehensive conservation plan as well as an archaeological research policy and a public use plan;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a progress report on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

51. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

52. Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab) (Lebanon) (C 850)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

53. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

54. Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 287)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

55. Ksar Ait-Ben-Haddou (Morocco) (C 444)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1987

Criteria
(iv) (v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
30 COM 7B.45 ; 31 COM 7B.65 ; 33 COM 7B.60

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 49,833 for technical cooperation

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

September 2003: reactive monitoring mission; November 2003: World Heritage Centre mission; April 2006: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; February 2007: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Partial abandonment of the property;
- b) Gully erosion;
- c) Rock falls due to erosion;
- d) Increased offences in old *Ksar* and degradation;
- e) Delays in the establishment of a technical and administrative structure responsible for the property;
- f) Uncontrolled tourism and visitor pressure.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/444>

Current conservation issues

On 15 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. This report outlines the progress made on setting up a management structure and financing mechanism for the property as well as an update on a number of the conservation and infrastructure projects.

a) *Management structure*

The State Party reports that the Ministry of Culture has created a entity for the mangement of the property, and states that necessary funds for this organization will be provided, although no source of fuding has been identified. A site for the offices of this new entitiy has been provided by the province of Ouarzazate. According to the report, a “conservator” (site manager) should have been appointed in February of 2011, but it is unknown if this has happened yet.

The State Party further reported that a local mangement committee meets on a twice-yearly basis. The most recent meeting was in July 2010 during which the Centre for the conservation and rehabilitation of the architectural heritage of Atlas and Sub-Atlas zones (CERKAS) presented an update on the conservation works being carried out at the property.

b) *Incorporation of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value into the Management Plan*

The State Party reports that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which was approved by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), has been integrated into the Management Plan and that it has been sent to the local management committee for consideration in their decisionmaking process. No further indication is provided as to how this is to be accomplished.

c) *Other issues*

The State Party reports on a number of ongoing conservation and management issues including the construction of a multiservice facility for the Department of Housing and Urbanism in the new village, infrastructure works including provision of water for the property, the maintenance and monitoring of the walls, consolidation and conservation of some buildings, the training of two local youth, and the development of signage for the property for

which drawings were provided along with the report. The World Heritage Centre received pictures of the bridge being built as foreseen in 2009. At this stage of the works, it is not yet possible to assess its impact on the visual integrity of the property.

Conclusions

The Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre view in a very positive manner the ongoing work on the management and conservation of Ksar of Ait-Ben-Haddou. However, they underline the absence of any confirmation that a site manager has been appointed at the time of drafting this report. In addition, it is not clear where the new management entity fits into the overall management system in relation to the local management committee, CERKAS, and the Ministry of Culture. Further, although the State Party has committed some funding of its own for the ongoing works, and additional funds have come from extra-budgetary sources, it is not yet clear how funding will be secured for the new management entity to sustainably operate.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to clarify the status of the new management authority, including its relationship to existing management bodies and sources of funding, and to appoint a site manager with clear management responsibilities and reporting lines.

Draft Decision: **35 COM 7B.55**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.60**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Recognizes the efforts made by the State Party to set up a management entity;*
4. *Notes the progress on a number of specific projects aimed at the better conservation and presentation of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide additional information on the new management entity including its roles and responsibilities, its relationship to the local management committee, between the Centre for the conservation and rehabilitation of the architectural heritage of Atlas and Sub-Atlas zones (CERKAS) and the Ministry of Culture, and on the appointment of a new site manager, as well as to provide a detailed progress update on the construction of the bridge;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, **by 1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, including information on the new management entity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

56. Historic City of Meknes (Morocco) (C 793)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee decisions

34 COM 7B.61

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

April 2010: World Heritage Centre emergency mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/793>

Current conservation issues

On 10 February 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property and activities carried out in recent months. The report indicates that the Plan for the Development and Safeguarding of the Historic City, including a development regulation, is nearing completion. In addition, an architectural charter for the historic centre of Meknes has been produced by the Ministry for Housing, Urban Affairs and Territorial Development, represented by the Urban Agency of Meknes. Other studies and projects are underway such as the landscape plan and a landscape charter for the valley of Wadi Boufekrane, a study of urban renewal and redevelopment of the historic centre of Meknes, a study of urban renovation and restoration of Fondouk El-Jdid, and the creation of thematic visitor itineraries.

In particular, a study was launched to prepare the urban rehabilitation of the medina of Meknes, with support from the European Investment Bank in the framework of the project "Medinas 2030", a pilot project with the objective to develop a "replicable" methodological framework to ensure the preservation of key elements of cultural heritage, promote local economic development and meet the basic needs of the resident population.

a) *Conservation*

The report of the State Party highlights the problems caused by poor maintenance and the lack of monitoring and maintenance teams. The Safeguarding Plan that is being prepared should remedy this situation. In addition, the State Party refers to the project for the establishment of a local Heritage Preservation Agency, with administrative and financial autonomy.

The report also contains fact sheets on 37 restoration projects completed, ongoing or planned, including photographs. They contain little technical detail on methods used, but the pictures show that they are rather complete renovations or identical reconstructions.

b) *Berdieyinne Mosque*

The State Party also submitted documents relating to the project for the restoration / reconstruction of the Berdieyinne Mosque whose minaret collapsed in February 2010. This project was transmitted to ICOMOS for assessment. ICOMOS notably regrets that the project includes a list of actions to be taken on individual components without policy guidance and overall philosophy of the project. It is particularly concerned by the indication of the use of contemporary techniques and materials, and wishes that the document present an analysis of options for earthquake mitigation proposing minimal measures to be taken.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee congratulate the State Party on the extent of the safeguarding and rehabilitation programme undertaken in the Historic City of Meknes and its Walls. Nevertheless they wish to be assured that the work has been conducted using traditional methods and materials.

Regarding the Berdieyinne Mosque, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies notice that the recommendations of the April 2010 mission have not been taken into account in the restoration project in order to ensure the authenticity of the monument. While understanding the need to ensure stability and resistance of the monument to earthquakes, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies do not consider that this need justifies a concrete reconstruction with brick siding, which would result in retaining only the shape of the monument and not its authentic structure. In addition, they wish to emphasize the importance of minimal interventions in conservation approaches, involving the fewest possible changes, to be considered only when the functional needs so dictate.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the restricted timetable of this project has resulted, in a certain manner, in an invasive approach. They consider it a priority to review the project and adopt a conservation approach that respects the original materials and authenticity of the monument. The project should involve appropriate conservation experts both in the definition of this approach and in the implementation phase. Finally, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish that the revised project be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies before beginning work.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.56

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.61**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party and appreciates the magnitude of the actions implemented to safeguard the heritage of the Historic City of Meknes;*
4. *Requests the State Party to take into account the recommendations of the expert who visited the Berdieyinne Mosque in April 2010 and those of ICOMOS in its 2011 evaluation, in view of the implementation of the restoration project of the mosque;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible the overall philosophy and general guidelines of the project missing from the*

submitted document for consideration by the Advisory Bodies, and a revised project respecting the original materials and preserving the authenticity of the structure, for review by the Advisory Bodies before the commencement of work;

6. *Further requests the State Party to continue to regularly inform the World Heritage Centre of the work undertaken and the progress made in the completion of a conservation plan and in the establishment of the local Safeguarding Agency.*

57. Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) (C 1073)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

58. Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.63 ; 33 COM 7B.63 ; 34 COM 7B.64

International Assistance

Total amount allocated to the property: USD 149,690 for Technical cooperation.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

Total amount allocated to the property: USD 10,000 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust.

Previous monitoring missions

March and December 2007: World Heritage Centre missions for the King Faisal Street project; April 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Poor state of conservation;
- b) Inappropriate restoration techniques;
- c) Lack of a buffer zone;
- d) Lack of a management plan.
- e) Development projects threatening the significant historic fabric.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/20>

Current conservation issues

On 19 January 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the Ancient City of Damascus was submitted by the State Party, providing information on the following issues:

a) Buffer zone

The World Heritage Committee, at its 34th session had expressed satisfaction with progress in establishing a buffer zone. The report of the State Party indicates that a new standard was developed for the buffer zone proposed in Ministerial decision N° 27 of 26 June 2010, and approved by several institutions. The State Party submitted a proposal for the creation of a buffer zone which will be examined by the World Heritage Committee at this session.

b) Rehabilitation projects

Some detail is given on the four rehabilitation projects for which further information was sought by the World Heritage Committee. Along the southern path between the Citadel and the Souq Hammidyia, shops are being restored, soil removed, plaster surfaces rehabilitated, stonework repointed. In the old Gold Souq the excavations are being secured. The rehabilitation of the Naqacchat and Alyahoud quarters and Saida Roukayya is directed mainly towards the upgrading to modern stands of services such as sewerage, electricity, lighting, and telephone. In all projects flagstone paving is being installed, which may well be a matter of concern. Had a conservation and management Plan for the city been in place, issues such as street paving would no doubt have been addressed.

The report indicates that King Faisal Street project has been 'stopped', though it remains unclear whether permanently abandoned or not. The Medhat Pasha cultural centre project is reported to be proceeding upon a much improved basis, avoiding the mistakes of the first phase. However, no plans or designs were provided to the World Heritage Centre.

c) Conservation and Management Plan

At its 34th session, the World Heritage Committee had reiterated its request that the State Party develop a Management Plan for the property. The issue of a Conservation and Management Plan is addressed only indirectly in the report. It is noted that the Old City of Damascus is supervised by 'the Committee for the Safeguarding of the Old City' chaired by the Mayor of Damascus, which defines strategies and is responsible for the issue of permits. A Conservation and Management Plan should be prepared on a professional basis, reviewed by experts and the public, and then adopted officially. The issue of permits should be guided by the Plan, but should be a completely distinct process. Any compromise made to the requirements of the Plan, for commercial or other reasons, should be transparent. This might not be achieved under the administration as presently structured.

Despite these concerns, there is much to be commended in the plans for taking soundings and prioritising urgent excavations; the proposal to ban cement and concrete in restoration works and to require the use of traditional materials; the proposal to publish a code for traditional lime plaster; and the plan to improve the controlling of illegal works.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that there has been a serious attempt to meet some of the major concerns expressed in Decision **34 COM 7B.64**, though most of the responses are proposals yet to be finalised and put into effect. The modifications made to current development projects are positive, though sufficient details are not supplied

to assess these. The major remaining concern is the lack of an appropriate Conservation and Management Plan.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.58

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.64**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note of the proposals by the State Party, including the establishment of a buffer zone, the modification or abandonment of deleterious developments, the improvement of conservation standards, the use of traditional materials, and the improved controlling of illegal developments;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, with detailed information on the four rehabilitation projects, and on the redesign of King Faisal Street area and Medhat Pasha Cultural Centre before further work is undertaken;*
5. *Also reiterates the urgent need for the preparation and adoption of a Conservation and Management Plan to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a state of conservation report and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

59. Archaeological Site of Carthage (Tunisia) (C 37)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

N/A

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 163,551 for preparatory assistance and technical cooperation; USD 40,000 for training

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: International Safeguarding Campaign, 1973-1989

Previous monitoring missions

N/A. However, 5 expert missions between 1997 and 2002 for the Protection and Enhancement Plan

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/37>

Current conservation issues

Since some time, information has reached the World Heritage Centre about successive declassifications of parts of Carthage Archaeological Park. As requests for clarification were not conclusive, the State Party was requested to provide a report to be presented to the World Heritage Committee. This report was submitted on 29 January 2011. It recalls the importance of the site of Carthage to the State Party and the increase in resources used for conservation, including increased funding for its maintenance and restoration and strengthening of the management structure of the property.

The report indicates that the State Party has adopted a policy for land-use control in the archaeological area, including land acquisition, but also the downgrading of certain parcels – deemed without impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property - in peripheral areas or those with high-density urbanization.

The State Party has launched a major restoration and enhancement programme, particularly in the quarter of the Maalga cisterns, the Punic ports, the park of the Antonine Baths, Bysra Hill, the Tophet, and the Roman villas. A protocol for servicing and maintenance covering the entire site has also been established with sufficient manpower and equipment.

The report also states that the management plan initiated for many years is progressing despite delays due to a volume of new data which has emerged in recent years, and to archaeological investigations necessary for the establishment of a reliable delineation of the perimeter of the property. Nevertheless, the report gives no indication of progress or timetable for its completion.

a) Retrospective Inventory

Since 2006, as part of the Retrospective Inventory, letters are sent annually to the Tunisian authorities, requesting a clarification of the boundaries of the World Heritage property at the time of its inscription. Moreover, the link between the perimeter of the World Heritage property and that of the "Archaeological Park of Carthage-Sidi Bou Said" established in 1985 also needs to be clarified. Establishing a buffer zone to preserve the integrity of the property seems necessary, considering the many developments in the city of Carthage.

b) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

In the framework of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Arab States in which Tunisia actively participated, the retrospective statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the Archaeological Site of Carthage was drafted and adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010, Decision 34 COM 8 E). The conclusions of Section 2 of the Periodic Reporting Questionnaire indicate that the integrity and authenticity of the property have been affected by a number of negative factors, but that measures have been taken and the state of conservation of the property has not suffered any significant impact.

c) New information

On 15 March 2011, the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that a decree-law was enacted on 10 March 2011 by the Provisional Government of Tunisia, "cancelling all abusive declassifications which have occurred in regard to the original classification scheme". On 30 March 2011, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre a map indicating the boundaries of the Archaeological Park as requested within the framework of the Retrospective Inventory. However, some information is still required in order to transmit this map to the Advisory Bodies for evaluation.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies appreciate the efforts of the State Party for the preservation of the property and congratulate it on having cancelled the declassification decrees of recent years. They nevertheless wish to underscore the impact that these declassifications may have had and by the unregulated urban development that potentially affected the integrity of the property, as well as by the lack of progress in completing the Plan for the protection and enhancement of the property (management plan). They recommend in particular the urgent establishment of a buffer zone to preserve the integrity.

Draft Decision: **35 COM 7B.59**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Takes note of the report submitted by the State Party and the information provided on the state of conservation of the property;*
3. *Welcomes the cancellation of the decrees of declassification within the Archaeological Park of Carthage-Sidi Bou Said;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to submit a minor boundary modification in order to define a sufficient buffer zone to preserve the integrity of the property, and to indicate the legal framework of protection;*
5. *Urges the State Party to complete, adopt and implement the Plan for the Protection and Enhancement of the property initiated since 1996;*
6. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property and the progress regarding the Plan for its protection and enhancement;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above recommendations for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

60. Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) (C 385)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

ASIA-PACIFIC

61. The Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) (C 322)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

62. Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia) (C 1224rev)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Application of the Reinforced monitoring mechanism)

63. Old Town of Lijiang (China) (C 811)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1997

Criteria
(ii) (iv) (v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.69; 32 COM 7B.67; 32 COM 8B.53; 33 COM 7B.66

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 20.000 Conservation and management assistance, October 2001

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
January 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; November 2008: UNESCO advisory mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Progressive loss of integrity and authenticity due to major tourism and commercial developments in and around the property
- b) No clearly defined boundary or buffer zones
- c) Lack of a comprehensive Conservation Master Plan for the property and its surroundings

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/811>

Current conservation issues

On 21 January 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Centre. This report includes the proposal for boundary modification of the property as requested in Decision **32 COM 8B.53**. In response to Decision **33 COM 7B.66** adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), the State Party provided information on three main actions taken:

a) *Completion of the comprehensive Conservation Master Plan (CMP)*

The report traces the history of efforts to develop a Conservation Master Plan for the property back to 2002, including suspension of these efforts from 2003 to 2007 in order to permit development of an urban master plan for Lijiang. Upon reactivation of this process, a UNESCO advisory mission visited the Old Town of Lijiang in November 2008 and confirmed the findings of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission of January 2008 that the property is currently witnessing progressive loss of integrity and authenticity due to new tourism and other commercial developments in and around the inscribed cluster sites of Dayan town, Shuhe housing cluster, and Baisha housing cluster. The advisory mission was impressed with the preparation of the Conservation Master Plan but noted that work was not yet complete and that new threats to the property's integrity seemed to be emerging such as to the east between the existing built-up area of Dayan and the proposed railway station. Current efforts to complete the Conservation Master Plan have focused on redefining the boundaries of the three components of the Lijiang inscription (Dayan Old Town, Baisha and Shuhe and their respective buffer zones in order to be sure what territory the Conservation Master Plan covers). As a result of the various iterations developed and reviews at national level (State Administration of Cultural Heritage - SACH) and local level (Lijiang Peoples' Government), definitive determinations of "property area" and "buffer zone" for all three components have been agreed. However the State Party does not provide information about the approach of the CMP to address the progressive loss of integrity.

As a part of providing a clear management focus for the CMP, the State Party has submitted to the World Heritage Centre, on 21 January 2011, a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV) of the property for review by the World Heritage Committee within the framework of the Periodic Reporting exercise for Asia and the Pacific region.

The State Party reports that the Conservation Master Plan for the property will be further developed and improved to reflect the protection for the extended buffer zone of Dayan and the larger buffer zones for Baisha and Shuhe.

b) *Re-submission of a request for minor modification to the buffer zones and possibility of an extension of the boundaries of the property in order to protect the property and the area between its three components*

Protection zone adjusted in January 2010 and modified in October 2010

In January 2010, China's State Administration of Cultural Heritage (SACH) sent an expert panel to Lijiang to provide consultation on the modification to the protection zones. Following this initiative, a new proposal was submitted to SACH which subsequently put forward further modifications in September 2010.

In October 2010, the "*Request for Defining the Protection Zone of the World Cultural Heritage Old Town of Lijiang*" was approved by SACH and the Lijiang People's Government. This proposal modified the protection zones of the Old Town of Lijiang, increasing the protected area of the 3 components from 125.7 hectares (January 2008) to 145.6 hectares (October 2010), and of the buffer zones from 323.3 hectares (January 2008) to 582.3 hectares (October 2010)

Although the information on boundary and buffer zones modification was provided in the State Party report, no original copy of the topographic map showing the property and its buffer zones was submitted.

Protection of the area between the three components of the property

The current Conservation Master Plan demarcates the entire Lijiang *Bazi* (terraces) between the property areas and buffer zones as an environmental co-ordination zone. It established strict requirements on new construction defining protective measures for natural environment features and the eco-systems in the area between the three components.

Strengthening the capacity of Lijiang Management Bureau to implement and co-ordinate planning initiatives

The State Party reports progress in strengthening the Lijiang Management Bureau in clarifying its role in enforcing the legal framework in place, building the protection and management system through its 8 functional departments, establishing scientific research and property development guidelines, including the Conservation Master Plan, development of an in-situ monitoring system for natural and cultural assets, digital systems for protection, measures for protection of traditional culture, publication of owner's manuals for building protection and repair, and ongoing training and awareness building for heritage managers and others.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the Conservation Master Plan is being developed and is nearing completion. The newly defined protection zones for the property and its setting, the proposal for boundary modification and the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value submitted, once adopted, will provide a basis for finalization of the Conservation Master Plan. With the technical requirements for the Conservation Master Plan in place, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would like to see the provisions of the Conservation Master Plan addressing the threats to property's integrity and authenticity previously identified, and the capacity of the Lijiang Heritage Management Bureau strengthened. They consider that the State Party should submit a formal request on the modification of boundaries of the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.63

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 33 COM 7B.66, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the efforts of the State Party's national and local authorities to strengthen the protection of the property and its setting;*
4. *Welcomes the proposal for boundary modification to include protective buffer zones for Baisha and Shuhe cluster sites and to enlarge the buffer zone for Dayan town of the property and encourages the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a*

formal request for the modification of boundaries of the property and buffer zones with three copies of original topographic maps;

5. *Requests the State Party to complete the Conservation Master Plan in order to address the threats to integrity and authenticity identified by the 2008 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and the 2008 UNESCO advisory mission, and to submit to the World Heritage Centre a synthesis in English, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre of any restoration or development projects planned at the property prior to their implementation, for examination by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a state of conservation report on the property and progress made in the completion and implementation of the Conservation Master Plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

64. Historic Centre of Macao (China) (C 1110)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2005

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions
29 COM 8B.28; 32 COM 7B.68; 33COM 7B.67

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
January 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
The proposed high-rise buildings were threatening to affect the visual integrity of the property.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1110>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee in Decision **33 COM 7B.67** noted, *inter alia*, the apparent inadequacy of the current management system and requested the State Party to develop a

draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and appropriate legal and planning tools, including a comprehensive urban plan.

On 21 January 2011, the State Party submitted a brief state of conservation report on the progress made in response to the Committee Decision.

a) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

In January 2011, the State Party submitted a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to the World Heritage Centre.

b) Management system

The State Party reports that two studies completed in April 2010 'will form the basis of Macao's Urban Plan', and goes on to describe the characteristics of the existing urban plan. It therefore appears that the changes requested by the World Heritage Committee are or may be in process, but have not yet been implemented. Only when these changes have been finalised will the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies be in a position to assess their adequacy.

The State Party reports that 'several detailed studies on building control of districts around the property' were conducted in 2010. It appears that the intention is to develop District Plans based upon the detailed studies referred to. Again, only when these changes have been finalised will the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies be in a position to assess their adequacy.

c) Legal and regulative measures

The State Party also reports upon certain legal and regulative measures. These include the Urban Plan previously referred to, which is 'in drafting process'; regulation 01/DSSOPT/2009, which would have been in place on or about the time of the World Heritage Committee's request, and is therefore not new; and the new 'law to safeguard Macao's World Heritage' which is 'now in the final stages due to be reviewed by the Legislative Assembly in the fall of 2011'.

There are no specific indications as to when these plans and regulatory measures are expected to be put into force.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned that none of the conservation measures requested by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **33 COM 7B.67** have yet been completed and put into force. Once they are in place, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would be able to review their appropriateness and adequacy.

In view of the considerable potential threats identified by the 2009 Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies urge the State Party to fully implement all legal planning and management recommendations made.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.64

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,

2. Recalling **Decision 33 COM 7B.67**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Notes the initiatives taken by the State Party toward the development of the Urban Plan, District Plans, and a proposed law to safeguard Macao's World Heritage;
4. Expresses its concerns at the continuing inadequacy of the current management system, the buffer zone and legal provisions, to protect effectively the very important visual and functional linkages between the inscribed monuments and the wider urban land and seascape of Macao;
5. Reiterates its request to the State Party to develop appropriate legal and planning instruments comprising the Urban Plan as developed so far, and to submit to the World Heritage Centre when they are finalised, so that they can be assessed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
6. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and the progress made in the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

65. Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C 707 ter)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994; 2000; 2001

Criteria

(i) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.50; 31 COM 7B.77; 33 COM 7B.68

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2001: ICOMOS monitoring mission; April 2003: UNESCO/ICOMOS expert mission; May 2005: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Uncontrolled urban development and expansion of tourism-related facilities in and adjacent to the boundary of the property;
- b) Negative impact of the rehabilitation projects on the protection of the traditional urban tissue of the historic centre.

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted its report to the World Heritage Centre on 20 January 2011.

The report describes efforts to ensure better protection and management of the property. From 2005 to 2010, a financial contribution of a total of RMB 380 million (USD57.58 million) was provided to repair and preserve the Potala Palace, RMB 310 million (USD46.97 million) to improve its surroundings, RMB 169 million (USD25.60 million) to improve the roads and water-supply and drainage system within the buffer zone of Jokhang Temple and to maintain some 56 traditional residences. To reduce the negative impact of tourism, concrete measures such as on-line reservations, visits during designated periods, and adjustments to visiting routes were introduced.

The report also provides information on the following issues:

a) *Formulation of the conservation master plans of the property*

Following the requests of the World Heritage Committee, the State Administration of Cultural Heritage of China (SACH) has accelerated the preparation of the Conservation Master Plans of the Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace. Thus far, the Cultural Heritage Bureau of the Tibetan Autonomous Region (TAR) has entrusted the Chinese Academy of Cultural Heritage to prepare the Conservation Master Plan of the Potala Palace, and the Henan Research Institute of Ancient Architecture Protection to set up the Conservation Master Plan of Norbulingka in Lhasa. At the same time, the formulation of the Conservation Master Plan of the Jokhang Temple has started and is expected to be completed by December 2011.

The Conservation master plans will be submitted to the World Heritage Committee and its Advisory Bodies for review upon their completion.

b) *Ensuring coherence and complementarity between the Conservation Master Plans of the property and the Urban Master Plan for Lhasa City.*

The Urban Master Plan of Lhasa City includes a special section on World Cultural Heritage Protection specifying requirements for the protection and management of the property area and buffer zone as follows:

- Requirements for the protection and maintenance of the physical fabric of the World Heritage site to ensure its authenticity, integrity and security are established.
- Requirements for the protection of the overall property are also defined and include protection of the environment in the areas surrounding the Potala Palace, including the Red Mountain and its vegetation, as well as other historic remains, preservation of protected historic sites and historic buildings within the Barkhor Street zone, as well as protection of the water systems, vegetation and other natural elements of Norbulingka.
- Requirements for the protection of the buffer zone of the property are also established. These include ensuring that the appearance of the buffer zone of the Potala Palace is in harmony with its traditional appearance, and that the above ground height of transformed or newly-built buildings in the buffer zone shall not exceed 12 metres; protection of the traditional appearance of the buffer zone of the Jokhang Temple Monastery, and establishing control for the protection of the historic precinct, i. e., the Barkhor Street, with specific requirements limiting height of buildings ; ensuring that the appearance of the buffer zone of Norbulingka is harmonious with its traditional appearance, and that transformed or newly-built buildings, the nature of land use, the degree of development, green space, height, size, style and colour of the buildings shall be strictly controlled.

c) *Strengthening the institutional co-ordination body to ensure the implementation of plans*

A World Heritage Steering Committee, led by the Vice Chairman of the TAR, and involving related departments of cultural heritage, construction and planning, has been established to co-ordinate important decisions in the protection and management of the property.

The Cultural Heritage Bureau of the TAR, as the administrative body for cultural heritage affairs at the provincial level, supervises and provides instructions on the protection and management of the property. In charge of formulation of related policies and regulations, the Bureau also develops and implements protection and maintenance projects for the historic ensemble, and examines and approves related construction projects.

At each of the three sites in the property (Potala Palace, Jokhang Temple and Norbulingka), special entities have been set up to ensure the property's protection and management. These protection and management institutions at various levels have ensured the effective implementation of the plans and related measures from the institutional perspective.

d) *World Heritage Property boundary*

In the framework of the on-going periodic reporting exercise for the Asia and the Pacific region, the Cultural Heritage Bureau of the TAR is evaluating a plan to carry out minor modifications to the buffer zone, in accordance with Decision **33 COM 8B.47**. The completed proposal will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for approval by the World Heritage Committee.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made by the State Party in elaborating the conservation master plans for the three areas of the property. The drafts of these plans shall be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would additionally emphasize the necessary integration of the three conservation master plans around the property's Outstanding Universal Value. They would also recommend the conservation master plans take into account the foreseeable socio-economic impacts of the conservation policies on the local communities and propose any necessary mitigation measures.

Draft Decision: **35 COM 7B.65**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **33 COM 7B.68** and **33 COM 8B.47**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes with appreciation the efforts made by the State Party to develop the conservation master plans for the three areas of the property and to harmonize these with the Lhasa Urban Development plan;*

4. Welcomes the establishment of a World Heritage Steering Committee in Lhasa to strengthen institutional co-ordination and ensure proper implementation of the conservation master plans;
5. Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit the drafts of the above-mentioned plans to the World Heritage Centre, before their finalisation and enactment by the competent authorities, for review by the Advisory Bodies;
6. Requests the State Party to submit proposals for minor boundary modifications to the buffer zone of the property to the World Heritage Centre;
Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, **by 1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

66. Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1986

Criteria
(i) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
1999-2006

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 7B.70; 33 COM 7B.71; 34 COM 7B.71

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 122,370 for Technical co-operation.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds
Total amount provided to the property: Funding under the France-UNESCO Co-operation Agreement for expert missions (2003, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010) for a total amount of 24,000 Euros.

Previous monitoring missions
2000: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; 2001: expert technical assessment mission; 2003 and 2004: World Heritage Centre and expert advisory missions; August 2005: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission; January 2007: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; since 2003 regular France-UNESCO Co-operation Agreement and UNESCO New Delhi Office technical missions to the property.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Lack of an operational site management plan;
b) Lack of traffic regulations limiting heavy-duty vehicular traffic.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/241>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, the State Party submitted a brief report providing information on the progress achieved with regard to the requirements outlined in Decision **34 COM 7B.71**.

- a) *Preparation of a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

The State Party submitted a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. However this is incomplete.

b) Extension of the buffer zone boundaries of the property by 1 February 2011

The State Party reports that following the recommendations of the 2005 Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission, it was decided by the site manager that the property boundary will remain unchanged and that the buffer zone boundaries will be increased. The proposal for boundary modification will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

c) Completion of the Integrated management plan (IMP)

The State Party reports that the final Integrated management plan (IMP) is under preparation and will be submitted in 2011, along with a synthesis of previous documentation. The Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) has initiated a consultative process to seek views and consensus of different stakeholders for the finalization and implementation of the plan. The State Party will provide confirmation when the IMP has been approved, is fully resourced and will be implemented.

d) Illegal constructions and control of development

The State Party reports that previous encroachments and illegal construction is under scrutiny by the Government of Karnataka, and that implementation of Orders is underway. No new constructions are permitted without authorization, and immediate necessary action is being taken in case of encroachment with reference to section 3 of the Karnataka Public Premises Act-1974 (Eviction of Un-authorized Occupants) through a recently appointed authority.

e) Demolition and removal of the remaining debris, pillars and carriageway of the collapsed bridge;

The State Party reports that the central government is addressing this issue with the appropriate agencies of the Karnataka State government.

f) Location for a vehicular bridge outside of the current and possible future boundaries of the property

It is reported that a Cultural Impact Assessment Study is being initiated to relocate the bridge outside of the property. Appropriate decisions will be taken, based on this study.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies understand that the Integrated management plan has not yet been adopted and needs to be finalised by the Hampi World Heritage Area Management Authority, in consultation with ASI and other relevant stakeholders. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies express concern that the IMP has not yet been fully adopted, implemented and resourced. They further note that no satisfactory request has been submitted by the State Party to obtain formal approval by the World Heritage Committee for an extended World Heritage property buffer zone. In order to approve the considerable extension to the property, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies encourage the State Party to prepare and submit a satisfactory boundary modification request of the property together with the relevant maps and information.

Many of the issues relate to the recommendations of the 2007 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission. Given the vulnerability of this property in terms of development, and the commitment expressed by the State Party, at the time of removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2006, with regards to the finalisation and the full implementation of the IMP, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the previous decisions of the World Heritage Committee have not yet been fully implemented. These issues need to be addressed and pursued with some urgency in order to have in place

robust management systems that can address the conservation, protection, development and management challenges of the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.66

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.71**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Reiterates its request to the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre regarding the progress on:
 - a) The demolition and removal of the remaining debris, pillars and carriageway of the collapsed bridge,
 - b) Appropriate decisions of a new more suitable location for a vehicular bridge outside the current and possible future boundaries of the property;
4. Requests the State Party to:
 - a) Submit a satisfactory proposal for the extension of the buffer zone boundaries of the property;
 - b) Submit to the World Heritage Centre the completed Integrated Management Plan together with a synthesis and a prioritisation of existing recommendations and intentions, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
 - c) Provide confirmation that the finalized and approved Integrated Management Plan is fully resourced, and will be implemented;
5. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on progress made in the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

67. Taj Mahal, Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri (India) (C 252; C 251; C 255)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

Taj Mahal: 1983
Agra Fort: 1983
Fatehpur Sikri: 1986

Criteria

Taj Mahal: (i)
Agra Fort: (iii)
Fatehpur Sikri (ii) (iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.59; 31 COM 7B.80; 34 COM 7B 68

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 38,753 (Taj Mahal)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 158,200 under the UNESCO/Aventis project "Preservation of Taj Mahal and other Monuments in Agra".

Previous monitoring missions

2004: Joint World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

In 2003: Development project negatively impacting the World Heritage value of the properties of Taj Mahal and Agra Fort ('Taj Heritage Corridor Project'). The project was suspended by the Indian authorities in 2004.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/252/>

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/251/>

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/255/>

Current conservation issues

On 24 January 2011 reports were submitted by the State Party on the state of conservation of the Taj Mahal, Fatehpur Sikri and Agra Fort World Heritage properties. These reports provide brief overviews of progress at the properties, in response to Decision **34 COM 7B.68**.

a) Integrated Management Plan

The State Party reiterates that a site management plan was prepared for the Taj Mahal in March 2003, and resubmits a copy of this plan along with the report noting that it should be considered as the framework for the integrated management plan for Agra Fort and the Taj Mahal that has yet to be prepared.

b) Visitor Facilitation Centre

The State Party reiterates its 2010 report that a common entrance ticket arrangement to allow tourists access to all Indian World Heritage properties has been introduced, and that it has moved the Taj Mahal ticket booking facilities to Shilpagram, 1km distance from the property.

The State Party reports that a proposal for the provision of Fatehpur Sikri visitor facilities at a Centre near Agra Gate, the deployment of heritage police, and the provision of a new tourist access road, in the northern periphery of the property, has been submitted. The report also states that a Fatehpur Sikri site museum is being established, and that the unauthorised shops within a 100 metres radius of the Dargah complex have been vacated, and were replaced by a new shopping and parking complex near the Gullstan tourist complex in 2006-07.

c) Progress on boundaries

The State Party reported that the requested information was provided by letter to the World Heritage Centre on 5 October 2006, and reiterates the property and buffer zone boundary.

d) Impact assessment study on new bridge over Yamuna River

The State Party reports that the proposed new bridge mentioned at the 34th session of the Committee has now been constructed near the Strachy Bridge, at 2 kilometre distance from the property boundary. It connects the Taj Mahal with the tomb of Itimad ud Daula. The report states that it has no adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, whilst improving tourist access to Taj Mahal from other important Agra monuments.

No details of this project, nor any associated impact assessment studies were submitted in advance of its construction, as was requested to be done as a matter of urgency in paragraph 6 of Decision **34 COM 7B.68** (Brasilia, 2010).

e) Conservation

With the addition of succinct information covering the period 2010 – 2011, the State Party report provides the same brief textual and illustrative year-by-year summary of technical conservation and restoration work projects (including demolitions of modern appendages) carried out on the Taj Mahal property since 2004. This includes the provision of Door Frame Metal Detectors and barricaded queue arrangements at the Eastern and Western gates which lack sensitivity in design.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body are concerned that little further progress has been made in pursuing the agreed intentions of creating an integrated management plan for Agra Fort and the Taj Mahal, or of developing a separate plan for Fatehpur Sikri as agreed by Decision **31 COM 7B.80**.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also regret that the State Party did not provide any information in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and as requested by the World Heritage Committee, before a commitment was made to construct the new bridge. The State Party report acknowledges that this bridge facilitates traffic to the property and a comprehensive assessment should have been carried out on its impact on traffic and visitor management as well as on other aspects. It would appear that the bridge could lead to an increase in the already very high numbers of visitors (over 4 million a year) and that it is likely to have a negative impact on the visitor management of this comparatively fragile property.

The development of this bridge underlines the need for an integrated management plan that gives consideration to the wider setting of the property and its traffic and visitor management strategies as well as giving guidance on appropriate interventions for visitor management structures.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.67

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **31 COM 7B.80** adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) and **34 COM 7B.68**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Urges the State Party to continue progress in the development of an integrated management plan for the Taj Mahal, and Agra Fort properties, and requests it to submit the plan when completed to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to continue progress in the development of a separate management plan for Fatehpur Sikri, and also requests it to submit the plan when completed to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies;*

5. Requests the State Party to reconsider the inappropriate design and installation of the Door Frame Metal Detectors and barricaded queue arrangements at the Eastern and Western gates of the Taj Mahal;
6. Regrets that the State Party did not provide any details of the new bridge over the Yamuna river, nor a heritage impact assessment, as requested by the Committee, before any commitment was made in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
7. Expresses its concern at the apparent impact on visitor numbers that the new bridge could have and considers that an overall visitor management strategy which considers traffic management in the hinterland of the property needs to be developed urgently as part of the management plan for the property and Agra Fort;
8. Requests furthermore the State Party, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to ensure that impact assessment studies are undertaken for any other development proposal that could affect the properties, including the current visitor, traffic access and museum development proposals at Fatehpur Sikri, before any operational work commitment is entered into;
9. Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

68. Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India) (C 1101)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(iii) (iv) (v) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.79; 33 COM 7B.70; 34 COM 7B.69

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Lack of management structure and management plan

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1101>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides a detailed account of the progress made on the development of the management plan and also details of various interventions carried out at the property to individual monuments.

The report has addressed and provided a detailed account on the development of the management plan, as requested by the World Heritage Committee. The State Party report refers to actions undertaken in support of this objective and to preliminary documents that have been prepared as part of the process of developing the management plan. The report also includes "an operative part of the management plan", which describes a series of actions for immediate, near-term and medium term implementation. The report states that the comprehensive management plan is being finalized and will be ready by 31 January 2011. The State Party has not yet, however, provided this management plan to the World Heritage Centre.

The State Party further reports that it has strengthened the management structure by establishing the Champaner - Pavagadh Archaeological Park World Heritage Area Management Authority through a legal act approved in 2006 by the state government. The Authority has started its operations.

The State Party also submitted a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property as part of the periodic reporting process on 1 February 2011, which should act as a key reference in finalizing the management plan.

The report of the State Party also contained a comprehensive account of activities being carried out for the benefit of individual monuments at the property, and the larger property of which they are part.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the steps taken by the State Party for the ongoing protection and management of the property. It is particularly encouraging that a management authority has now been set up and that the management plan is in the final stages of preparation. It is hoped that with the new Authority in place, it will be possible for the State Party to quickly finalize the management plan and submit it to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies. This management plan, as well as the Statement of outstanding universal value will provide a comprehensive framework for underpinning conservation decisions as well as decisions on other activities at the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.68

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.69**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Recognizes the efforts made by the State Party to ensure the safeguarding of the property and encourages it to continue such efforts in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*

4. Reiterates the request to provide the World Heritage Centre with the completed management plan for review by the Advisory Bodies;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2013, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the adopted management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

69. Prambanan Temples (Indonesia) (C 642)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late complementary information)

70. Sangiran Early Man Site (Indonesia) (C 593)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1996

Criteria
(iii) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.70; 32 COM 7B.71; 33 COM 7B.72

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 45,000 for training activities and on-site promotion.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
September 2006: UNESCO expert mission; January-February 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Lack of an effective site-management authority;
b) Absence of appropriate land-use regulations in the face of development pressure;
c) Need for a buffer zone;
d) Poor site interpretation and museum display

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/593>

Current conservation issues

The State Party report was submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 27 January 2011. The report addresses the issue of the site potentially satisfying additional World Heritage criteria,

and responds to issues identified in Decision **33 COM 7B.72** (Seville, 2009). The report addresses the following main points:

a) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

b) Authority of the site manager to control development through appropriate land-use regulations

The State Party report emphasises that the planning regulations are now in place to enable the manager to control development. However, the application of National Law No. 26/2007 and Regulation No. 26/2008 on National Spatial Planning, which gives additional controls for World Heritage property as National Strategic Areas (KSN), have not yet been finalised; application to designate the area a National Vital Object has not been finalised; and the establishment of a new Management Board has not been finalised. While these proposed mechanisms appear to satisfy the World Heritage Committee's concerns, it is essential that they are implemented in practice.

c) Setting up of archaeological and socio-cultural impact procedures for development

The report indicates that while a Memorandum of Understanding and a Cooperation Agreement exist between the Central Java Government and the Sragen and Karangayar Regencies, Environmental Impact Assessment (which would include archaeological and socio-cultural impacts) is not regulated by these agreements. Implementation of an Environmental Impact Assessment process is foreseen by the State Party, but again it is essential that this is implemented in practice.

d) Involving the residents as stakeholders in property management

The report states that a number of programs are developed to involve the community in the property management, which are valuable initiatives. The 2008 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission recommended three approaches central to resolving current problems at the property which have not yet been addressed

e) Control over sand mining

The report indicates that sand mining in the fossiliferous soil by villagers has been a problem, solved by compensating miners and closing the sand pits. This, however, is a reactive solution that would not appear to deter future sand mining. Identification of alternate sand sources and a community involvement approach need to be considered to prevent sand mining in the longer term.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the opinion that a number of decisions still need to be made to apply the most effective aspects of national law to the protection of the property, and that the establishment of the new Management Board needs to be finalised in order to ensure effective management and conservation of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are also of the opinion that an effective heritage impact assessment process should be carried out.

Given that the property has a resident population of approximately 200,000, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider it essential that efforts continue to involve the community in the management and conservation of the property. The State Party should address the detailed actions recommended by the 2008 reactive monitoring mission to achieve that objective. It should also develop long-term solutions to the illegal mining of sand within the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.70

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.72**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009);*
3. *Notes the progress made by the State Party in developing the management system for the Sangiran site and acknowledges the information provided on the actions being taken to implement effective management of the Sangiran site;*
4. *Urges the State Party to continue its work to address the actions recommended at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), including:*
 - a) *Implementing an effective heritage impact assessment process within the property,*
 - b) *Involving the residents as key stakeholders of the property;*
5. *Also urges the State Party to:*
 - a) *Finalise the legal and administrative measures required to protect and manage the property,*
 - b) *Develop mechanisms to prevent illegal sand mining at the property;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a progress report on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

71. Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (C 870)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1998

Criteria

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.72; 32 COM 7B.73; 33 COM 7B.76

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in the previous reports

- a) Potential negative impact of an express highway to the property;
- b) Potential negative impact of large-scale events commemorating 1300th Anniversary of Nara Heijo-kyo capital, planned to take place on the property in 2010.

Illustrative materials

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/870>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. The report provides an overview of the current progress of the discussion towards the establishment of a groundwater monitoring system and risk mitigation plans in order to prevent any negative impact on the buried cultural properties beneath the site, which might have been caused by the construction of the expressway, while also presenting the current condition of the Nara Palace Site following the Commemorative Events of the 1300th Anniversary of Nara Heijo-kyo Capital that took place on the site last year.

a) *The Yamato-Kita Road highway*

The State Party reported that the "Yamato-Kita Road Groundwater Monitoring Study Committee" held its 5th meeting on 22 December 2010, where discussions focused on the groundwater monitoring area during the actual construction of the road. Design of the groundwater monitoring system and risk mitigation plans have not yet been completed. The State Party intends to establish this before the construction work starts within the section adjacent to the Nara Palace Site. However, neither a concrete timetable for completion of the plan nor the starting date for construction have been determined, as priority is being given to work in other areas of the site. The State Party has confirmed that they will report to the World Heritage Committee on the progress of the discussion.

b) *Nara Heijo-kyo Palace Site*

The State Party reported that temporary facilities and structures set up on the Nara Palace Site for the Commemorative Events concluded on 7 November 2010, would be removed by the end of March, 2011. Nevertheless, some of these temporary provisions have been retained on the site (pavement, earthen mounds and other facilities) to support construction of temporary parking lot, bus terminal, restrooms. The State Party noted that these facilities are necessary for ensuring visitors security and effective access to the site until permanent facilities have been constructed outside of the Palace in about 5 years. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies suggest that all temporary facilities put in place for the Commemorative Events be removed as previously promised by the State Party, and requests that design of any temporary and permanent visitors facilities be submitted to the

World Heritage Centre for review, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

With regard to the National Government Park Project, the State Party reports that they have planned for the reconstruction of the corridors with earthen walls around the Front Courtyard of the Former Imperial Audience Hall Compound, and that these are currently surrounded by temporary fences. The reconstruction plan will be developed along national guidelines and the result of the study implemented by the experts' committee established in September 2010, to maintain its Outstanding Universal Value, but no plan as yet has been determined.

However, the State Party report does not respond to the World Heritage Committee recall that "any reconstruction project should have to be based only on complete and detailed documentation and to no extent on conjecture", nor does it provide the "full justification of the rationale for the reconstruction including the detailed evidence on which it is based" requested of the World Heritage Committee. The State Party notes that a Study Committee was established in September 2010, and this Study Committee will eventually submit the requested rationale. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain very concerned by the reconstruction plans, as in their view the evidence for reconstruction of long vanished elements of this archaeological site can not be achieved without significant conjecture. They would stress the importance of the State Party urgently providing the reconstruction rationale (including all documentary evidence) previously requested by the World Heritage Committee.

In response to the World Heritage Committee's request that the State Party clarify how the conservation policies at each of the eight sites of the property are harmonized to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained and presented, the State Party mentioned that the National Government Park (NGP) project relates only to the Nara Palace Site, among the eight sites. The State Party also reported that the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (MLIT), which is the proprietor of the NGP project will work closely with the Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan which will coordinate the project in co-operation with the Nara Prefectural Government, Nara City and the owners. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies stress the importance of establishing a permanent institutional co-ordination mechanism to ensure the harmonized implementation of conservation policies for all sites of the inscribed property.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, whilst noting the progress made on the establishment of a groundwater monitoring system and risk mitigation plans at the site, reiterate the need for a concrete timetable for completion of the monitoring plan, and for the detailed information on all aspects of the planned construction of the Yamato-Kita Road highway, for further review. They stress the need for addressing the requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session concerning removal of all temporary facilities put in place for the Commemorative events of 2010. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies stress the need to provide a conservation rationale (including all evidence) for any planned reconstruction of corridors at the Nara Heijo-kyo Palace site.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.71

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*

2. *Recalling Decision 33 COM 7B.76, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes that the State Party has not removed all of the temporary facilities associated with the Commemorative Event and plans to retain some of these until such time as permanent visitor facilities can be constructed, and urges it to proceed with the removal of all such structures, as previously requested by the World Heritage Committee;*
4. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines:*
 - a) *plans for both temporary and permanent visitor facilities,*
 - b) *details of progress towards the establishment of the groundwater monitoring system and risk mitigation plans and plans for construction of the Yamato-Kita Road highway,*
 - c) *an overall conservation rationale for all planned reconstruction work at the corridor of the Nara Heijo-kyo Palace site, including detailed plans and the evidence on which they are based before any reconstruction work is approved;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2013, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above.*

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

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late request of information to the State Party)

73. Melaka and George Town, Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca (Malaysia) (C 1223)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late request of complementary information to the State Party)

74. Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1997

Criteria
(iii) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.75 ; 33 COM 7B.79; 34 COM 8B.54

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 50,000, of which USD 20,000 in 2001 for Brick Conservation and Geophysical Survey of the property; USD 30,000 in 2007 for the Preparation and Establishment of an Integrated Management Plan.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 931.606; USD 791.786 from the Japanese Funds-in-Trust for 2010 – 2013; 5,000 euros from Oriental Cultural Heritage Sites Protection Alliance in 2011; USD 20,000 from Oriental Cultural Heritage Sites Protection Alliance in 2010; USD 62.620 from the Japanese Funds-in-Trust in 2009 ; USD 50,000 from Oriental Cultural Heritage Sites Protection Alliance in 2008 and USD 7,200 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust in 2006.

Previous monitoring missions

May 2004 and November 2005: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions; April and September 2008: UNESCO Advisory missions; UNESCO expert missions have been sent every year since 2009 in the context of the implementation of specific projects.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a conservation policy and inappropriate management of the property;
- b) Impact of the new structure of the Maya Devi Temple (constructed in 2002) on the archaeological remains, as well as on the visual integrity..

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/666>

Current conservation issues

At its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), the World Heritage Committee had requested the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and to continue its work on the Integrated Management Plan (IMP). It had also requested the State Party to avoid carrying out any development projects pending completion of the IMP. At its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), the World Heritage Committee did not approve the proposed boundary modification of the property submitted by the State Party. By Decision 34 COM 8B.54, the Committee requested the State Party to consider reformulating the proposal “as a major modification” for subsequent evaluation by means of an ICOMOS mission.

A UNESCO Japan Funds-in-Trust (FIT) project for the “conservation and management of Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha” was launched in Lumbini in August 2010. The three-year project (2010-2013) has a budget of USD 791,700 and is being implemented jointly by UNESCO, the Department of Archaeology and the Lumbini Development Trust. It will reinforce the capacity of the Nepalese authorities for the protection, enhancement and sustainable development of the World Heritage property.

On 28 January 2011, the State Party submitted a report, outlining progress as follows:

a) **General response to Decision 33 COM 7B.79**

Draft an updated Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:

A draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Values has been prepared and submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

Continue work on the development of the Integrated Management plan (IMP):

The development of the IMP is in progress, and a detailed explanation of this process, the progress made and future considerations have been presented in section (c) of the State Party report.

Avoid carrying out any development project pending completion of the IMP:

The report noted that development works including the “Ring Road” have been halted, that an inappropriate temporary toilet for visitors has been removed and that temporary improvements are being carried out in close consultation with the national and international consultants working with the JFIT project.

*b) General response to Decision **34 COM 8B.54***

The report noted that the proposed modification of the boundaries “be supported in principle” by the authorities.

With regard to point 8 of the Decision recommending the State Party to submit a fuller nomination that will be considered as a major modification and evaluated with a mission to the property, the report mentioned that the State Party is considering the possibility of submitting a new nomination for the property which will be prepared during the above-mentioned project period of the UNESCO Japan Funds-in-Trust project.

*c) Preparation of the IMP refer Decision **33 COM 7B.79** and **34 COM 8B.54***

The report also noted that various steps for the preparation of the IMP were carried out during the report period, notably through the implementation of the UNESCO Japan Funds-In-Trust project; Oriental Cultural Heritage Sites Protection Alliance, an NGO based in France, financed the Broad Study on the Sacred Garden as well as some specific legal and management improvement activities including the establishment of a “World Heritage Unit” within the Lumbini Development Trust to take up the specific responsibilities of safeguarding the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as well as initiation of related amendments of the Lumbini Development Trust Act and its by-Laws.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made with respect to the recommendations contained in the Committee’s decisions of the last few years. With respect to the IMP, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the good progress made at present, including through the UNESCO Japan Funds-In-Trust project, and the partnership with the Oriental Cultural Heritage Sites Protection Alliance.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the proposal to enlarge the property to encompass the entire inner sacred garden and to recognize the outer sacred garden as a new buffer zone is to be supported in principle and encourage the State Party to further prepare a new nomination.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned about some proposed development projects, including the enlargement of the existing airport; upgrading of tourist infrastructure and the proposed development projects by international investment groups. Information on these proposed developments has been provided by the UNESCO Office in Kathmandu as well as by a group of stakeholders self-named “*Lumbini Institutions*”. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that decisions on these proposals should be based on an Heritage Impact Assessment taking into account the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, within the framework of the IMP under preparation, and in line with information supplied by the State Party concerning such new developments, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

In November 2010, the UN Secretary General and the UNESCO Director General discussed the possibility of jointly launching an international initiative to draw attention to the need to better preserve and manage Lumbini, the birthplace of Lord Buddha. Nepal's authorities (Minister for Federal Affairs, Constituent Assembly, Parliamentary Affairs and Culture, Secretary of Culture, Director-General of Department of Archaeology, Vice-Chair of the Lumbini Development Trust) have very positively reacted to this re-newed interest in Lumbini. In January 2011, UNESCO proposed to establish an International Expert Committee for the Safeguarding of Lumbini. The experts would provide advice for the safeguarding and promotion of the historical sites related to the life of Lord Buddha in the Greater Lumbini Area. This proposal is under consideration by the Nepali authorities.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.74

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **33 COM 7B.79** and **34 COM 8B.54**, adopted at its 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the efforts and commitment of the State Party for the safeguarding of this property, in particular in undertaking the process of preparation and development of the Integrated Management Plan (IMP);*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to continue its work on the development of the integrated management plan (IMP), based on the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and to avoid carrying out any development project within the property and the adjacent areas identified as having potential archaeological significance, pending completion of the IMP;*
5. *Calls upon the international community to provide technical and financial support to assist the State Party in the development of the IMP and in implementing the appropriate conservation measures for the archaeological remains contained within the Maya Devi Temple;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre detailed information on any proposed developments in the vicinity of the property, including a Heritage Impact Assessment on any project that could affect the property's Outstanding Universal Value, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the progress made on the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

75. Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121)

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

30 COM 7A.26; 31 COM 7A.23; 32 COM 7B.76

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 332,775 (1980 to 1999) for technical cooperation

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 10 million (1979-2001) - International Safeguarding Campaign; USD 45,000 (2005) - Dutch Funds-in-Trust

Previous monitoring missions

February 2003: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; April and August 2005, April 2006, and April 2007: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions; March 2011: UNESCO international expert advisory mission;

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Uncontrolled urban development resulting in the loss of traditional urban fabric, in particular privately-owned houses;
- b) Lack of coordinated management mechanism.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/121>

Current conservation issues

The State Party at the request of the World Heritage Centre provided a reply letter on the state of conservation issues, dated 29 December 2010.

- a) *Study on the impact of the proposed road on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property*

The property, comprising of seven Monument Zones, includes the Hindu temples of Pashupati. The World Heritage Committee, at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), adopted Decision **32 COM 7B.76**, requesting the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed of the mitigation efforts for the proposed new road in the Pashupati Monument Zone, initiated in 2007, crossing the Pashupati monument zone from West to East and cutting through the forest. Following several consultation meetings and the World Heritage Centre mission of April 2008, the State Party was requested to undertake a technical study on the impact of the proposed road on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. Despite the Government of Nepal's commitment in its state of conservation report of 2009 to advise its Department of Roads (DoR) to re-examine and realign the trajectory of the road in order to ensure the safeguarding of the property, the World Heritage Centre has not, to date, received any further information on the matter.

- b) *Tunnel road construction*

A project proposal for the tunnel road construction from 2007 was received by the World Heritage Centre in late July 2010. The Advisory Body (ICOMOS) indicated in August 2010 that the proposed road would negatively impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and the World Heritage Centre requested the Nepalese authorities to consider

suspending road construction on 1 September 2010, until such time as an independent environmental assessment could be carried out. Further, upon a request from the Government of Nepal in December 2010, the World Heritage Centre organized a UNESCO - Netherlands Fund-in-Trust funded international expert advisory mission to Kathmandu from 12 to 18 March 2011, to provide technical advice on the proposed road construction design, taking into consideration the local needs and context and its possible impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property.

The advisory mission report cites many potential threats faced by the property including previously unidentified threats such as the proposed extension of the Kathmandu International Airport. The mission's recommendations include the need to define and secure clear boundaries for the property, the stabilization of the hills along the damaged area, the re-establishment of the damaged natural drainage system, the introduction of measures to secure the property from unauthorized pedestrian and vehicle access and the restoration of the disturbed forest area. The advisory mission also states that the current tunnel road construction proposal is unsatisfactory and can neither be implemented in its current form nor improved by additional studies. Finally, the mission report notes that there is a need to carry out a detailed study of alternative routes for the road around the property boundary.

c) *Lightning damages Pratapur Temple in the Swayambhu Monument Zone of the Kathmandu Valley World Heritage site*

Pratapur Temple in the Swayambhu Monument Zone of the Kathmandu Valley World Heritage site, suffered damage from a lightning strike on 14 February 2011, during a sudden thunderstorm. According to the UNESCO Kathmandu office, the temple appears to be quite heavily damaged, probably by two different lightning strikes. The main damage appears to be on the north and south sides, while there are cracks to the temple's east side. The stairway to the south side entrance to the temple is heavily damaged, with at least one sculpture dislocated. The Department of Archaeology, Nepal, is undertaking the necessary emergency repairs.

Conclusions

The World Heritage and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the proposed construction of the road and the extension of the Kathmandu International Airport will have significant adverse impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and that alternative approaches for both projects should therefore be closely reviewed by the State Party. They underscore the importance of the State Party immediately implementing the recommendations of the UNESCO advisory mission. In light of the above, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would propose that the State Party consider requesting a reactive monitoring mission to review the overall state of conservation of the property and propose necessary corrective measures to achieve the desired state of conservation of the World Heritage property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.75

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision 32 COM 7B.76, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*

3. Takes note of the conclusions and recommendations of the March 2011 UNESCO international expert advisory mission to the Pashupati Monument Zone of the Kathmandu Valley with respect to the proposed tunnel road construction of 2007 and the proposed Kathmandu International Airport extension;
4. Urges the State Party to abandon its plans for the tunnel road construction crossing the Pashupati monument zone, to determine a road trajectory that goes around the property boundary and to restore the pre-2007 situation at the monument zone;
5. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / Advisory Bodies reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the state of conservation of the property, including the tunnel road construction crossing the Pashupati monument zone and the planned extension of the Kathmandu International Airport;
6. Also requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with detailed information including an independently prepared Heritage Impact Assessment for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, prior to the mission;
7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the implementation of the March 2011 UNESCO international expert advisory mission recommendations and on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

76. 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

31 COM 7B.85; 33 COM 8B.1; 33 COM 7B.80

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November-December 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission

October 2010: World Heritage Centre fact-finding mission to the property following the major flood that devastated the area in August 2010.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Significant decay of the property caused by local climatic conditions and alluvial erosion;
- b) Stability of the foundations (earth mechanics) of the Jam Nizamuddin tomb;
- c) Lack of definition of boundaries of the property and buffer zone of the necropolis;
- d) Lack of monitoring.

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Centre on 31 January 2011. A number of management issues identified in **33COM 7B.80** have either been addressed in the State Party's report or remain unresolved, and are outlined as follows:

a) *Master Plan and Management Plan*

A Master Plan for the preservation and development of the property has been developed and is yet to be approved by the Sindh Government, therefore not yet implemented, a situation that has not changed since the 2009 State Party report. As a result, there is no progress concerning the Management Plan, which is to be developed within the scope of the Master Plan.

b) *Monitoring programme, Condition report and Prioritised Emergency Intervention Plan*

The State Party has not reported on any of these issues.

c) *Identification of boundaries and buffer zone*

The State Party has indicated that work on the topographic mapping and documentation of monuments would take place after the Master Plan is approved. The State Party has stated that work on defining the property boundary and the establishment of a buffer zone will be completed before the end of June 2011.

d) *Conservation of Jam Nizamuddin's Tomb*

The State Party has resubmitted a request for conservation and management under the World Heritage Fund (28 March 2011) for soil investigations to determine the stability of the foundation (earth mechanics) of the Jam Nizamuddin tomb, and prepare an action plan for measures to stabilize the endangered monuments. In addition, a condition report for all other monuments and tombs shall be carried out to establish a hierarchic emergency intervention plan.

The World Heritage Centre together with international experts carried out a fact-finding mission to the property following the major flood that devastated the area in 2010.

The mission observed that during the flood internally displaced persons (IDP) have occupied the property. While recognising that this was not a phenomenon that can be controlled and cannot be directly attributed to the current state of conservation, the mission observed looting, vandalism, destruction and degradation of various elements of the property. The mission however, attributes some of these to the lack of clearly defined boundaries of the property and buffer zone and protective measures such as proper fencing in place. It was also observed that there were no adequate security measures in place to control the access to the property and inside some of the important buildings. The mission also felt that security measures were also necessary to protect visitors since some of the buildings within the property were in danger of collapse. On the other hand, the mission also reiterated the need to consider negative impacts of the visitors, already highlighted by the 2006 mission. The mission also noted that there was no adequate preparation of emergency plans for appropriate interventions and actions.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are very concerned about the serious degradation of the property and the lack of adequate attention given to the issues raised by

the Committee at its previous decisions. They are also concerned about the situation after the flood and the lack of any preparation for emergency situations.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the opinion that the formal adoption of the Master Plan by the Sindh Government, and the subsequent development of the Management Plan are critical to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the State Party should pursue its effort to define the property boundary and establish a buffer zone, and to resubmit its International Assistance request for the stabilisation of the Tomb of Jam Nizamuddin.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies suggest that, based on the findings of the October 2010 Post-flood Assessment Mission, a reactive monitoring mission be carried out to the property to enable the World Heritage Committee to re-examine the state of conservation of this property, with a view to considering, in the event of ascertained threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the possibility of inscribing the World Heritage property of the Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta, Pakistan, on the List of the World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.76

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.80**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Regrets that little progress has been made towards the implementation of the Committee decisions and that no information provided concerning ongoing conservation work including repair work to pavilions, monuments and tombs;*
4. *Expresses its concern about the serious degradation of the property aggravated by the recent flood and the lack of preparations for emergency actions, including the lack of security measures to protect the buildings and the visitors and urges the State Party to develop an emergency action plan to address urgent measures necessary for security and stabilisation of structures and to implement them;*
5. *Also urges the State Party to take action to adopt the Master Plan and the development of the management plan;*
6. *Further urges the State Party to take appropriate measures to stabilise the Tomb of Jam Nizamuddin;*
7. *Requests the State party to submit the defined boundaries to the World Heritage Centre and proposals for the establishment of a buffer zone, for approval by the Committee;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to review the state of conservation and the progress on the above issues;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of property, including progress on the above issues and the recommendations of the 2006 Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, for examination by the World Heritage*

Committee at its 36th session in 2012, with a view to considering, in the case of confirmation of the ascertained threat to Outstanding Universal Value, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

77. Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro (Pakistan) (C 138)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(ii) (iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.86; 33 COM 8B.17; 33 COM 7B.81

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 90,000 (conservation and training assistance)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 23,500,000 (total of contributions for the International Safeguarding Campaign for Moenjodaro)

Previous monitoring missions

Following the closing of the UNESCO International Safeguarding Campaign (1974-1997), numerous UNESCO and expert missions have been carried out; November/December 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, October 2010: Post-flood World Heritage Centre expert assessment mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of appropriate conservation work;
- b) Deterioration of structures;
- c) Suspension of management system.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/138>

Current conservation issues

a) *Emergency situation after the flooding of August 2010*

On 12 August 2010, the impact of the floods on the Archaeological Ruins at Mohenjodaro was reported as critical, with around 1100,000-900,000 cusecs water flowing past the World Heritage property which is protected by bunds and spurs constructed during the UNESCO International Safeguarding Campaign (1974-1997). At that time, the river training scheme consisted of the construction of the outer bunds and stone pitched t-spurs for the purpose of preventing the river, with its ever shifting course and seasonal overflow, from eroding the site. To the north of the archaeological site the bunds and spur, beginning at the village of Hassan Wahan, have not been sheathed with stone.

In response to the August 2010 flood emergency in Pakistan, the Director-General of UNESCO set up a Task Force to respond to the situation on all levels of UNESCO's programmes. At the request of the State Party and the Director-General, a World Heritage Centre Post-flood assessment mission was carried out to affected World Heritage properties

in Pakistan, from 7 to 15 October 2010. The mission found that urgent consideration must be given to the possible strengthening of the vulnerable mud embankment and spur located to the north of the property. In addition, it must be determined whether the other embankments and spurs have been compromised internally. For this purpose a project proposal has been developed which includes a geotechnical and a submerger study based on high resolution topographic maps. Although the brick structures had suffered some damage due to the heavy rains, this could be addressed by the customary maintenance work. The mission also recommended that progress should be made on the site presentation and interpretation as noted by the 2006 mission.

The mission noted that the emergency response plan of the property functioned well. However, they consider that the disaster event presents an opportunity to review the property, review any ground floor level storage facilities that may contain artifacts or papers, and integrate the involvement of local communities to contribute to its effectiveness both in terms of site protection and saving of lives and livelihoods of the citizens in the surrounding villages.

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Centre on 31 January 2011. A number of management issues identified in Decision **33 COM 7B.81** have either been addressed or remain unresolved, and are outlined as follows:

b) Master Plan

An updated Master Plan for preservation, development and tourism at Moenjodaro has been under consideration by the Pakistan Federal Government since February 2009, with no resolution reported in the 2011 State Party report.

An updated Medium Term Action Plan is reported as being implemented, but the clarification of the relationship of this document to the 2006 mission recommendations, as requested in Decision **33 COM 7B.81**, has not been offered.

c) Redefinition of boundaries

The work to identify the extent of related archaeological remains outside the World Heritage property by dry core drilling has been held up by funding availability and flooding, but is scheduled for completion by June 2011.

d) Archaeological Research Strategy

The State Party has not reported any progress in the development of an archaeological research strategy, requested in Decision **33 COM 7B.81** as a necessary precursor to further major archaeological interventions at the property.

e) Land use encroachment on archaeological remains subject to future extension of the property

The State Party has identified the need to construct a wall or barrier to prevent grazing animals and other activities by villagers inside the property. This would suggest that the areas subject to future extension are also being impacted by such encroachment.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the adoption of an updated Master Plan for preservation, development and tourism at Moenjodaro has been pending, and consider that the State Party should finally approve an updated Master Plan.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also consider that the State Party should implement measures recommended by the October 2010 mission, including the updating of a risk management plan, and preventive interventions, as well as the definition of the extent of the property by dry core drilling, and the development of an archaeological research strategy.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party has identified the need for a boundary wall or fence, and encourages the State Party to investigate more fully the issue of land use encroachment both inside the property and in the area which may be subject to a possible extension of the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.77

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.81**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes that a comprehensive Master Plan has been prepared and is pending approval by the Pakistan Federal Government and that work is in progress to identify the actual extent of the archaeological area of Moenjodaro;*
4. *Also notes with appreciation the efforts made by UNESCO's Director-General to address the emergency situation of August 2010 flooding at Moenjodaro through a Post-flood assessment mission to the property in October 2010;*
5. *Requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *Update the risk management plan,*
 - b) *Submit a topographic map of the archaeological area including a possible extension of the property once the dry core drilling to determine the extent of archaeology has been completed,*
 - c) *Develop an archaeological research strategy, including non-invasive methods of investigation, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and refrain from undertaking any major archaeological interventions until this strategy is in place,*
 - d) *Provide a full report on the measures put in place to protect areas of archaeological interest both within the property area and in any area subject to potential extension of the property from encroachments and land uses,*
 - e) *Further develop a site presentation and interpretation programme as suggested by the 2006 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the October 2010 World Heritage Centre Post-flood assessment mission, as well as on the implementation of the above.*

78. Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

79. Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan) (C 602 rev)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late mission report)

80. Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2001

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.74; 32 COM 7B.79; 33 COM 7B.84

Application of the Reinforced monitoring mechanism for one year in 2008 (**32 COM 7B.79**)

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property (up to 2005): USD 30,000 Training Assistance

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2006: UNESCO Tashkent Office/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; April 2005: UNESCO Tashkent Office/ICOMOS expert mission; October 2006: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; December 2007: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; March 2009: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of strategic approach to urban conservation;
- b) Lack of a proper management plan;
- c) Detrimental impact of new roads;
- d) Conservation of urban fabric.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/603>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report.

a) Strategic approach to urban conservation

The State Party report summarizes that the preparation of the 2011-2015 general plan for the conservation and rehabilitation of the historic city, dissemination of the intent and collaboration with concerned institutions has formed a main initiative for Samarkand's heritage. According to the report, the database on monuments have been prepared, consultations on conservation with owners and users of historical monuments have been taking place, the borders of historic-cultural museum reserve area have been specified, and the general concept for conservation and rehabilitation of the historic city has been elaborated.

b) Development of a management plan

A four-day International Technical Workshop to set the framework for a management plan for Samarkand was held in October 2010. Involving participants from the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM, the workshop resulted in an Action Plan that includes specific works to be carried out in Samarkand. And it was prepared and agreed by the Uzbek authorities. The State Party subsequently submitted an international assistance request to the World Heritage Fund for the development on a management/conservation plan for the property that was approved in January 2011.

c) Proposed zoning and road schemes including proposals to close new road between Afrosiab and Timurid city to through-traffic

In the 2009 state of conservation report, it was mentioned that no major road constructions are planned and more detailed information on the General Plan would be provided. However, the State Party report received this year does not provide the information on this issue.

d) Conservation of urban fabric

The State Party mentions that an alcohol factory and museum have now been removed from the historic part of the city as both were seen to be negative to the character. A new Museum and new houses have been constructed, respecting the traditional architectural styles, according to the State Party.

Funding through a World Bank loan has been secured to develop water supply and sewage systems. Phase one (out of three phases) is complete, with the first instalment of new fresh water pipes. It is proposed to have more residents connected to the main sewage system and thus improve environmental and ecological conditions in the old city.

e) Other issues

The State Party report places considerable emphasis on tourism and its potential revenue and associated employment generation. The State Party documents the plan value to be '6140 million sums'. Although this amount is not detailed or qualified, it is noted that the following will form a part of the plan:

- Approximately 3000 jobs in research and restoration works
- Development of new tourist routes, new tourism amenities and infrastructure services with the expectation of a 1.5 growth rate with '1.7 billion sums' expected in the state budget within 5 years
- GIS database to study and monitor the tangible and intangible cultural heritage.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are satisfied with the priority being given by the State Party to the formulation of the Management Plan, including the application of International Assistance to the World Heritage Fund. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the development of a general plan 2010-2015 for the conservation and rehabilitation of the historic city. It is not clear how this relates to the urban plan for the development of Samarkand city 2004-2025 (General Plan) which was reported at the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee in 2008 to be under revision, nor to any revised plans for roads which were to be developed after the moratorium on road construction agreed in 2007. Furthermore, they note that the general plan 2010-2015 appears to involve major conservation and restoration projects to encourage international tourism. It is essential that further details of these proposals are provided before any formal decisions have been made.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.80

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.84**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Acknowledges the progress made by the State Party in civic planning, consultative processes and historic structures documentation;*
4. *Notes the references in the State Party's report to the development of a general plan, and requests the State Party to provide clarification on the scope and the extent of this plan, particularly whether it covers planning and development of infrastructure as well as conservation and rehabilitation, and whether it sets out a long term strategy for traffic management;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to provide clarification on the major conservation and restoration proposals in the general plan above, for the 2010-2015 period;*
6. *Also notes the World Bank projects to develop water supply and sewage systems in the historic part of the city and invites the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with details of the scope of this project and its impact on the archaeological and historic structures;*
7. *Further notes the State Party's efforts in securing international assistance to support the management plan, and reiterates the need to further develop the management plan, to undertake further conservation work on monuments within the property, to establish an effective management framework for the site and to sustain and plan for infrastructural work respecting the traditional urban fabric;*
8. *Notes furthermore the importance that the State Party places on tourism development and touristic initiatives and also further requests that tourism planning mechanisms form a part of the management plan;*
9. *Encourages the State Party to continue strengthening its efforts in cooperation with the Ministry of Culture, local authorities, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, and possibly other partners, to advance the strategic planning processes and finalize the*

management plan with a focus on technical assistance and guidance concerning the conservation of the traditional urban fabric, the development of structural restoration projects and the creation of an adequate management framework;

10. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, information concerning urban developments, including the new building construction and reconstructions, sewage and other projects having impact on the property;*
11. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, **by 1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress made in the management plan and strategic planning, for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

81. Complex of Huế Monuments (Vietnam) (C 678)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

82. Historic Centres of Berat and Gjirokastra (Albania) (C 569 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005, 2008 (extension)

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 8B.48; 32 COM 8B.56; 33 COM 7B.87

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 44,964.00 (two requests for the preparation of the nomination file of Gjirokastra and a joint management plan for the two cities)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 1,367,014 is provided by the Albanian Government within the framework of the project 933 ALB 4000 "Safeguard and restoration of selected monuments within the World Heritage site of the Old City of Gjirokastra – Albania"

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal construction dating from the late 1990s
- b) Lack of specific monitoring indicators
- c) Lack of programme of archaeological excavations
- d) Lack of adequate fire fighting arrangements in the historic urban zone
- e) Lack of detailed tourism development plan

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/569>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report addressing the issues identified by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). The report provides detailed information on the issue of illegal constructions and the development of a sustainable tourism strategy yet indicates very little progress on the other measures requested by the World Heritage Committee, such as monitoring and fire response.

a) *Illegal constructions*

The report informs that as a result of improved control, illegal constructions have been minimised in both Berat and Gjirokastra, and that no violations have been noted within either Historic Centre during 2010. Efforts have been made to curb the situation of uncontrolled constructions by compiling an inventory that categorises the constructions. In addition, projects have been prepared to integrate any modern facades with the traditional homes of the Historic Centre of Berat. In response to the issue of ongoing constructions in the area opposite the castle gate in Berat, the State Party points out that permissions for these constructions had been issued prior to 2009 in accordance with the existing law, yet due to

various technical reasons they are being carried out at present. However, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies express their concern that constructions are being carried out when during the evaluation at the time of extension in 2008 the legal framework was considered adequate and therefore no permissions issued after the inscription of the property can be considered as complying with the legal requirements.

b) Monitoring indicators

The current monitoring indicators for the Historic Centres of Berat and Gjirokastra include the number of restorations on individual monuments and the annual funds allotted for these restorations. The State Party proposes as an additional indicator the number of restoration interventions that include a part of either Historic Centre.

c) Fire fighting measures

Berat still lacks safeguarding measures against the risk of fire within the Historic Centre. However, a project prepared in 2010 and financed by the European Union to improve infrastructure in the inhabited area within the fortress walls of the Kala quarter is expected to be implemented in 2011. Gjirokastra is still lacking a long-term plan for the installation of new hydrants as well as smaller fire fighting vehicles for entrance into narrower paths of the city.

d) Archaeological excavations

The report indicates that the Institute of Archaeology did not undertake any archaeological excavations in Berat or Gjirokastra between February 2009 and February 2011 and that rescue archaeological excavations are soon to take place as part of a massive restoration project on a large part of the castle.

e) Tourism

A Tourism Action Plan has been prepared for Berat with a main aim of developing tourism at a sustainable level in order to protect the unique values of the Historic Centre and respect the needs of the local community. While tourism is the driving force for the development of the local economy of Gjirokastra, no medium-term development plan for tourism is in place. Still a matter of urgency is the preparation of an overall tourism development plan for the protection of the entirety of the property.

Conclusions

While the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the slow down of illegal constructions in Berat and Gjirokastra as stated in the State Party report, they are still extremely concerned about the lack of control regarding illegal constructions and regret that a long term plan has not been established to rectify the violations that have already occurred in order to improve the value and integrity of the property. Also still necessary is a more detailed set of monitoring indicators, which directly relate to the attributes that carry the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and are based on detailed inventories of the sites within the property. Additionally, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the opinion that little to no progress has been made to increase fire fighting measures since February 2009.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recognise the State Party's efforts in restoration and intervention and encourage the State Party to continue such efforts, while at the same time regret the lack of a programme of archaeological excavations related to development projects. They additionally note the intention to carry out a 'massive' restoration project at Berat Castle and consider that it is essential that details of the scheme are submitted to the Advisory Bodies for assessment before any work is started.

They consider that there is a need to continue efforts in developing sustainable tourism in Berat and strongly recommend that the State Party carry forth these same efforts in

Gjirokastra. In general, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies express concern that less attention is given to safeguarding of the values of Gjirokastra than to those of Berat.

Overall, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are deeply concerned with the state of conservation of the property and therefore recommend that a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission take place to assess the overall state of conservation of the property, progress in its management and whether the criteria for the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger are met.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.82

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.87**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Expresses its great concern regarding the lack of control for illegal constructions and regrets that a long-term plan has not been established to rectify the violations that have already occurred in order to improve the value and integrity of the property;*
4. *Also expresses its concern that no progress is being made to introduce a programme for archaeological interventions in case of implementation of major restoration, as well as for the lack of an agreed overall fire response plan for the entirety of the property;*
5. *Recognises the efforts made to develop a tourism plan in Berat which aims to support the needs of the local community within the framework of the management plan and also expresses its great concern that no such plan has been developed for Gjirokastra;*
6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to urgently put in place an agreed action plan and timescale to address the current ones and prevent any further violations;*
7. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to develop and implement detailed and appropriate monitoring indicators related to the attributes which carry the Outstanding Universal Value of the property based on detailed inventories;*
8. *Notes the intentions of the State Party to carry out a major restoration project at Berat Castle and requests the State Party to provide details to the World Heritage Centre, for assessment by the Advisory Bodies, before any work commences;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the overall state of conservation of the property, progress in its management and whether the criteria for the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger are met;*
10. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a progress report on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

83. Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.105; 32 COM 7B.81; 33 COM 7B.88

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2009: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressure, high-rise projects;
- b) hydroelectric power station Salzburg-Lehen;
- c) Train station project outside the buffer zone.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/784>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report in response to Decision **33 COM 7B.88** that reflected the concerns of the 2009 World Heritage Centre /ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission, related to new developments not respecting the existing urban scale and historic patterns, and to the need to strengthen the coordinated management systems.

a) Hydroelectric power station environmental and cultural assessment

The State Party reports that the Environmental and Cultural Assessment for the hydroelectric power station was prepared and submitted to the World Heritage Centre in 2010. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies do not consider that the assessment is sufficient and adequate as it does not address the potential impact of the proposed upstream power station on the left bank of the river Salzach, on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Instead, the impact assessment describes changes to the river course and its banks over time. The State Party without having received the evaluation of the heritage assessment by the the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies has already begun construction.

b) Integrated approach towards management

The State Party reports that several areas where systematic coordination needs to be improved have been identified. These include nature protection, railway law and general questions concerning traffic. The State Party reports that ICOMOS Austria, at the 6th Austrian World Heritage Sites conference in October 2010, proposed the creation of a unitary consultation mechanism to improve communication. Representatives of the property welcomed the proposed creation of coordination roundtables with representatives of the federal state and the province. The State Party reports that once such an enhanced coordination mechanism is in place, a revision of the management plan will be considered.

c) *Other issues*

The State Party report includes information on a variety of projects that are either in progress, or planned, at 33 locations within the boundaries of the property and in the surrounding historic town centre, including the train station. These projects are supervised by the Federal Office for Protection of Historical Monuments; the Expert Commission for the Preservation of the Old Town and experts from the City of Salzburg. It remains, however, unclear whether or not Environmental Impact Assessments have been carried out for any of these current or pending projects, as called for in 2009 by Paragraph 5 of Decision **33 COM 7B.88**.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the state of conservation report submitted by the State Party deals only superficially with the range of issues identified during the 2009 reactive monitoring mission and, in particular, does not include references to any detailed progress regarding the mission recommendations. No specific progress has been made concerning the strengthening of the management system and the updating of the management plan. Furthermore, it is not clear whether the impact of the numerous on-going projects on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been formally assessed. The impact assessment for the Power Station submitted in January 2010 is not sufficient as it does not address potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value in a structured way. As it is understood that some work has started, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that a formal impact assessment needs to be undertaken and submitted as soon as possible to the World Heritage Centre, for evaluation by the Advisory Bodies.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.83

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.88** adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Acknowledges the State Party's efforts to establish clear mechanisms for a coordinated and integrated approach among all decision-making entities and requests the State Party to take the lead in establishing coordination roundtables;*
4. *Notes with concern that only few recommendations of the 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission have been addressed and reiterates its request to the State Party to take steps towards implementing all the mission recommendations;*
5. *Regrets that the submitted impact assessment for the hydroelectric power station did not contain sufficient information to assess the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and urges the State Party to submit as soon as possible a heritage impact assessment to the World Heritage Centre based on the ICOMOS Guidance for Heritage Impact Assessment for World Heritage cultural properties;*
6. *Notes the range of projects under way within the boundaries of the World Heritage property and in the surrounding historic town centre and also requests the State Party to undertake heritage impact assessments as necessary and, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, provide information on major development projects*

that might impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in line with the ICOMOS Guidance mentioned in paragraph 5 above;

7. Reiterates its request to the State Party to revise the draft management plan as stated in the Decision **33 COM 7B.88**;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

84. World Heritage properties of Vienna

- **Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786)**
- **Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

Vienna: 2001
Schönbrunn: 1996

Criteria

Vienna: (ii) (iv) (vi)
Schönbrunn: (i) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

Vienna: **32 COM 7B.82; 33 COM 7B.89; 34 COM 7B.76**
Schönbrunn: **32 COM 7B.83; 33 COM 7B.90; 34 COM 7B.76**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission to the "Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn"

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) High-rise construction projects of Central Vienna ;
- b) High-rise construction project of Vienna Main Train Station.

Illustrative material

Vienna: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1033>
Schönbrunn: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/786>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the Historic Centre of Vienna and the Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn in response to Decision **34 COM 7B.76**. This report includes considerable illustrative additions to the 2010 Visual Impact Study for the two World Heritage properties with regard to the potential impact

of the projects “Vienna Main Station” and “Kometgründe” on the Outstanding Universal Value of the properties.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that it has been possible to create some supplementary views in winter, but not the previously suggested views by night, or from upper level vantage points.

a) Kometgründe-Meidling project

The report states that if the Kometgründe office project is implemented, its height will be maintained at 60 metres in accordance with decisions taken by the Vienna Advisory Board for Urban Planning and Urban Design on 20 October 2010, and the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee.

b) High-rise construction projects in Central Vienna

Forum Schönbrunn project in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property “Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn”: The State Party is of the opinion that this project integrates well with the surrounding Gründerzeit buildings with regard to its height and scale and that its future silhouette would not impact the World Heritage property. However, according to the information submitted by the State Party this project seems to contrast sharply with its surroundings both in scale and style. According to the Federal Ministry for Education, Art and Culture the buffer zone is not subject to increased legal protection. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have not been informed about this project at a planning stage.

Vocational Horticultural School Schönbrunn: The construction of an additional wing to the boarding school is considered compatible with the World Heritage status of Schönbrunn by the State Party. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have not been informed about this project at a planning stage.

Monte Laa: According to the development plan of 2010, this project comprises the construction of three high-rise buildings of 65, 100 and 110 m. Since they are situated over six kilometres south of Vienna’s city centre and therefore not visible from the city centre, the State Party considers that this project will not interfere with the World Heritage status. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies agree with this assessment despite the project’s considerable impact on the skyline of Vienna in general.

Urban development along Danube Canal: The State Party is currently erecting a Raiffeisen high-rise building of 78 metres immediately outside of the buffer zone of the “Historic Centre of Vienna” in an area that already features a considerable number of skyscrapers of comparable height. The height of the planned building was reduced further to the initiative of the City of Vienna to ensure compatibility with the World Heritage status.

The *Marillentalm* project situated in the vicinity of Schönbrunn Gardens will not be implemented.

c) High-rise construction project of Vienna Main Train Station

The State Party report contains extensive information about developments at the Vienna Main Train Station project. This project envisages a new station complex and a new urban quarter with offices and flats and ancillary service buildings for 30,000 people. This development is based on a Master Plan adopted by the City Council of Vienna in 2004. It is constantly being re-evaluated in response to the changing conditions and new designs. All newly proposed high-rise buildings are evaluated for their impact on the adjacent Historic Centre of Vienna. The development is divided into sections which are proceeding at a different pace. The high rise sections nearest the historic centre are:

High-rise site Main Station – SEESTE: According to the current planning, several buildings up to 60 m height will be erected. A zoning and development plan for the area could be prepared in 2011, once the impact studies have been completed. Works are scheduled to begin in 2013 at the earliest.

High-rise site Main Station – Erste Campus: The project consists of several buildings subdivided into partly curving sections with building heights from approximately 26 m to over 50 m. The impact assessments have been completed. The State Party states that the silhouette of Belvedere Palace is respected. The zoning and development plan was adopted in June 2010 and construction is to commence in 2011.

InterCity section of Main Station: The State Party reports that the architects Jabornegg & Palffy have re-designed this sector. The two proposed high-rises deviate from the former Master Plan with regard to their location and design: with heights of approx. 55 m and 60 m respectively, they correspond to the planning zones. The State Party informs that the modified high-rise locations are to be evaluated and surveyed. Once this has been done, a zoning and development plan is to be prepared. Work could start in 2012.

High-rise site Main Station – Österreichische Bundesbahnen (ÖBB) corporate headquarters and lot A.01: The State Party reports that the proposed development in this area corresponds to the approved Master Plan. After evaluating the project for potential effects on the World Heritage site, a corresponding zoning and development plan was drafted and adopted in June 2010. According to the State Party, work will start in autumn 2011.

Regarding the planned development of the Main Station some of the proposed changes in design will increase the overall size of the development and in some cases the height. In December 2010 the Vienna District decided to amend the existing Master Plan so as to increase the total floor space of office buildings by some 6,000 square metres, which will result in an increase in height of the office buildings.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the project *Marillenalme* will not be implemented.

Concerning the Main Station project, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that it will be essential to ensure that impact assessments are adequately carried out for all amended structures. In this context, it is essential that visual impact studies are undertaken from eye level within key places of the property, such as the windows of the museums in both the Lower and Upper Belvedere as well as from far views. Night-time views are also needed, as previously requested. In all cases the details recorded for the images should ensure replicability. In order to provide reassurance that all appropriate views have been considered, there is a need to provide a list of key areas within the property from which views have been considered. Reassurance is needed that in particular the following will not be impaired:

Views from:

- the Lower Belvedere Palace and its Gardens;
- the western entrance to the Upper Belvedere Palace from the Prinz-Eugen-Strasse concealed in;
- the windows of the Austrian Gallery of the Upper Belvedere Palace Museum.

Views to:

- the South across the ornamental pond.

It should be ensured that the two high-rise towers at the entrance to the Main Railway Station (Südtirolerplatz and ÖBB Headquarters) will not be visible from inside the area of the Belvedere Palace and its Gardens.

From the building plans received Forum Schönbrunn appears to have a stronger impact on the Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn than is described in the State Party report.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that future impact assessments should be undertaken in line with ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties to ensure that impact on Outstanding Universal Value is specifically considered.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.84

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **33 COM 7B.89**; **33 COM 7B.90** and **34 COM 7B.76**, adopted at its 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions respectively,*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party in addition to the 2010 visual impact study;*
4. *Notes that the Kometgründe project will, if implemented, be carried out according to the request of the World Heritage Committee made at its 34th session (Brasília, 2010) and requests the State Party to inform it of any decisions taken in this regard;*
5. *Also requests the State Party, given the multiplicity of development projects in the properties, their buffer zones and beyond, to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the properties to assess:*
 - a) *the proposed changes in the design of Vienna Main Station,*
 - b) *the potential impact of new developments on the properties,*
 - c) *the integrity of views from within key places of the properties;*
6. *Further requests the State Party, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to inform the World Heritage Centre of any additional major urban development projects as well as amendments to current projects that may adversely impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the properties;*
7. *Urges the State Party to ensure that future impact assessments consider impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and conform with ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties;*
8. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the properties and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

85. Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh (Belarus) (C 1196)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2005

Criteria
(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
29 COM 8B.34; 33 COM 7B.93; 34 COM 7B.78

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
February 2010: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Demolition and rebuilding of the Eastern Gallery of the Complex;
- b) Lack of updated management plan including policy for restoration, conservation and renewal works;
- c) Insufficient number of national specialists in conservation and restoration;
- d) Lack of appropriate planning measures.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1196>

Current conservation issues

In its report, submitted on 31 January 2011, the State Party indicated progress on the updating of the management plan, the development of a conservation approach, the “musealisation” of the Palace and Park Ensemble, the staff increase of conservation specialists, and the protection of the town’s urban landscape.

a) Updating of the management plan

In 2010, the management plan was modified in response to the request made by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). The changes concern the staffing of the Management Commission of the Nesvizh properties in addition to the conservation works of the Palace and Park Ensemble, on the basis of a project approved by the Ministry of Culture in March 2010. The State Party reports that the Belarusian Scientific and Methodological Council of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Belarus, and the Belarus and Poland Consultative Commission on the Preservation of History and Cultural Heritage, provided advice. In addition, the Expert group met in Nesvizh on 4 October 2010 to discuss restoration and conservation problems, issues of authenticity, and concerns related to the use of the site.

b) Development of a conservation approach

In response to the request of the Committee to develop an overall conservation plan before proposals were drawn up for the installation of heating and restoration of Corpus Christi Church, the State Party describes the research and design work that has been undertaken and notes that the planned conservation works carried out in the Church had included

technical investigations of the building's structure; geological-engineering research of the Church's adjoining territory; drawings of the church, and photofixing of modern conditions; physical and chemical research of the building materials and painting, and the development of an investment project. A number of future conservation actions are planned, including restoration of the roof; reconstruction of the balcony; creation of graphic images of lost architectural elements; organisation of a drainage system for rainfall and reduction of groundwater intake; installation of a louvered opening in the upper reaches of the church for ventilation; and the introduction of a heating system.

c) *"Musealisation" of the Palace and Park Ensemble*

To enhance the authenticity of the property, the Committee encouraged the State Party to explore the possibility of reinstating documented original furnishings of the former residence of the Radziwill and original paintings from Nesvizh. Further to the 2008 approval by the Board of the Ministry of Culture of Belarus of the Plan for Musealisation of the Palace and Park Ensemble, the National History and Culture Museum-Reserve "Nesvizh" and the National Art Museum of the Republic of Belarus, have developed a joint plan for particular artefacts through long-term deposit arrangements and joint exhibitions. Additionally, the Radziwill Family has donated a number of artworks from the Nesvizh collection to the Museum-Reserve and, since 2007, the Museum-Reserve itself has been actively acquiring artworks for the collection.

d) *Increase of staff conservation specialists*

The Department of Protection of Historical and Cultural Heritage and Restoration was encouraged by the Committee to increase its staff of specialists in conservation, restoration and documentation. Progressive actions to do so include the preparation of a bill on the protection of the cultural heritage of Belarus that will enable the introduction of specialists into the Museum-Reserve's staff; the introduction of a state programme to help create professional services on heritage protection; and the establishment of the Department of Scientific and Methodological Work on the Protection of History and Cultural Heritage and Restoration.

e) *Protection of the town's urban landscape*

The State Party was encouraged by the Committee to adopt planning measures to protect the urban landscape of Nesvizh. The Nesvizh General Plan approved in 2007 provides special rules and restrictions on the use and development of the centre of Nesvizh and its buffer zone. The report does not provide sufficient information in order to review whether or not the authorities developed and adopted additional planning measures to the existing 2007 Nesvizh General Plan.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the significant efforts of the State Party in the implementation of the World Heritage Committee decisions. They also took note of important government financial support allocated for the restoration of the Corpus Christi Catholic Church.

They note that no conservation plan for the Corpus Christi Catholic Church has been submitted as requested by the Committee, before work on the heating system was undertaken.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party did not provide sufficient information in order to review whether or not the authorities developed and adopted additional planning measures in order to protect the urban landscape of the town of Nesvizh and prevent the construction of new buildings that could have an impact on the historic centre and the visual integrity of the property.

They encourage the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre detailed documents regarding the additional planning measures, the restoration project progress of Corpus Christi Catholic Church, and any other relevant information in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.85

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.78** adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Acknowledges the efforts pursued by the State Party in the implementation of the World Heritage Committee decisions and, in particular, the updating of the management plan of the property;
4. Notes the information provided on conservation work planned for the Corpus Christi Catholic Church, but reiterates its request to develop a conservation plan before further major interventions, and in particular the installation of a heating system;
5. Also reiterates its request to the State Party to adopt appropriate planning measures, in order to protect the urban landscape of the town of Nesvizh and prevent the construction of new buildings that could have an impact on the historic centre and the visual integrity of the property;
6. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a progress report on the state of conservation of the property, including documents regarding the conservation plan for the Corpus Christi Catholic Church, the additional planning measures and any information in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines.

86. Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2005

Criterion
(vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 7B.85; 33 COM 7B.95; 34 COM 7B.80

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 44,960 for Emergency and Technical assistance.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 190,000.

Previous monitoring missions

2006: ICOMOS mission; 2007: UNESCO/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; 2008: ICCROM/ICOMOS expert mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Construction of a hotel in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property, not in conformity with provisions of the Master Plan, which was part of the management plan included in the nomination file;
- b) Cracks appearing on the surface of the old bridge.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/946>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, including drawings of the proposed reconstruction of the Ruža Hotel and the information on the monitoring of cracks in the bridge, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010).

a) Construction of a hotel in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property

According to the report of the State Party, the design of the hotel has been modified to take into account the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). Modifications include the removal of a covered roof-top bar and seating area. It should be noted, that the current design still maintains a swimming pool on the roof as well as several small constructions to allow for a number of stairways to the roof both to access the pool and to serve as fire escapes, as required by law.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that this present redesign meets the conditions set out by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session. It will, however, be necessary to monitor the implementation of the work to ensure that the final construction sticks to the agreed upon limits at the roof level.

b) Cracks in the surface of the bridge

In compliance with Committee decisions, the State Party has undertaken a number of activities for structural monitoring of the bridge including:

- A visual survey of all areas of the bridge was carried out in accordance with the international standards;
- Investigation using 3D laser scanning technology was carried out to compare the current condition of the bridge with a previous laser scan;
- A new system of reference points was put in place for future monitoring efforts.

Some of these activities were carried out with funding from International Assistance.

In addition, there was an attempt to reactivate the structural monitoring system that was put in place at the time of the construction of the bridge. It was found that while some of the embedded sensors were still active, others had ceased to function and it was not considered viable to reactivate or replace them.

According to the preliminary result of the monitoring in 2010 the overall deformation of the bridge is minor. Nevertheless, baseline data has now been established for ongoing monitoring of the deformations of the bridge. The current data will continue to be analyzed and ongoing monitoring will be continued.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress being made by the State Party in the area of structural monitoring of the bridge and stress the need for ongoing monitoring to ensure that the cracking does not deteriorate over time.

c) Other issues

In addition to the two areas for which the World Heritage Committee has asked specific information, the State Party also provided some additional information in regard to the implementation of the management plan and the conservation and repair work to a number of the historic buildings in the old City of Mostar.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the two main issues for which this property has been included within the state of conservation process are being dealt with in a satisfactory manner by the State Party. At present, it is necessary only to ensure, through ongoing monitoring, that the hotel construction stays within the established recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and that the structural monitoring of the bridge be continued in an ongoing manner.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.86

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.80**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Also recalling the results and recommendations of the 2006 ICOMOS mission, of the 2007 UNESCO/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and the 2008 ICCROM/ICOMOS expert mission,*
4. *Notes that the State Party has instituted ongoing monitoring activities for the structural stability of the bridge;*
5. *Also notes that the redesign of the Ruža Hotel conforms to the decision of the World Heritage Committee adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) and requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, final documentation on the Ruža Hotel at the completion of construction, to ensure that the hotel, as built, is in compliance with the Decision of the World Heritage Committee;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and in particular on the status of the structural monitoring and the construction of the Ruža Hotel.*

87. Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria) (C 217)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late finalization of the mission report)

88. Historic Centre of Český Krumlov (Czech Republic) (C 617)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1992

Criterion

(iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.83; 31 COM 7B.109; 33 COM 7B.97

International Assistance

Total amount allocated to the property: Emergency Assistance (USD 50,000) in 2003 for the restoration of the Historic Centre of Prague and the Historic Centre of Český Krumlov which were severely damaged by the floods of August 2002.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2005: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Revolving theatre located in the castle garden

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/617>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, providing highly detailed information on current state of conservation issues identified by the national authorities, and responding to the requests for removal of the revolving theatre from its site in the Cesky Krumlov castle garden.

The State Party indicates that, in compliance with the applicable legislation and in particular the Land Use Planning Act and Building Act, the revolving theatre issue may not be resolved before 2015. The State Party reports that, on 27 March 2010, the Municipal Assembly approved the application to draft amendment No 1 to the Land Use Plan that is currently subject to a public consultation. The amendment includes, among others, provision for an alternative location of an open-air theatre with a revolving amphitheatre, in the "former garden centre behind the castle garden". No further details about this new theatre location and its exact position or an impact assessment have been provided by the State Party, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).

a) *Date for dismantling the existing theatre structure*

The State Party informs that the deadline for the use of the existing revolving theatre structure has been extended to 30 September 2015, and that a new lease agreement was

signed between the national authority administering the property and the owner of the revolving theatre, on 7 and 13 July 2010. The lease agreement is valid until 31 December 2015. No further dates regarding the dismantling of the theatre, or the rehabilitation of affected areas into their original condition, have been provided.

b) *Use of the property for open-air theatre activities*

The State Party reiterates its plans to continue using the current location of the revolving theatre for open-air cultural activities after the physical removal of the existing structure, maintaining that these new festivities will not impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property.

c) *Impact of the revolving theatre*

The State Party reports that two studies assessing the impact of the revolving theatre were prepared and discussed during the May 2010 International Seminar dedicated to the issue and involving ICOMOS/IFLA (International Federation of Landscape Architects) experts and relevant national authorities. The final ICOMOS/IFLA Seminar report of 2 June 2010 concluded that the revolving theatre has a negative impact on the authenticity and integrity of the castle garden, and a negative visual impact on the garden structure. Consequently, the State Party has indicated that it will undertake a prospective study taking into account the Seminar conclusions and the outcomes of the studies.

The State Party further indicates that, as a result of the global crisis and the subsequent restriction of public funding, the scheduled removal of the current theatre structure, its replacement with a new structure at a different site, and the use of the current site for open-air cultural events, may be limited due to budgetary constraints.

d) *Management plan*

The State Party reports that Phase I of the management plan, involving supporting materials and initial analysis, was implemented in 2009. A long-term phase II was defined in 2010 and this will have, as its main output, an electronic tool to be used in the further development of the management plan.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend elaborating a Draft Statement of OUV, to be used as the basis for the further development of the management plan.

e) *Other conservation issues*

The State Party also provides information on other current conservation issues identified by the national authorities. In particular, these concern monument protection, legislation and zoning. Amongst other initiatives, the report informs on emerging difficulties regarding the continued adoption of traditional lime-based façade repair materials, and a number of pending major restoration projects in the historic centre including the revitalisation of two monasteries for use as a contemporary cultural and educational services complex, and the construction of a road tunnel and bridge across the Vltava river, located in the buffer zone. According to Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the report further includes details of a range of other works and new buildings in the protected area.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies commend the efforts by the State Party in the conservation of the Historic Centre and the Castle, including the work on the preparation of the management plan. However, regarding the adoption of Phase II of the plan, there is some concern over the large number of current and pending restoration projects that is being embarked upon without the intended management tools being in place.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies underline that detailed information about any existing projects regarding development works in the protected area of the property should be submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre, for its review by the Advisory Bodies.

They also remain very concerned about the unresolved issue of the revolving theatre, especially in view of the extension of use and its delayed removal until 2015. As the impact of the revolving theatre on the integrity and authenticity of the castle garden was initially confirmed by ICOMOS mission in 2005, and more recently in the 2010 ICOMOS/IFLA Seminar report, and as recognised in the State Party report, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies strongly recommend that the State Party immediately doubles its efforts in implementing the previous World Heritage Committee's decisions; which otherwise could lead to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger by the World Heritage Committee.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.88

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.97**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Recognises the efforts of the State Party to ensure the protection of the property and the progress being made in the drafting of the site management plan and encourages it to continue these efforts in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
4. *Requests the State Party in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, for examination by the World Heritage Committee, as a further basis for the elaboration of the management plan;*
5. *Urges the State Party to continue ensuring that all current and pending restoration projects use appropriately specified traditional lime technologies, and building elements, consistent with those historically adopted;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to inform and seek views from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, prior to decisions being taken, on any emerging proposals regarding the intention to rebuild the bus station and to construct a vehicular tunnel and bridge in the buffer zone;*
7. *Deeply regrets that the State Party has not respected the time schedule for dismantling the revolving theatre as laid out in Decision **33 COM 7B.97**, and that the use of the revolving theatre at its current location has been extended until 2015;*
8. *Strongly urges the State Party to speed up the process of dismantling the revolving theatre and rehabilitating the affected area, and reiterates its request to the State Party to submit the detailed project for the final location of the new theatre and an impact assessment on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties;*

9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the requests above, including a detailed plan and schedule for the relocation of the revolving theatre and mitigation of all its negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

89. Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1992

Criteria
(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 7B.86; 33 COM 7B.96; 34 COM 7B.82

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 50,000 for Emergency Assistance in 2003 (floods).

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
March 2008, January 2010: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Development of high rise constructions on the Pankrác plain;
b) Lack of effectiveness of existing planning, management and conservation measures for the property.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/616>

Current conservation issues

In conformity with Decision **34 COM 7B.82** following the report of the reactive monitoring mission on the Historic Centre of Prague in January 2010, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 4 February 2011.

a) The Blanka Tunnel and traffic proposals

The World Heritage Committee urged the implementation of the mission's recommendations, particularly those relating to the Blanka Tunnel. The recommendations concerned ensuring the downgrading of the Eastern Highway, halting the proposed tunnel behind the National Museum, and removing sections of the Eastern Highway from the eastern edge of the property.

The State Party's report is very extensive, but it reports little practical achievement in relation to these recommendations. It attempts to reassess the grade of the Eastern Highway, but only once 'the missing parts of the main communications network are completed' (for which no target time is given), traffic is reduced in the city centre and on the north-south highway (so-called), and the north-south highway is converted into an urban boulevard. With regards to the tunnel 'currently no action [is] taking place', but the proposal still stands in place. There is no specific plan to remove sections of the Eastern highway from the edge of the property.

b) Heights controls

The World Heritage Committee also requested the completion of a 'high-rise limitations plan'. The State Party responded on different levels. It explains that there are existing high-rise limitations, which are controlled through land use planning regulations in conformity with 'monument care targets' in the Historic Centre and buffer zone. A new draft Land use plan is currently under preparation. Public feedback "from public proceedings related to the draft of the new Land use plan" is currently under evaluation. Yet to be established is a final draft and yet to be obtained are comments and an approval from 'the respective bodies of the City of Prague'. A timeframe for achieving this cannot yet be specified.

To short-circuit this process, a proposal for high-rise limitation has been proposed as an amendment to the existing Land use plan, and was publicly exhibited from September to November of 2010. The aim is to have legally binding controls in operation during 2011.

c) Clarification of regulations

The World Heritage Centre further sought clarification of the regulations currently applied to infill, reconstruction, rehabilitation and conservation works. It appears that these matters are controlled by the current Land use plan. Some explanatory materials have been issued for public use, and two new handbooks have been proposed. However, the information supplied by the State Party is insufficient and therefore these issues still remain unclarified.

d) Historic Railway stations

The World Heritage Committee also had requested that the World Heritage Centre be kept informed on major development proposals, especially at Visegrad and Zitkov stations. The State Party provides a general description of ongoing proposals for these two sites, yet this description is not sufficient for assessing their adequacy.

e) Charles Bridge

The World Heritage Committee, after regretting the improper restoration of the Charles Bridge, had requested that future works be based upon detailed assessment and documentation, and be executed by skilled craftspeople and conservators. The State Party's proposals are substantially in accordance with these requirements.

f) Průhonice Park

The World Heritage Committee also had urged for the protection of Průhonice Park. The State Party reports that the park is now subject to the highest possible protection, and that documentation regarding conservation and promotion measures is in preparation.

Conclusion

On the basis of the information provided, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies consider that satisfactory measures have been taken or are in progress with regards to the Charles Bridge and Průhonice Park. However, a number of the remaining recommendations from the January 2010 reactive monitoring mission have not been satisfactorily addressed, including but not limited to the height controls, development proposals around the railway stations, the Blanka Tunnel and the Eastern Highway.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.89

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.82**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Commends the conservation measures which have been taken in relation to the Charles Bridge as well as improvement regarding the legislative protection of Průhonice Park;
4. Expresses its concern that the recommendations from the January 2010 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission have not all been satisfactorily addressed, particularly those applying to limitations on high-rise development, measures affecting the Blanka Tunnel and the Eastern Highway, development proposals for Visegrad and Zitkov stations as well as regulations currently applying to infill, reconstruction, rehabilitation and conservation remain unclear; and urges the State Party to address these issues;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a progress report on the abovementioned regulations and measures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

90. Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia) (C 822)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.95; 32 COM 7B.87; 33 COM 7B.99

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 14,600 for training assistance (1998)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 4,279 for an expert mission in December 2005 (Italian Funds-in-Trust)

Previous monitoring missions

December 2005: upon request of Estonian national authorities, World Heritage Centre expert mission to Tallinn

January 2010: upon request of Estonian national authorities, ICOMOS technical advisory mission to Tallinn

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of an integrated management plan;
- b) Extension to Viru Hotel;
- c) Development of the Skoone Bastion;
- d) Construction of new buildings adjacent to the Town Wall between Suurtüki and Rannamäe Streets;
- e) Impact of the transportation of hazardous materials to the Old Town;
- f) Framework for high-rise buildings.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/822>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 1 February 2011. The report addresses three key issues, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session:

a) Progress made in implementing the management plan/system

The State Party report explains that a comprehensive development plan (“Development Plan of Tallinn Old Town” for 2008-2013) had been prepared instead of a comprehensive management plan, as the Estonian judicial system does not recognize management plans, and that there had been no clear understanding of the requirements of a management plan. Following review of the Development Plan by the World Heritage Committee in 2009, the State Party notes that the existing development framework will be refocused to become a document based on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property. The structure and timetable for the preparation of this management plan was included as an annex to the State Party report, which envisages its approval by December 2011.

In addition, the State Party considers that the current management system for the property is adequate, and has become an example for heritage protection in other Estonian cities.

b) Results of the technical advisory mission

The State Party report addresses the key recommendations of the January 2010 ICOMOS technical advisory mission. A Management Committee for the Tallinn World Heritage property was established on 8 September 2010. It includes representatives of the state, the municipality of Tallinn, the Union of Estonian Architects, the Estonian National Commission for UNESCO, etc. Its purpose is to provide an open forum for the preservation and development of the property and to monitor the preparation of the management plan.

- A Nordic-Baltic workshop for preparation of draft retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV) resulted in a draft SOUV for Tallinn Old Town, to provide the basis for the management plan. The draft SOUV was submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre together with the state of conservation report.
- Concerning the Thematic Plan, “The Location of High-Rise Buildings in Tallinn”, the mission considered that it was not entirely in conformity with the protection of the setting of the World Heritage property. The already completed high-rise buildings in the Maakri district, just outside of the buffer zone, were considered by the mission to impact adversely on the views to/from the Old Tallinn. The mission also considered that the construction of any of the approved 130-metre high-rises in the area could impact adversely on the visual integrity of the property.
- However, the State Party report states that the Thematic Plan ensures that no high-rise buildings will be built within the property or in the buffer zone, and that the silhouette of the Old Town will dominate from the sea and from fixed key viewpoints within the town. The report further notes that the Maakri district, in a wider setting (designated in the late

90s as the new Tallinn City and for high-rise developments and where high-rise buildings have been built) is far enough from the Old Town, in order for its structures not to have a negative impact on the silhouette of the Old Town.

A number of the conclusions of the mission are not addressed by the State Party report. These include:

- The resolution concerning treatment of vacant plots in Old Tallinn, agreed at the 2002 Tallinn international conference on “Alternatives to Historical Reconstruction in UNESCO World Heritage Cities”. The elements of that resolution concerning the principles to be observed in managing archaeological remains, new constructions and the designing of detailed plans within the area are still relevant today and should be included in the comprehensive management plan.
- The work on the preservation of the urban historic wooden areas within the buffer zone, including implementation of the approved environmental (milieu) plans, should be supported.

c) *Work in progress*

The State Party report notes that the Heritage Conservation Act is currently under revision to ensure involvement of qualified and licensed professionals not just for work on national monuments but for all structures within the World Heritage property, and that a full time archaeologist is now working within the Cultural Heritage Department, to assist in archaeological investigation and in monitoring repair work in the Old Town.

Finally, the State Party lists major restoration works underway including several towers and other elements of the city's defence system, such as the former cannon tower Kiek in de Kök.

The State Party report does not address the proposed construction of a new city administration building. However, in January 2011 ICOMOS reviewed plans for this building, set in the buffer zone, which had been previously submitted by the State Party. While ICOMOS believes that a building on this site could reinforce the city's urban fabric, the documentation supplied for the architectural competition did not provide sufficient information concerning the boundaries of the World Heritage property or its buffer zone or specify the importance of respecting the property's Outstanding Universal Value. As the new building would change views from the sea towards the Old Town and the urban structures in front of the Old Town, ICOMOS recommends that a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment be carried out to assess its impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that good progress appears to have been made to develop a comprehensive management plan, to prepare a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and to establish a Management Committee. They support the suggestion made in the mission report to include the key points of the resolution of the 2002 conference on “Alternatives to Historical Reconstruction in UNESCO World Heritage Cities” in the comprehensive management plan. The State Party and the ICOMOS mission reports do not agree on the degree to which certain parts of the Thematic Plan “The Location of High-Rise Buildings in Tallinn” offer protection for the setting of the Old Town and its key views and silhouettes.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would like to reiterate the recommendation made in the state of conservation report presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session, that the Development/Management Plan should provide the

over-arching framework for regulations on high-rise buildings. There is a need to ensure that the Thematic Plan supports the Management Plan based on the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note receipt of information concerning major new restoration works underway and underline that the State Party should submit detailed plans for all constructions which might have an impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. They further recommend use of *ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties* to assess the potential impact of new constructions (including the proposed new city administration building) on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.90

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **31 COM 7B.95**, **32 COM 7B.87** and **33 COM 7B.99** adopted at its 31st (Christchurch, 2007), 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes progress in developing a comprehensive management plan, in preparing a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and in establishing a Management Committee for the property;*
4. *Recommends that the State Party include the key points of the resolution of the 2002 Conference held in Tallinn on "Alternatives to Historical Reconstruction in UNESCO World Heritage Cities" in the comprehensive management plan based on the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide information concerning major new restoration works mentioned in its report of 1 February 2011, which might have an impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to prepare a cultural heritage impact assessment, in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessment for World Heritage Cultural Properties, to assess potential impact of the proposed new city administration building on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a progress report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above.*

91. Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay (France) (C 80bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(i)(iii)(vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

34 COM 7B.83

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Development pressures
- b) Environmental constraints
- c) Natural disasters (earthquakes, wind storms (1987 and 1999), earth slides)
- d) Tourism/ visitor pressure (including the intensification of fish/shell industries and pasture in the bay)
- e) Problems related to the presentation of the site: Car parking at the foot of the Mount, sign posts
- f) potential impact of wind turbines on the landscape setting of the property

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/80>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, the State Party submitted a detailed report on issues relating to the potential impact of wind turbines on the landscape setting of the World Heritage property, as well as on its state of conservation and management.

a) *Potential impact of wind turbines on the landscape setting of the World Heritage property*

The State Party informs that no wind turbine or any area of wind power development has been authorized or is planned within the perimeter of the property or in the buffer zone. It further informs that the French authorities launched a forward-looking reflection on the modalities of heritage protection which notably took into account the construction of wind turbines. This led, in 2007, to the creation of an additional perimeter of protection around the Mont-Saint-Michel, "an area of landscape influence", which extends beyond the buffer zone and takes into account the panoramas of distant visibility towards the Mount. According to the report, this area of landscape influence aims not only to eliminate the risk of co-visibility nuisances, but also to reestablish Mont-Saint-Michel in its environment, in the broadest sense. The area of influence takes into account all the places where the view of Mont-Saint-Michel participates in the total landscape and comprises two distinct registers: 1) an area of total exclusion, where no wind turbines are authorized; 2) a calculated area of exclusion, in which projects must demonstrate their lack of impact. The area of landscape influence will be integrated into the regional wind turbine plan that is being developed in Brittany, and is already included in the Manche Department Wind Turbine Scheme.

In its report, the State Party also reports on the approved and refused wind-power projects and wind turbine development zones, as well as those being considered in and beyond the area of influence. It also provides information on the height and distance of the turbines from Mont-Saint-Michel. The State Party informs that only one wind turbine development zone has been authorized in the Vallée de la Sée, in December 2009, within the perimeter of the calculated exclusion area. Of the 15 wind-power projects, three have been granted building permits, including two in the Ille-et-Villaine Department and beyond the area of landscape influence (including six 125-metre-high turbines, built at Trémeheuc at a distance of 23 km and at a height perceived, according to the State Party's report, at 6 mm from Mont-St-Michel, and another at Coglès, which, according to the report, collapsed) and one in the Manche Department, municipality of Argouges (comprising three wind turbines at 20 km from the property, and of a height of 100 m to the blade tips). The latter is located at the edge of the area of influence and is not yet built.

In additional information received on 11 March 2011, the State Party indicates that, given the extensive features of the area of landscape influence and the type of wind turbines authorized and their location, the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is not threatened. The report submitted on 1 February 2011 also mentions that a retrospective evaluation of the approved project for the municipality of Argouges (3 turbines) shows that the current ability to better analyze the wind-power projects would probably lead to the refusal of these turbines. However, the State Party undertakes to ensure, during the preparation of all new cases, as well as during the defence of pending litigation, to take greater account of the visual area of influence of the Mont-Saint- Michel.

The World Heritage Centre continues to receive numerous letters from civil society concerned with the management of the property and the visual impacts of wind projects affecting it, including the possible construction of four wind turbines in the commune of Tremblay outside the area of landscape influence. However, the State Party confirms that this project was refused. Media inquiries on this subject are also very numerous.

b) Protection and management of Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay

The report of the State Party indicates the work accomplished in the context of Operation Grand Site (OGS) as well as the work involved with the project to restore the maritime character of Mont-St-Michel, and informs that future parking lots, welcome facilities and shuttle operation buildings are being constructed. The overall project, and each of its components, will receive particular attention from all stakeholders. The project has received funding of 164 million Euros to date and should be completed in 2014. In addition, the report highlights some difficulties with protection and management consultation and coordination of the property related to different administrative responsibilities: 2 departments, 2 regions and 2 ministries, and which would have blocked the proposed extension of protection for the entire Bay. The report repeatedly stresses the importance of designating a Regional Coordinator Prefect for the entire Bay of Mont-Saint-Michel.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies encourage the State Party to continue its efforts towards concerted management of the entire property. In this regard, they recall the results of the 2005 periodic report concerning the lack of a management plan in force for the entire property, as well as the lack of a timetable for implementation of the measure relating to the establishment of a Committee for interregional monitoring. The same report also indicated that the protective measures of the property are insufficient.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the view of the State Party that the authorized wind turbines do not affect the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. However, they consider that there could be a potential visual impact of these projects on the landscape setting of the property and propose that a reactive monitoring mission be carried out to examine the prevailing logic in defining the overall context for a better understanding of the impact of wind turbines on the OUV of the property.

They recommend that the State Party prepare, firstly, a draft Retrospective Statement of OUV that will enable the identification of its attributes.

Regarding the management of the property, it was recommended that a management plan based on the OUV be initiated, involving regional and national authorities concerned, to strengthen the protection and governance of the property and avoid any problems of coherence with regard to the long-term development on the site.

In addition, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the work involved with the project for the Restoration of the Maritime Character of Mont-St-Michel.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.91

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35 COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.83** adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party on the management and protection of the property and the potential impact of wind turbines on the landscape setting of the property, in particular the introduction of the area of landscape influence of Mont-Saint-Michel;*
4. *Requests the State Party:*
 - a) *to develop a draft Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value as the basis for the protection and management of the property and thus avoid any irreversible impacts of development projects on the property, including wind turbines,*
 - b) *to initiate a management plan, based on the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, in order to strengthen the protection and governance of the entire property, and to indicate a timetable to implement the creation of an Interregional Monitoring Committee for the management of the property,*
 - c) *to invite a World Heritage Centre/Advisory Bodies reactive monitoring mission in 2011 to examine the prevailing logic for the definition of the context of the ensemble and to better understand the impact of the wind turbines on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and to prepare the draft Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value prior to and as support for the discussions of this mission,*
 - d) *to suspend all wind power projects approved and underway which would have a visual impact on the views toward and from the property whilst awaiting*

examination of the results of the reactive monitoring mission by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012 ;

5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, a report on the state of conservation and the implementation of the above-mentioned items, as well as the draft Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, as requested by Decision 34 COM 10B.3 of the Committee, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

92. Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (France) (C 85)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1979

Criteria
(i) (iii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 7B.88, 33 COM 7B.100, 34 COM 7B.85

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
2006: World Heritage Centre site visit; March 2009: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
Outbreaks of mould and bacterial spores on the surface of the cave paintings of Lascaux

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/85>
http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dp/archeo/pdf/lascaux_unesco.pdf
<http://www.lascaux.culture.fr/>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2010, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report in response to the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). This extensive report includes an Action Plan and detailed annexes with graphics and visualisations.

a) Overall conservation issues

No biocide treatments have been made since 2008. Conservators have continued to monitor the surfaces of the cave throughout the year in order to record the level of contamination of the painted surfaces and to assess any changes or modifications. In some non-painted zones in the lower part of the walls, manual removal of micro-organisms has been carried out under archaeological supervision.

Throughout 2010, the overall level of contamination of the cave is reported as remaining relatively stable and there have been no significant changes in the location of contaminated areas.

Regression of areas of white mould has been noted in several places. Only the vault of the passage remains a sensitive area. However between April and November 2010 there were more disappearances than new appearances of mould sites in this area.

The black spots that appeared in March 2006 are photographed twice a year, with an analysis of their numbers and disposition in the significant areas of the Apse and Nave. Their development has been slowed down and a few new spots were reported in 2010. However the apparition of new spots has been reported on the vault of the Nave. Today less than 1% of the paintings are still affected by this phenomenon.

In October 2009, the limited presence of vermiculations had been reported in the Hall of the Bulls. To understand better the evolution of this phenomenon, visual surveillance is made every week and photographic surveillance is undertaken regularly. The resulting analysis showed the slow evolution of this phenomenon with only very few new outbreaks. As there is very little scientific data on this phenomenon, a scientific study is being undertaken by the University of Bordeaux on the vermiculate phenomenon. It appears only to be active for a few weeks each year during late summer.

The multi-disciplinary research project set up in 2007 to examine the overall relationship between physical and climatic parameters and the development of micro-organisms was planned originally for three years. It concentrated on three areas of the cave. The observations tend to confirm the hypothesis that control of microclimatic conditions on the surface of the walls is essential to control microbial growth at the air-mineral substrate. The changes that affected the microclimate in the chosen areas were luckily too low to modify the surface colonization that has remained broadly stable. In the absence of visible growth of microorganisms on the surface of the walls, the appropriate collection of microbiological data proved impossible. The project was therefore re-oriented towards two new areas: one towards clay without visible fungal contamination, the other towards the sandy sediment covered with large clay, the seat of "black spots". This project will be assessed by the Scientific Council in March 2011.

A second project, initiated in 2010, is led jointly by the National Institute of Agronomic Research, Dijon and the Instituto de Recursos Naturales y Agrobiología of Seville. This examines the microbial ecology of micro-organisms in the cave, in order to understand their metabolic needs, which may help to explain the appearance of the black spots. The objective of this project is to explore all microbial communities in the cave in order to understand the reason for upsetting their balance. The preliminary results of this project identified a new species of *Scolecobasidium fungus*, called *Ochroconis Lascauxensis* that highlights the role of the faeces of Collembolles (minute arthropods) in the dissemination of *Scolecobasidium* spores. This project, which will last until mid 2011, will report its findings to the Scientific Council for follow-up actions.

During 2010 a third project carried out by a partnership between l'Ecole des Mines d'Alès, le Centre National de Préhistoire, and la Conservation régionale des monuments historiques helped to develop a methodology to detect and assess any minute changes in the wall surfaces through chromatic monitoring, as means for preventive conservation.

The Lascaux Simulator has been in development since 2005. The modellers now have access to a much larger processor, ranked first in Europe and sixth in the world, which means that analysis of the data can be undertaken in a much shorter time. The Simulator is now estimating the impact of the closure of the old sliding vents and the conditions that any new climate support machine would have to address in terms of cold spots, etc. This data is being used to develop possibly a new climate support system.

The installation of an overlay roof for the machine room is scheduled for early 2011 in order to reduce the thermal impact of the water flow. This will be made of removable panels that can be disassembled quickly to ensure quick access, in the case of microbiological growth.

Currently, a “cave laboratory” is being established in Dordogne – a cave devoid of archaeological interest that has many similarities with Lascaux. Once equipped, the cave will serve as an experimental site for studying interaction processes between water, air and micro-organisms to understand the impact of each of these parameters which could be used for the management of Lascaux cave.

b) Isolation of the hill

In order to reduce the number of tourists visiting the hill area as part of the tour of the facsimile cave, Lascaux II, a feasibility study is being undertaken to relocate the car park outside the area of the karst caves. The work should be carried out between 2011 and 2012. The policy of acquiring hill land, initiated in 2007, has led to the purchase of three parcels of land. The working group established in March 2009 with the purpose of considering a new system of cultural tourism management, within the perspective of overall development of the Valley, submitted its report in June 2010 and set out several options, including a proposal for a completely new facsimile cave.

c) Communication Strategy

All meetings of the Scientific Council are now followed by Press conferences and Press Releases. The website on Lascaux hosted by the Ministry of Culture and Communication now contains details of the conservation projects, including the conclusions of the Scientific Council sessions which contain information on the intervention protocols. Publication of the proceedings of the international symposium of Lascaux, held in 2009, is expected in early 2011 and there are further publications in academic journals. In 2011, the Scientific Council wishes to establish a website independent of the current site of the Ministry of Culture and Communication for communication and information towards public.

d) Action Plan and priorities

The Scientific Council has identified two main objectives (priorities):

- To respond in the shortest possible time to problems identified in the cave (e.g. black spots and vermiculations)
- To study the parameters for future interventions (e.g. possible replacement of climate support system).

The knowledge management, in case of a new potential crisis (e.g. impact of climate change), has been set up as a low priority.

To reply to these priorities four working groups have been set up:

- Microbiology, microfauna and vermiculations
- Hydro-climatology and simulations
- Surface eco-systems and relationship with underground eco-systems
- The state of the cave and its possible evolution

Each working group has defined objectives, deliverables and timelines that have been set out in detail in the report and were approved by the Scientific Council in December 2010 and January 2011.

e) Management

As reported in the last report, simultaneously with the setting up of the Scientific Council, an Executive Committee was established to take in charge technical and administrative matters. Thus, the Scientific Council will develop the conservation plan for the cave and the administration will implement the necessary actions. From 2011, the Scientific Council will meet five times a year. If necessary, further scientific experts will be invited to the meetings. In 2010, the State Party reports that 600,000 Euros have been invested in research, conservation and administration.

f) Protocol on Intervention

This protocol was issued in July 2010 by the Ministry of Culture and Communication.

g) Lascaux International Scientific Task force (LIST)

In January 2011, a spokesperson of the LIST wrote to the World Heritage Centre to express concerns at the composition of the Scientific Council. He pointed out that although there were many scientists on the Committee, there were no scientists specialising in subjects related to specific threats – such as mycologists or experts in underground climatic conditions and that the promised transparency was not in place. He reported that the information emanating from the Council was very general and considered that there was a need to renew the machinery installed in 1999-2000 and to repair the sliding vents.

On 15 March 2011, the State Party replied to these points. It considered that many of the points had been addressed in their State Party report – such as the list of members of the Scientific Council that showed the participation of mycologists. The LIST representative was invited to the next meeting of the Scientific Council.

h) International Committee for the Preservation of Lascaux Foundation (ICPL)

In January 2011, the ICPL sent a report to the World Heritage Centre suggesting that the Cave of Lascaux might be considered as a pilot project, as mentioned in Decision **34 COM 5D** of the Committee which suggested that pilot projects might address “the relation between conservation and sustainable development at regional/ecosystem scales”. The report acknowledges that the interventions at the cave in the 1940s destroyed the cave’s natural climatic system that had protected the paintings. ICPL considers that the engineers of the 1960s understood the need to intervene to mimic the natural systems through providing a barrier to insulate the cave from changes in outside temperatures and introducing a regulated air flow, and that the forced air system installed in 2000 (although recently adjusted to assist the cave’s breathing mechanism based on the natural convection currents) reflected the opposite of sustainability and that recent interventions have aimed to modify the cave’s ecosystem. The ICPL thus asks the Scientific Council to re-examine priorities with the goal of restoring what they describe as “*a sustainable ecosystem that can survive and thrive without humans having to continually add or take out of the system*”.

Replying to a request of the Centre on the above issues, the State Party considers, in its letter of 15 March 2011, that it is not correct to say that the new system installed in 1999 ‘forced air’ into the cave as the system has satisfactorily controlled the climatic conditions. It also points out that at the time the cave was discovered, the paintings were not in perfect condition and had already suffered some loss. It considers that it is problematic to define an ‘ideal’ or natural state for the cave as we do not know enough about the climatic condition that prevailed over thousands of years, and furthermore the outside condition of the hill have changed drastically even in recent centuries. The State Party further considers that the proposal of the ICPL seems to be based simply on the notion that it is sufficient to control the flow of air, and that the complexity of the cave systems, combined with the diversity of conditions it experienced over 18,000 years mean that a simple climatic model is not

possible and that equilibrium will also need to include biological considerations if the cave is to be transmitted to future generations.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the cave is now reported to be comparatively stable in terms of levels of contamination. There appears to be regression of areas of white mould, black spots and reticulations over most of the affected areas, with only a few areas now deemed to be 'unstable'. They further note that the Scientific Council has strengthened its operations through the development of four sub-groups and that these have set out priorities and detailed action plans for the next 3 years.

The research so far undertaken has identified a new microbial species of *Scolecobasidium*, called *Ochroconis Lascauxensis*, and that its dissemination seems to have a symbiotic relationship with a minute arthropods, *Collembola*. The lack of information on these organisms is highlighting the specificities of the Lascaux problems and the need for more research. In view of the restricted access at Lascaux, the importance of surrogate caves for research and experimentation is growing, and the Council is responding to this need.

The overall report contains a wealth of information on the on-going investigations. From the comments of ICPL and LIST it is clear that knowledge of the full extent of what is being undertaken, the range of specialists involved, the rationale for the actions and the time that will be needed to fully model the cave and understand the enormous complexities of its eco-systems are not fully appreciated by those outside the structure. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the aim of the Scientific Council to establish a separate web-site for Lascaux, but urge the State Party to develop a communication strategy for disseminating information about the web-site, as requested previously by the Committee.

Draft Decision: **35 COM 7B.92**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decisions **32 COM 7B.88**, **33 COM 7B.100** and **34 COM 7B.85** adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008), 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions respectively,
3. Takes note of the extensive and detailed observation, monitoring, analysis and research being undertaken to develop an understanding of the complex microbiological and climatic dynamics of the Lascaux cave as a means to fully understand the causes of the surface decay;
4. Notes the need for more research into the recently identified specific microbes present in the cave and the need for surrogate caves within which to undertake research;
5. Also notes that during 2010 the conditions of the cave are reported by the State Party to be relatively stable with most adverse effects being in regression;
6. Welcomes the detailed action plans of the four sub-groups established by the Scientific Council;

7. Notes with satisfaction the intention of the Scientific Council to establish a new web-site for Lascaux in 2011;
8. Considers that there is still a need for more information to be made public concerning the wide range of work, in order to allay fears in the wider community, and urges the State Party to present a Communication Strategy to ensure the greatest possible transparency for its approaches and actions;
9. Acknowledges the progress with the isolation of the hill, through proposals to move car parking and acquire land into State ownership, further notes the scoping exercise on a possible facsimile cave and requests the State Party to ensure that the World Heritage Committee is kept fully informed about all stages in this tourism project, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, before any commitments are made;
10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a progress report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, and particularly in connection with tourist development plans, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

93. Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2002

Criteria
(ii) (iv) (v)

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 7B.93; 33 COM 7B.104; 34 COM 7B.87

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
February 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS advisory mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports:
a) Noise pollution and traffic increase;
b) Potential impacts by Rhine crossing project.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1066>

Current conservation issues

On 20 January 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report addressing the recommendation of the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) that any proposed bridge development should be considered within the context of an overall Master Plan for the property to ensure that the bridge contributes towards the overall sustainable development of the Upper Middle Rhine Valley.

a) *Master Plan*

The State Party reports that it proposes to draw up the Master Plan on the basis of the existing 2001 management plan and the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value submitted to the World Heritage Centre in January 2010 (which will be presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session). The Master Plan will not only include an assessment of the management plan's implementation, but will also review noise pollution as well as demographic and economic developments. Moreover, by presenting the legal framework of the property, it might inspire law improvements. Furthermore, it will explore possibilities of private funding to conserve and develop the site. With a particular focus on creating synergies, the plan will aim to provide an overview of existing activities contributing to the protection of the property and to propose innovative collaborations.

The development of the Master Plan will be carried out by the federal government in collaboration with two federal states and local authorities. It will actively involve local stakeholders in order to foster stewardship of the site. A task force consisting of representatives of the various authorities has been set up. Work should commence in mid-2011 and is scheduled to last for three years.

b) *Proposed bridge*

The State Party reports that it considers that the World Heritage Committee "assumes that plans will be implemented with a view to constructing a bridge over the River Rhine". As a significant spatial development project, the construction of a bridge would need to satisfy a spatial planning procedure (Raumordnungsverfahren, ROV) to ensure that regional planning requirements are met through an assessment of the spatial compatibility of a project or plan. Settlements, infrastructure, environment, nature and landscape are considered.

The State Party reports that it is intended to start this process by mid-2011 and complete it by early 2012 and during the process new forms of stakeholder participation will be tested. It is further stated that with feasibility studies and expert reports on traffic, World Heritage compatibility and environmental impacts and an assessment of options already completed, the remaining task relates to spatial and technical details.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the details of the proposed wide ranging development of the Master Plan. They consider that, in line with the World Heritage Committee's decision, the Master Plan should provide the framework for sustainable development of the property and describe how a bridge might be compatible with sustainable development and with the site's Outstanding Universal Value.

In the second part of the report there appears to be an assumption that all background studies have been carried out for the proposed bridge and that only the spatial planning arrangements remain to be satisfied. However, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would like to recall that the impact assessments of the proposed bridge highlighted the extra traffic that would be generated – up to 2,000 extra cars a day – that would add significantly to pollution and noise levels, and that there is currently no clear understanding as to how a bridge might not be highly damaging to the cultural landscape.

As the State Party stated in its 2010 report, the bridge is only one option out of many that might be considered. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies stress that it is essential for the Master Plan to be completed and approved before proceeding with any plans towards the construction of a bridge. This approach ensures that future developments take into account economic and social aspects of the valley in relation to the site's Outstanding Universal Value and meet sustainability goals.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.93

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.87** adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Welcomes the information provided by the State Party on the progress towards the development of a Master Plan for the property that will set out how its Outstanding Universal Value will be sustained, and how the property might develop in a sustainable way in relation to traffic, noise pollution and demographic and economic developments;
4. Notes the details provided by the State Party for taking forward the spatial planning procedures for the bridge;
5. Recalls the need for any bridge development to be part of the overall sustainable development of the property;
6. Requests the State Party to finalize and submit to the World Heritage Centre for review the Master Plan before finalizing details of a bridge project in order that traffic and transport development are embedded in the overall sustainable approach to the property;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, 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 37th session in 2013.

94. Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape (Hungary) (C 1063)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2002

Criteria
(iii) (v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
26 COM 23.14; 32 COM 7B.95; 33 COM 7B.106

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
2001: International Workshop on vineyard landscapes; september 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
Possible development of straw-burning power plant

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1063>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage property was submitted by the State Party.

From 20 to 25 September 2010, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission visited the property, at the invitation of the State Party, to consider the impact of the straw-burning power plant in the buffer zone on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property as well as the overall management of the property. The outcomes of that mission are included in the State Party's report. The mission report is available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>.

a) *Current status of the straw-burning power plant*

The State Party reports that there has been no change since the last Committee. After excavating for foundations, the developer stopped work, probably due to lack of funding. The State Party acknowledges that it has few means to reverse the permissions that have been already granted for the plant. However, although the environmental utilisation permit for the power plant does not expire until 30 April 2027, the deadline for its first required inspection is 30 April 2012, and the building permit expires in July 2012.

The mission noted that funding for the project was not ensured, as the financial backers from Japan had withdrawn and the State Investment Bank had declined to support the project. The mission also noted that it was now acknowledged that the procedures for permission for the plant had been inadequate, as the procedural rules of the Szerencs local authority did not include special provisions for the property, nor had the requirements laid down in the property Management Plan been 'adopted' as part of planning regulations. The local authority did not therefore consider the impact of the development on the property as an entity and neither did the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

The Ombudsman for Future Generation made clear to the Mission that it was regrettable that the permission for the plant had been granted, and that an investigation launched by his office had highlighted concern over irregularities in the procedures that had been followed. Furthermore he considered that "*the construction of the plant in the authorised form might have endangered the sustainability of environmental, natural and world heritage values through its negative impact in terms of transportation, intensive arable production, the growing of energy grass, and the emission of CO₂.*"

The mission concluded that the construction of a large straw-burning power plant in the buffer zone near Szerencs city could have severe negative impacts on many of the attributes of the OUV and that every effort should be taken to halt this development. Furthermore the mission considered that the collection of straw, for any straw-burning power plant, should not take place within the property, nor within its current buffer zone, nor in the floodplains of Bodrogek and Taktaköz rivers (as they are the origin of the mists that cause the botrytisation of grapes that is crucial for Tokaj wine), nor in places from which the collection routes would pass through one of these zones.

The State Party states that it will take these recommendations seriously when the review of the environmental permit takes place (before 30 April 2012).

b) *World Heritage Law*

The State Party reports that following the Hungarian general elections in 2010 the new government retracted for revision the first draft World Heritage law. The Government will submit to Parliament in 2011, a new draft, which is expected to frame the bill that will be adopted during the year. The law will regulate the procedural and organizational issues related to the management of World Heritage properties in Hungary, and also create the necessary financial support. This will greatly improve the current situation in Tokaj in which the management body of which is a very committed association, but does not have the appropriate legal power and also lacks adequate human and financial resources.

c) *State of conservation and management of the property*

The mission made recommendations which included the need for more detailed inventories of landscape patterns; area protection for settlements that could foster traditional building practices; an updated management plan with clearer governance arrangements; fostering opportunities for sustainable development and for optimising the assets of the property for the benefit of local communities; the management plan to inform local Spatial Plans, and to be formally 'adopted'; develop a more strategic approach to traffic management; ensure that further road widening is not undertaken in the property; and preserve existing road hedges from any encroachment by cultivation or by road widening.

The State Party in its report responded that many of these issues will be addressed in the re-drafting of the new management plan that will meet the requirements of the future World Heritage Law, apart from the recommendations for roads which will be considered more urgently in the light of consultations on road building programmes.

d) *Boundaries and buffer zone*

The mission recommended that the logic for the boundaries of the property be re-considered on the basis of the retrospective Statement of OUV, as currently there is no clear distinction in some places between the property and its buffer zone. The mission also considered that the buffer zone might be extended to take into account the concerns of ICOMOS at the time of inscription relating to adequate visual protection near Zalkod and Tokaj, and the need for the buffer zone to include ecological protection for the wetlands that foster the botrytisation process.

e) *Mines and Quarries*

The mission considered that there was a need to regulate quarries in the property and in the buffer zone. Small quarries that provide stone for local buildings could be seen as a continuation of a long standing tradition. However, large-scale quarries for road stone that impact on large swathes of the landscape cannot be justified and are not in line with the strategies in the management plan. The State Party reported that there is an application for a license for an andesite mine near the settlement of Szegi in the property that could impact adversely on the property. It has initiated a survey of existing and potential mining sites within the property and its buffer zone in October and this will be evaluated in 2011.

The State Party understood that at the time of inscription the boundaries of the property did not include the mining / quarrying site within the boundaries. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies can confirm that the maps adopted at inscription did not show exclusion areas.

f) *Possible trans-boundary extension*

The State Party reports that the respective agencies and experts of the States Parties of Hungary and Slovakia have frequent working contacts. Hungary is open to further discussions on the possibility of extending the buffer zone of the property to the north.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the fact that work has halted on the construction of the large straw-burning power plant at Szerencs and urges the State Party to do all in its power to ensure that this plant is not constructed, in the light of the new understanding of the shortcomings in the approval process and the findings of the advisory mission that construction of such a plant would have a highly adverse impact on the OUV of the property.

They welcome the commitment of the State Party to put forward a World Heritage Bill and to take steps to strengthen the protection, documentation, and management systems of all World Heritage properties, the involvement of stakeholders and ways of delivering benefits in the context of overall sustainable development.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note proposals for andesite mining within the property and underscore the need for clearer policies to be developed on what quarrying and mining might be compatible with the value of the property. They also consider that any proposals for road development in the property or its buffer zone need to be considered with the utmost care.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.94

The World Heritage Committee

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.106**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes that currently work on the construction of a large straw-burning power plant in the buffer zone on the outskirts of the Szerencs has halted;*
4. *Urges the State Party to use all the means at its disposal to ensure that work does not resume, in the light of the adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value identified by the advisory mission and to keep the World Heritage Committee informed;*
5. *Welcomes the on-going work to prepare a World Heritage Bill that will provide enhanced protection and management systems for all World Heritage properties in Hungary and also notes that many of the recommendations of the advisory mission will be addressed as a result;*
6. *Further notes that the maps of the property adopted at the time of inscription do not show exclusion areas for mining and quarrying sites within the property, and therefore considers that all proposed and existing mining and quarrying sites within the Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape's boundaries lie within the boundaries of property;*
7. *Recalls the World Heritage Committee's clear position that mineral exploration and exploitation is not compatible with World Heritage status, in line with the international policy statement of the International Council of Minerals and Metals (ICMM) of not undertaking these activities in World Heritage properties;*
8. *Expresses serious concern about the potential development of an andesite mine near the settlement of Szegi within the property, and urges the State Party of Hungary not to grant a license for this proposed mine;*

9. Requests the State Party to undertake a review of the impact of the different traditional and commercial quarries within the property on its Outstanding Universal Value and to submit it to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, for consideration by the Advisory Bodies;
10. Notes furthermore that there is a need for a reflection on the precise delineation of the buffer zone in the light of the development of a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value;
11. Takes note that there are several proposals for new or improved roads that might impact on the property or its buffer zone, and also requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Committee informed, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
12. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, 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 37th session in 2013.

95. Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrássy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1987 and 2002 (extension)

Criteria
(ii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
27 COM 8C.2; 32 COM 7B.94; 33 COM 7B.107

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO and Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount provided to the property: 800 million HUF (ca. 2.7 million EUR) EU support for the "Street of Culture" project

Previous monitoring missions
March 2005: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission; November 2007: ICOMOS advisory mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Demolition and inappropriate development in the buffer zone known as the 'Jewish Quarter';
- b) Inappropriate use of public areas and street amenities;
- c) Lack of conservation of residential housing in the area inscribed as World Heritage;
- d) Increased traffic volume

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/400>

Current conservation issues

On 27 January 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre. The report addresses issues raised in Decision **33 COM 7B.107** and also contains detailed information about a major city centre development proposal in the buffer zone, adjacent to the property's boundary, in the 5th District of Budapest.

a) Inappropriate development in the buffer zone

The State Party reported that although there are still valid demolitions and construction permits in the so-called Jewish Quarter of the buffer zone, work is not proceeding. Furthermore, it reports that between 2004 and 2010 the municipality authorities have taken decisions that endangered the status of the property's buffer zone. The responsible municipal officials no longer hold these positions and some are the subject of criminal proceedings.

The State Party also reports that a comprehensive ten-year rehabilitation project (2009 – 2018) with a total budget of 3.622 million EUR has been initiated in the 'Jewish Quarter'. The project 'Street of Culture' is centred on Kazinczy and involves the renovation and rehabilitation of buildings and their re-use as cultural spaces. In 2008, the City recommended that the government consider the development and legal enactment of detailed financial tax benefits and a targeted support system that would facilitate commercial and economic activities associated with the rehabilitation and re-use of historic urban districts. No action was taken regarding these initiatives by the previous Parliament. The State Party reports that the current government understands the merits of such an approach and will explore these possibilities.

b) Management plan and management system

The State Party reports that progress on a management plan and system has been suspended while the World Heritage Bill is being pursued.

c) Boundaries and buffer zone

The State Party also reports that the property and its buffer zone are currently protected in a historic monument district much larger in area than the inscribed property, including the entire Margit Island. It also reports that the incorporation of Margit Island into the property's buffer zone has been agreed upon in principle at a national level, but that research would be required to advise on any possible extension and demarcation of the historic monument district.

d) World Heritage Bill

Within the present timeframe, a new World Heritage Bill could be enacted by the end of 2011 or the beginning of 2012. This would regulate the procedural and organisational issues related to the management of World Heritage sites and create necessary financial support.

e) Other issues

The State Party reports on the completed and necessary extension of the retaining wall of the lower Buda embankment to accommodate a new main wastewater collector. It also states that the advice of the UNESCO/ICOMOS advisory mission of 2005 was followed and the embankment road was not widened from two to four lanes.

f) *Development Project in Bécsi Street*

The State Party, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* and in response to a request by the World Heritage Centre of 8 December 2010, provides details on a development project planned for Bécsi Street in the historic part of downtown Pest, in the buffer zone between the so-called Jewish Quarter and the property boundary.

The State Party reports that this large-scale project would require the demolition of an entire side of Bécsi Street. Details of this demolition were made public in the second half of 2010 and occasioned a significant professional debate due to the intended design, and the number of important protected historic buildings that would be affected. These buildings are under historic monument protection and lie within a historic monument district.

Currently no permission has been given for this demolition. The preliminary position statement of the professional authority of 29 December 2010 rejected the demolition request for three properties. The State Party acknowledges the need to strengthen heritage protection and to consider subsidy schemes to encourage restoration and adaptation.

g) *Museum Project*

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have been made aware of a project to restructure and extend reuse at the Fine Arts Museum, Heroes' Square by developing new rooms underground and creating various light wells at ground level as well as a new entrance structure on the principal elevation. The symmetry of this building and of the overall structure of the Square would appear to be interrupted by the proposals.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that activating demolition permits in the so-called Jewish Quarter have slowed down and welcome the investment in the "Street of Culture" project to rehabilitate and find new uses for buildings along Kazinczy Street.

They also welcome progress with the drafting of a new World Heritage Bill and note that work on the revision of the management plan and improvements to the management system now await this Bill.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further welcome the potential decision to enlarge the property buffer zone with the addition of Margit Island.

They note with extreme concern the development proposals in the historic part of downtown Pest that are predicated on the demolition of the whole of one side of Bécsi street. The buffer zone in this area includes many distinguished buildings that are linked to the attributes of the property's Outstanding Universal Value. It provides a framework for Andrassy Avenue embedded in the urban fabric and for the overall Danube cityscape. They note the commitment of the State Party to strengthen protective measures to ensure the conservation of this extraordinarily important urban landscape. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the impact of the proposals for Heroes Square needs to be considered through a detailed heritage assessment. They suggest that a reactive monitoring mission takes place prior to the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2013 to assess the progress in the implementation of all necessary measures requested by the World Heritage Committee.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.95

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.107** adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Notes the reduction in demolition permits in the so-called Jewish quarter;
4. Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on progress being made regarding the 'Street of Culture' initiative that aims to act as a model for sustainable development of this area;
5. Also notes with extreme concern the major development proposal in the buffer zone in Pest adjacent to the property boundary that would result in the demolition of one side of Bécsi and urges the State Party to use all means necessary to halt this demolition;
6. Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed regarding ongoing developments planned for Bécsi Street and for Heroes Square and that procedures for Heritage Impact Assessments on Outstanding Universal Value are followed for all steps of these development proposals;
7. Recognises the work by the State Party to enable and enact a new World Heritage Bill by the beginning of 2012 and also requests that a copy of the document be sent to the World Heritage Centre on its promulgation;
8. Encourages the State Party to finalise the revision of the property management plan and its management organisation as soon as possible, following the promulgation of the new Bill;
9. Welcomes the in-principle decision reached at a national level for the incorporation of Margit Island into the property buffer zone and also urges the State Party to bring this initiative into action through the formal procedures of the Committee;
10. Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess progress in the implementation of all necessary measures in compliance with the World Heritage Committee's decisions, prior to its 37th session in 2013;
11. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

96. Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata (Italy) (C 829)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

97. Historic Centre of Naples (Italy) (C 726)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1995

Criteria
(ii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
33 COM 7B.110

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount: USD 201,900 from the Funds-in-Trust "A Management Plan for the Historic Centre of Naples" in 2010-2011

Previous monitoring missions
December 2008: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of continuous maintenance and monitoring of the urban fabric;
- b) Weaknesses in coordinating the complex safeguarding and development process; lack of management plan;
- c) Lack of formal clarifications of the delimitations of the property; lack of a buffer zone.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/726>

<http://www.comune.napoli.it/flex/cm/pages/ServeBLOB.php/L/IT/IDPagina/14142>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2011, a report on the state of conservation was submitted by the State Party. The report provides detailed information on the main outcomes and the implementation of the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission carried out from 9 to 13 December 2008. The report also provides information on the preparation of the management plan and on the overall implementation of Decision **33 COM 7B.110** by the Municipality of Naples in its capacity of site manager of the inscribed property.

a) Management plan

At its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), the World Heritage Committee urged the authorities to commence the preparation of a management plan in full consultation with all stakeholders, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.

On 3 February 2010, UNESCO and the Municipality of Naples, in liaison with the Government of Italy, signed a Funds-in-trust agreement enabling UNESCO to assist in the implementation of a project entitled “A Management Plan for the Historic Centre of Naples”. The main objective of the project was to advise and assist the Municipality of Naples, in close consultation with the Italian Ministry of Culture, in the preparation of a management plan for the effective protection of the property, in conformity with the conclusions of the Periodic Report for the Europe and North America region (2006) and of the Decision **33 COM 7B.110** (Seville, 2009). Two meetings of international experts in the field of management of urban properties were jointly organised by UNESCO and the Municipality of Naples and were held in June and November 2010 in Naples, with the aim to set the general reference frame for the draft plan, to provide an analysis of management scenarios and to set jointly the objectives and strategies of the management plan.

In the preparation of the management plan, the site manager and the technical assistance provider used the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) approach as put forward in the draft text of the new proposed Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape submitted to Member States in August 2010.

The report of the State Party points out that the Municipality of Naples is putting in place a structured coordinated management approach, with clear roles and responsibilities, to ensure an effective management system taking into account the complexity and the size of the property, with its manifold challenges and inputs from the main stakeholders involved (public and private entities such as the Port authority, professional associations, academia, individual experts, civil society), through a set of workshops with the representatives of the main stakeholders. The draft management plan was presented to the citizens of Naples in the framework of a set of public meetings organised by the Municipality of Naples in December 2010 and January 2011.

The plan foresees the establishment of a new management structure within the Municipality of Naples, directly under the authority of the Mayor of Naples, which will be mandated to coordinate and take proper action in the fulfilment of the principles and priorities set out in the management plan and act as a site manager of the property.

The management plan also deals with the integrated conservation of the broader urban fabric of Naples and its sense of place, with an emphasis on both monumental and non-monumental heritage, and sets criteria and priorities for the implementation of large rehabilitation projects within the inscribed property.

The management plan was submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 31 January 2011.

With regard to the other specific issues raised by the 2008 advisory mission, namely the threats brought forward by the intense traffic (vehicle congestion, air pollution, noise, vibrations) and the potential challenge to the physical, environmental and social integrity of the historic centre, the management plan includes a “traffic plan” with *ad hoc* actions to reduce and monitor the negative effects of the intense traffic. The plan also includes measures aimed at a better coordination between the cultural tourism policies of the World Heritage properties located in the vicinity of Naples. It identifies actions aimed at enhancing the support of cultural districts within the Historic Centre.

With reference to the “Universal Forum of Cultures”, to be held in 2013 in Naples and expected to attract a large number of tourists, the State Party report states that it intends to mobilize funds from the European Union Regional Development Funds 2007-2013 and from additional public resources with a view of rehabilitating historic buildings within the Historic Centre and to revitalizing the large areas adjacent to the Historic Centre that will host the event.

b) Boundaries of the property and buffer zone

On 31 January 2011, the State Party, in response to the request by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **33 COM 7B.110**, also submitted a set of maps clarifying the

delimitation of the property at the time of its inscription. It also submitted a proposed draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, together with a proposal for a minor boundary modification concerning the enlargement of the inscribed property and the establishment of a buffer zone (see Documents *WHC-11/35.COM/8B* and *WHC-11/35.COM/8D*). The latter includes the area comprising the Port managed by the Port authority, further to the recommendations of the 2008 advisory mission and the recommendations made by the above mentioned expert meetings pertaining to the management plan development.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS take note of the efforts to implement the recommendations of the 2008 advisory mission and encourage the State Party to fully implement the principles and actions set out in the management plan. While no report is requested for the next sessions of the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies request the State Party to keep them informed about the further implementation of measures and any new developments and projects which may have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and to report progress in the implementation of the recommendations within the framework of the forthcoming Periodic Reporting Exercise for Europe and North America to be launched in 2012.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.97

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.110**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party on the implementation of the recommendations by the 2008 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission as well as on the preparation of the management plan for the property;*
4. *Welcomes the finalisation of the management plan for the property and encourages the State Party to fully implement the principles and actions set in the management plan with particular reference to the establishment of a new management structure for the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed about the implementation of the 2008 mission recommendations and the strategies outlined in the management plan and to report about their progress within the forthcoming Periodic Reporting Exercise for Europe and North America to be launched in 2012.*

98. Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania) (C 541)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.86; 32 COM 7B.99; 33 COM 7B.112

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 114,550, including organization of training workshops by ICCROM

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: Within the framework of the Revitalization Strategy for Vilnius, UNDP – SPPD provided USD 64,000

Previous monitoring missions

1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000: World Heritage Centre project missions; May 2005: World Heritage Centre site visit; December 2006: on-site regional seminar

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) High-rise buildings which have an impact on the visual integrity of the property;
- b) Lack of an integrated management plan/system;
- c) Need for adequate legal protection.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/541>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report, received on 11 February 2011, including the following documents that have been approved by the relevant government bodies: “General guidelines for Management System of the Outstanding Universal Value of Vilnius Historic Centre - a World Heritage site” and “Special Plan of Immovable Heritage Protection for Boundaries of the Area of Vilnius Old Town and its Buffer Zone”.

a) Legal protection

At the request of the Committee, the State Party indicates four main laws related to the protection of the Vilnius Historic Centre: Law on Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage (1995), Law on State Commission of Cultural Heritage (2005), Law on Protected Area (1993) and Law on Territorial Planning (1995). The Ministry of Culture of Lithuania has also approved a “Regulation on the Protection of the Vilnius Old Town” (2003) which defines the framework and modalities for the maintenance, use and management of the Old Town. The State Party also lists a number of laws which have an indirect impact on the property including its movable heritage, traditional cultural expressions, environment and construction.

b) Integrated management plan/system;

The report of the State Party makes clear that there are a number of different laws and planning mechanisms which have a role in the management of the Vilnius Old Town. In response to requests by the World Heritage Committee, the State Party has submitted a document which outlines a set of guidelines meant to coordinate and integrate the various institutions and organizations which have a role in the management of the Vilnius Old Town.

The setting up of a “Commission for supervision of the site values and coordination and integration of management of the site” is central to the guidelines. This commission is meant to ensure territorial integration; horizontal, inter-institutional and multidisciplinary integration;

vertical coherence of management; and coherence between state institutions, local government and civil society. The composition of this commission includes the state authority, other state institutions with activities that are related to the site and can influence changes to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), and non-governmental bodies in the field of science and education, as well as interested civil society organizations. The commission is meant to meet at least every three months in order to review activities carried out in the preceding three months, monitor and evaluate problems/impacts on the property, and develop annual actions plans to solve problems or minimize their impact. The commission is also meant to prepare annual reports and also link to the World Heritage Periodic Reporting process. One of the first tasks of the Commission will be the review of the Vilnius Old Town Revitalization Strategy. The report also states that the Ministry of Culture and the municipal government will begin consultations on the integrated management of the property in February 2011. A Special Protection Plan for the Boundaries of the Area of Vilnius Old Town and its buffer zone was approved in 2010.

c) High rise buildings which have an impact on the visual integrity of the property

The State Party states that the Vilnius Official (Master) Plan regulates visual impacts, including the height of the buildings in the buffer zone. This plan is meant to ensure the retention of visual relationships among protected areas, valuable views, panoramas, and silhouettes, by capping the height of new buildings and the ratio of buildings to open space. The plan also prescribes that new constructions are banned except for those, which contribute to the reading of the urban plan or spatial structure, or are based on traditional principles of spatial form. For new constructions, an analysis of their visual impact on the protected area has to be carried out before they are approved.

d) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

As requested by the Committee the State Party report includes a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which has been transmitted to ICOMOS for review.

e) Minor boundary modification

The State Party submitted a map and a text containing precisions of the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, as a part of the state of conservation report. It has not, however, submitted these to the World Heritage Centre by the 1 February 2011 deadline for a minor modification of the boundaries and buffer zone of the property and according to the submission format already transmitted to the State Party in 2008.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies take note of the information provided on the legal framework. However, as the World Heritage Committee noted in its decision taken at its 33rd session, the planned "Commission for supervision of the site values and coordination and integration of management of the site" is essential to ensure an integrated management system that will allow the legal framework to effectively protect the property. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note, however, that very little progress seems to have been made in setting up this commission since the 2009 State Party's report. This new commission seems not to have begun its work, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, nor have a clear set of conservation objectives and decision-making processes and procedures been developed. Furthermore, there seems to be no additional information as to which institutions at the national and municipal levels, and civil society will be taking part in the commission. This commission should begin its work as soon as possible with clear objectives and procedures, to ensure that it is in a position to effectively control any activities or interventions which might have an impact on the OUV of the property.

In regard to the issue of high-rise buildings, while the State Party report refers to constructions in the proposed buffer zone, there is no additional information to discuss those high-rise buildings which are located outside the proposed buffer zone but may have an impact on the OUV of the property. It would be useful if the State Party develops a strategy for heritage impact assessment to ensure that large constructions, regardless of their location, do not have a negative impact on the OUV.

In regard to the proposed minor modifications to the boundaries and proposed buffer zones of the property, the World Heritage Centre has sent a letter to the State Party asking it to officially submit the request for minor boundary modifications at its earliest possible convenience.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.98

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7B.86**, **32 COM 7B.99** and **33 COM 7B.112** adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006), 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the information provided by the State Party on the legal framework for protection of the property;*
4. *Reiterates its request that the new coordination and management Commission begin its regular work as soon as possible, with a clear set of conservation objectives, procedures and a decision-making process which emphasize the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
5. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to provide adequate information in regard to regulations concerning the construction of high-rise buildings, beyond the proposed buffer zone which may have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value including the visual integrity of the property;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit a proposal for a minor boundary modification related to the creation of a buffer zone, for review by the Advisory Bodies and approval by the World Heritage Committee;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

99. Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late finalization of the mission report)

100. Seventeenth-century canal ring area of Amsterdam inside the Singelgracht (Netherlands) (C 1349)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2010

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

34 COM 8B.30

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports (identified at the time of inscription).

- a) Advertising policy;
- b) Charter of good building conduct with commercial sector;
- c) Examination of building permits and conservation objectives;
- d) Tall buildings control;
- e) Development projects;
- f) Data concerning the number of inhabitants and surface.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1349>

Current conservation issues

On 27 January 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report addressing the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee made at its 34th session, at the time of inscription.

a) Advertising

The State Party reports that a more austere policy on advertising on scaffolding wraps was introduced on 1 October 2009 and came fully into effect in July 2010. The new rules ban this form of advertising around Dam Square and, since 1 September 2010, on canal and square-facing elevations at corner junctions, but allows up to 50% of surface area coverage elsewhere (down from 100%), with the remaining area of the wraps illustrating the underlying building façade. Along with other restrictions, the State Party indicates that the number of

scaffold wrap adverts has been reduced by almost 50% over the two years since the policy was introduced.

The State Party also reports that a new policy on façade advertising was introduced on 27 November 2008 and, by 1 January 2011, grants amounting to a total of 217,989 EUR have been given by the district council to assist entrepreneurs and owners in dealing with undesirable façade advertising and ensuring compliance with the rules. Inspections are carried out to ensure compliance with the rules and, if necessary, to take enforcement action where default is found.

b) Charter of Good Conduct

The State Party considers that the suggestion to create a charter of good conduct between the city and the commercial sector, defining what is allowed and what is not with regard to the treatment of buildings, is already addressed by the Amsterdam Central Borough through existing regulations, land use plans, and policy documents for buildings, including the General Municipal Ordinance and the Manual on the Development and Redevelopment of the Public Space, as well as through local consultations and meetings with a wide range of interested parties.

c) Building permits and conservation objectives

The State Party indicates that the Amsterdam Central Borough confirms that conservation objectives are, and will, remain paramount when applications for building permits are examined.

d) Tall buildings

The State Party reports that the publication "*High-rise construction in Amsterdam*" was scheduled for adoption by the Amsterdam Council on 16 February 2011 as a section of the (draft) Structural Concept 2040.

In addition, the State Party reports that in January 2010 the Municipal Executive decided to add a special guideline on high-rises, as a separate policy document, to the new (draft) Structural Concept 2040 for Amsterdam where a High-Rise Impact Report is now compulsory for building initiatives above 30 metres in height. This is mandatory in the World Heritage Site and its buffer zone, in a 2km extra buffer zone outside the Singelgracht, and in the National and Municipal Protected Cityscapes under consideration outside the city centre.

e) Development projects

The State Party indicates that the Amsterdam Central Borough will inform the World Heritage Committee of any development project within the property, its buffer zone and surroundings.

f) Surface area of the property and buffer zone

The requested information on the surface area of the property and its buffer zone has been provided by the State Party in a report sent on 16 December 2010.

g) Other issues

The World Heritage Centre has been informed by the civil society about the decision of the authorities to remove a painted electricity sub-station at Johnny Jordaanplein and has asked the State Party for comments in August 2010. In January 2011 the State Party confirmed that the decision has been taken within the framework of necessary restructuring of a street where the substation stands and following proper consultation with local residents. The substation will be relocated in an existing building on Elandsgracht Street. According to the State Party, the relocation will restore views along the canals.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the development of control initiatives as additional safety mechanisms to keep open sightlines to and from the city centre.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recognise the work done for exercising a tighter control over advertising on scaffold wraps and building facades, and take note of the emerging achievements on the latter. But they are of the opinion that, albeit temporary, continuing to allow up to 50% of the surface area of some scaffold wraps to be covered by adverts is still much too large, that this will still excessively dominate the cityscape where deployed and that this significantly detracts from the more sensible intention of offering a virtual representation of the underlying structure whilst accommodating basic health and safety needs during work in progress. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note the decision to remove the painted electricity sub-station at Johnny Jordaanplein, and to relocate it from the Historic Area of Willemstad to an existing building on Elandsgracht Street.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.100

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 8B.30**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Urges the State Party to give further consideration to the revised policy that continues to allow up to 50% of surface area advertising on some scaffold wraps, with a view to stopping the practice and requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed;*
4. *Acknowledges the steps and initiatives being taken to continue to keep open sightlines to and from the city centre against the intrusion of tall buildings;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Committee about any development project within the property, its buffer zone and surroundings, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Welcomes the decision to remove the painted electricity sub-station at Johnny Jordaanplein, and to relocate it in an existing building on Elandsgracht Street.*

101. Centennial Hall in Wroclaw (Poland) (C 1165)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2006

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 8B.47

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1165>

Current conservation issues

Following the receipt of information and reports from numerous NGOs and individuals, the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to submit a state of conservation report, including clarifications regarding the modernisation and enlargement of the original Main Terrace Restaurant pavilion, all works carried out to protect the Szczytnicki Park and the Great Island's road project proposal. Taking into account the information received, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies initiated preparation of a state of conservation report for consideration of the World Heritage Committee.

The state of conservation report submitted by the State Party on 18 January 2011 provides feedback on three main issues as requested by the World Heritage Centre.

a) Modernisation and expansion of the Main Terrace Restaurant pavilion (currently Centre for business tourism)

This project concerns the rebuilding of a structure, designed by Max Berg in 1913, which contained a restaurant and an open terrace. Like all parts of the Exhibition Grounds included in the property, this part of the building was designed to be in harmony with the Centennial Hall, the main component of the property.

A report transmitted to the World Heritage Centre in 2010 by NGOs underlined that the enlargement of the original pavilion is disproportionate to the original designs and volumes of the structure, and that it was carried out by designers and enterprises not qualified to work with historic structures, that some parts of the original structure were destroyed, and that the external concrete-finished surface ("béton nu") of the original was replaced by mineral fibre panels.

However, the State Party's state of conservation report notes that the project was guided by several institutions in charge of supervising work carried out specifically in the historical areas. The State Party report states that the work was guided by an international design competition and was based on detailed historical research and building condition analysis which revealed that much of the original building had been lost or modified after suffering severe damages in 1945. The State Party also notes that the new side pavilions, "following the convention of aesthetic minimalism" were inspired by concept drawings prepared by Max Berg who had developed ideas for enlarging the building to its present size at a later date.

While the State Party provided information to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review and comment regarding the planned work on the pavilion in advance of construction in conformity with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the quality of work which could be seen in the photos provided by NGOs cannot be evaluated as satisfactory. However, prior to any conclusion, a reactive monitoring mission should be carried out in order to properly examine the works carried out in the property.

b) Protecting Szczytnicki Park

The report transmitted by NGOs observes a constant degradation of environment and the monuments in the Park the reason for that being the reduced means available and raises questions concerning the basis of decisions for cutting trees and means to dispose of them.

The State Party report notes that the suitability of the maintenance work was confirmed by an inspection of Szczytnicki Park in May 2010. The report notes that “pursuant to the regulations in force, works consisting in the removal of trees and shrubs are carried out in accordance with the procedures providing for the documentation of the trees that were cut down, reasons for their removal and information on what happened with the wood”.

It is to be noted that the State Party report does not directly address the specific concerns noted by NGOs (availability of resources, justification for cutting, and means used for disposing of trees), other than to state that all decisions respect the regulations in force.

c) Great Island’s road project proposal

The NGOs report notes that the construction of a high speed peripheral road across the island would degrade the natural environment of the Park and its microclimate as well as building surfaces and materials, through the emissions associated with increased vehicular traffic. The report also notes that the new route will separate the “garden cities” of Sepolno and Biskupin from the forest landscape of the Park, and that its construction, including noise barriers, constitutes an insensitive and harsh intrusion in what has been regarded as the “jewel” of the town.

The State Party report notes that the planned route runs outside the inscribed property and through areas adjacent to the buffer zone. The report notes that an environmental impact assessment “proved the admissibility of the works”. Further, the report emphasized the benefits to island residents by reducing “communication intensity” in the buffer zone. The State Party documents the traffic management imperatives and constraints that the new road would address: the inability to widen Zwierzyniecki Bridge or to build a new bridge beside it, limited capacity of Grunwaldzki Square to receive more cars, the increasing number of cars belonging to island residents, and the need to alleviate traffic pressures on the Great Island in view of the increasing number of tourists drawn by its many attractions. The State Party report also notes that traffic will be re-directed to the bypass roads “which run far from this historically important and sensitive area” and that the new road (to be recognized as a low category road rather than as a main road) will give local people easy access to the island. The State Party also confirms that the proposed road was the subject of public consultations.

Following the receipt of additional information from NGOs concerning the Great Island’s road project proposal, the World Heritage Centre requested on 2 May 2011 the State Party to submit detailed documents regarding this project, including an environmental impact assessment for review by the Advisory Bodies.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the proposals for a new road were not submitted to the World Heritage Centre during the early project planning stages in

conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. While the proposed road may have been the subject of an environmental impact assessment, this assessment has not been submitted for review. They note the desirability of reviewing the advantages and disadvantages of this proposal relative to alternative means to meet the same traffic management goals. Finally, while the State Party report confirms that this project was the subject of public consultations, the report does not provide information about the results of the consultations. Given some public opposition to this proposal, the consultation must have brought forward negative as well as positive reviews, and these reviews are not presented.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the documentation supplied at present is inadequate to fully judge the nature and quality of the work carried out on the rebuilt Pavilion, the proposed new traffic route and the maintenance management of the Park Szczytnicki. They are also concerned that the State Party justification for its assessment of projects places emphasis on suitability within local planning processes (institutional approvals, consultations, environmental assessment) without explicitly exploring impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, through specific heritage impact assessments.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would suggest that the World Heritage Committee encourage the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/Advisory Bodies reactive monitoring mission to assess the overall state of conservation of the property, including the impact of the rebuilt Pavilion and of the proposed road project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in the light of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment.

Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.101**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Takes notes of the information provided by the State Party in its state of conservation report and notes that it is insufficient to fully judge the nature and quality of the work carried out on the rebuilt Pavilion;*
3. *Also notes that detailed information concerning the proposed road project was not provided in advance, as required by Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and that the information available on the road project and the maintenance management of the Park Szczytnicki is insufficient to measure its impact on the Outstanding Universal Value;*
4. *Invites the State Party to undertake a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for the road project in line with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessment for Cultural World Heritage Properties;*
5. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the overall state of conservation of the property, including the impact of the rebuilt Pavilion and of the proposed road project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in the light of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

102. Churches of Moldavia (Romania) (C 598 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1993 (extension in 2010)

Criteria
(i) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
33 COM 8B.35; 34 COM 8B.39

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
N/A

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/598>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 31 January 2011.

a) Physical Condition

The report provides an individual overview of each of the churches, including a summary of the physical condition, its state of repair and restoration or other remedial work in progress.

In general, there are problems common to all structures including water penetration, biological occurrence and associated increased humidity levels, as well as masonry and/or plaster damage and some decorative mural deterioration.

The report provides brief information on the proposed actions to be undertaken to conserve and protect each monument. The State Party reports that funds have been included in the 2011 National Restoration Plan, with the exception of the Church of the Annunciation of the Moldovita Monastery, for which European Union funds have been secured.

Structural problems are particularly noted at the Church of the Raising of the Holy Cross and the "Saint George" Church of the "Saint John the New" Monastery from Suceava. Repairs are necessary on the roofs of the Church of the Beheading of Saint John the Baptist from Arbore, the Church of Saint Nicholas of Probotia Monastery and the "Saint George" Church of the "Saint John the New" Monastery from Suceava, the Resurrection Church of the Sucevita Monastery.

There is no reference to a proposed conservation laboratory which was addressed in the World Heritage Committee Decision **33 COM 8B.35**.

b) Management

The State Party briefly reports that the Cultural Direction of Suceava inspects and monitors activities within the protected zone of the property. In December 2010 the Romanian Legislation approved a General Plan for the Protection and Management for UNESCO monuments. The State Party indicates that for each UNESCO World Heritage property there will be a coordinator nominated and a Coordination Committee formed.

As a protective measure, the World Heritage Committee previously requested that planning for the management of tourism at the Church of Sucevita be undertaken. This has not yet been submitted for consideration. The State Party notes increased visits to several of the sites, including the need for a parking lot and control over graffiti. There is also no indication in the State Party's report of control or planning in regard to tourism impact.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the management plan has been finalised with the provision of the programme of planned conservation work. The implementation of the work and corrective measures should provide all properties with better physical conditions. They also note with concern that the water penetration and other structural problems have led to some deterioration of the mural paintings. They consider that more information should be provided on this specific conservation issue.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies had previously requested that the "actual functioning of the Coordination Committee" be provided, however this has not been clearly defined. The definition of tourism development plans for any of the components of the property, and particularly for the Sucevița monastery, has also not been mentioned.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.102

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 8B.39**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the actions being taken to implement corrective measures and encourages the State Party to continue its important conservation programme;*
4. *Requests the State Party to provide more specific information on the threats to the wall paintings and measures to be taken to address these threats;*
5. *Recognises the efforts made by the State Party to enact national legislation for protection of the property and reiterates its request to define the function of the Coordinating Committee, which is essential for effective management;*
6. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to establish a practical plan for the reception and control of visitors in the vicinity of the monastery of Sucevița and also requests that tourism planning mechanisms be included as part of the management plan;*

7. Further reiterates its request to the State Party to keep the World Heritage Committee informed about architectural projects pertaining to the conservation laboratory and other potential developments in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2013**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

103. Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslav (Russian Federation) (C 544)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

104. Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

105. Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1990

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.106; 33 COM 7B.119; 34 COM 7B.96

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

December 2007: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Erection of a monument in honour of Marshal G. Zhukov
- b) Ongoing and accelerated urban development pressures

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/545>

Current conservation issues

At its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), the World Heritage Committee expressed its utmost concern regarding the lack of response to previous requests made by the Committee at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions. The World Heritage Committee reiterated its requests concerning the submission of a state of conservation report for the property, in addition to the management plan, approved buffer zones, improved legal and institutional mechanisms, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and information and studies related to ongoing developments. On 31 January 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report providing information on the following:

a) Buffer zone and control regulations

The State Party report provides information on the protection of the immediate setting of the property by two mechanisms:

- Protected zone
- Reserved zone

The Protected zone was declared by a decree in 1997 and is regarded as the equivalent to a buffer zone. This is an area directly adjacent to the Kremlin and is intended to “protect the monument, maintenance and restoration of the valuable urban environment and holistic perception of the facility”. A map was also provided.

Within the zone, there are three levels of interventions/controls, namely: i) restoration mode; ii) regeneration mode; iii) renovation mode, which are applicable to monuments as well as to the urban environment. The regeneration zone includes Somoinovsky avenue, Volkhonka street, Borovitskaya square, Mokhovaya street, Vozdvizhenka street, Manezhnaya street, B. Kamenni bridge and Prechistenskaya embankment, Varvarka street, Kitaigorodskoi avenue, Moskvoretskaya embankment and the building of the "Russia" hotel, Sofiski embankment, B. Moskvoretsky bridge, Kadashevsky embankment and B. Kamenni and M. Kamenni bridges, as well as urban spaces in areas within direct line of sight of the Kremlin.

The Reserved zone is a “Zone of a high security of regulation of building-reserved territory” meant for the ‘preservation and restoration of character of a historical planning, spatial structure, an originality of view of the central part of a city, for maintenance of architectural unity of new constructions with historically developed environment’. No map was provided.

b) Institutional issues

The report provides details concerning various legal instruments for the protection of monuments and funding sources. It refers to several institutions responsible for the management of different components of the property but provides no indication whether or not an overall coordinating body has been established.

c) Management plan

The State Party reports that the 2004-2013 programmes for the development of the State Museums of Moscow Kremlin are currently being implemented.

Whilst this could be considered part of a management plan for the property, no details are provided as to the existence, or development, of such a plan, despite World Heritage

Committee requests at previous sessions to be provided with information concerning the management plan.

d) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The State Party report includes a chapter entitled “Justification of Outstanding Universal Value” but no Statement of Outstanding Universal Value as such has been provided.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the information provided with regard to the buffer zone and regulatory mechanisms do not sufficiently reflect the requirement to protect the immediate setting of the property and to control development in the overall setting that might impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The visual impact studies requested by the Committee for all new development projects have not been provided.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note that no Special Coordinating Board for the property has been established, as requested by the Committee. The purpose of such board will be to bring together all the relevant stakeholders including ecclesiastical authorities, urban planning authorities, and municipal agencies which exercise planning control in the immediate surroundings.

The State Party report provides detailed information about the restoration work carried out between 2000 and 2010, and emphasizes the activities of the State Museums of the Moscow Kremlin. The involvement, if any, of other stakeholders in the protection and management of the property and its buffer zone, including municipality authorities, is insufficiently addressed.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the challenge of ensuring adequate protection and management for the property and its setting, in the face of strong urban development pressures, needs to be addressed urgently.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the 2004-2013 programme prepared by the Kremlin Museum is far from fulfilling the requirements for protection and management as outlined in the *Operational Guidelines* in order to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is sustained. They consider that there is a need to develop a specific Management plan based on a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, as previously requested by the Committee, and to establish a Special Coordination Board for all key stakeholders, including municipal authorities and a representative of the Moscow Patriarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church, also as previously requested by the World Heritage Committee.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies underscore that the studies requested by the Committee in relation to development activities on ‘Middle Trading Towns’ have not been provided.

In addition, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have been informed about major construction projects on Borovitskaya Square near the Kremlin Wall, in the regeneration part of the Protected zone, that have apparently received approval from the relevant authorities without consultation with the World Heritage Centre.

On 13 April 2011, the State Party provided the following information:

- the former hotel “Russia” demolished in 2007 is outside of the buffer zone of the property and there are currently no construction plans for that territory;
- the construction project of a depository and restoration complex of the Museum-Reserve in the vicinity of the property was performed by the order of the Ministry of Culture and the Government of Moscow and approved by all relevant federal bodies. Since then, the Government of the Russian Federation cancelled this project. The construction of this complex will be relocated.

Taking into account that no information has been provided in compliance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and in order to prevent any inappropriate construction developments which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recall that the State Party should inform the World Heritage Centre of any intention to undertake, or authorize, major restoration or new construction projects. Notice should be given to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible (for instance, before drafting basic documents for specific projects) and before taking decisions that would be difficult to reverse, so that appropriate solutions could be found to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is fully preserved.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.105

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **32 COM 7B.106**, **33 COM 7B.119**, **34 COM 7B.96** adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008), 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the efforts made by the State Party for the protection and management of the range of architectural monuments of the property;*
4. *Reiterates its utmost concern about the lack of follow-up in response to its previous requests, and in particular the:*
 - a) *the delineation and approval of a buffer zone with a view to protect the immediate setting and to control impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value within the overall setting of the property,*
 - b) *the approval of adequate and effective protective legal regulations for the buffer zone,*
 - c) *the establishment of an effective control mechanism and institutional framework between all stakeholders involved in the management and protection of the Kremlin and Red Square in Moscow and its buffer zone, including the creation of a special Coordination board aiming at enhancing the protection of the property and its buffer zone,*
 - d) *the preparation of visual impact studies for existing construction projects;*
5. *Urges the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, on all planned urban development projects within or nearby the property, before drafting documents for specific projects and before taking decisions that would be difficult to reverse;*
6. *Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with three copies of the property management plan;*
7. *Reiterates its requests to the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, for examination by the World Heritage Committee;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2013, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property,*

including progress reports on the requested measures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

106. Ensemble of the Ferrapontov Monastery (Russian Federation) (C 982)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2000

Criteria

(i) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

24 COM C.1; 34 COM 7B.97

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

December 2010: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Lack of an overall management system

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/982>

Current conservation issues

The State Party provided a comprehensive state of conservation report on 1 February 2011. It informed the World Heritage Centre that a Federal Law on the transfer of State or Municipal properties of religious origin to religious organizations had been approved by the President of the Russian Federation in 2010. While the state of conservation report describes in detail approaches to conservation work for each component of the ensemble, the State Party emphasizes the importance of numerous proposals for tourism development (new hotels and ethnographic houses, removal of windmills, rebuilding existing structures on a larger scale, such as the 19th century Tea House and the reconstructed Dionysos' School in Ferrapontovo). The report also proposes reconstruction of certain spaces within the monastery to be used for visitors and museum facilities. The reconstructions proposed are justified in terms of completing former historic layouts to meet service needs, in spite of a lack of detailed documentation to support these proposals. The report further describes the desire of the State Party to expand the boundaries of the World Heritage property.

A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out at the property from 5 to 12 December 2010. Further to the adoption of the abovementioned Federal Law, the presence of a representative of the Department for External Church

Relations of the Moscow Patriarchate during the mission was a clear sign of the importance given by the religious authorities to the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM/>.

The principle recommendations of the mission are the following:

a) Management structure

The existing structure does not guarantee appropriate coordination between stakeholders. Different actors are involved, without sufficient coordination, in the management of different components of the property. Insufficient coordination and inadequate control represent potential threats for the property. The involvement of the Russian Orthodox Church is still unclear, although under the new Federal Law, it should play a key role in the future management of the property.

The State Party needs to establish a special board, including all stakeholders concerned, as well as representatives of the Patriarchate of Moscow and All-Russia, as previously requested by the World Heritage Committee, in order to develop and implement appropriate legal measures and rules for conservation, restoration and use, a joint management system for the religious World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation, and specific measures appropriate for each religious property.

b) State of conservation

The mission highlights the professionalism of the conservation work of the mural paintings in the church of Nativity of the Virgin. The layers of frescoes have been consolidated and cleaned using a specific methodology. This includes a consolidation under each shell layer of paint, instead of a full consolidation of the entire surface of the fresco. To ensure the absolute authenticity of all frescoes, alterations and improvisations have been banned. The missing fragments are left in neutral white. However, the mission noted a certain disproportion in the overall conservation approach. Over the past ten years, interventions have focused almost exclusively in the Church of Nativity of the Virgin, while all other components have been relatively abandoned (Martynian churches, Epiphany and Ferrapont). There is a significant delay in the maintenance of the property, and this has led to physical damage to the architectural structures. The mission also observed an inappropriate use of certain parts of the monastery. The mission recommended that the State Party should put in place permanent monitoring of the property to halt and prevent any structural degradation of its components.

c) Management, protection and boundary issues

The draft management plan submitted by the State Party was considered inadequate by the mission. In addition to the property, it includes two other sites (the Kirilo-Belozersky monastery and Tzipinski Pogost) with a clear intention of presenting arguments for a possible new serial nomination. The plan proposes a very superficial analysis of real problems related to the property, lacks proposals on the main instruments of a master plan, legal protection, limitations, development plans and the management system. It appears that the obvious aim of this plan is to prove the need for new constructions. The proposed Action Plan is limited and not sufficiently argued. The mission noted a lack of information on planned financial resources for the implementation of programmes and measures of protection, preservation and management of the property. Currently resources are not allocated according to clear and detailed short and long term programs, but only for occasional events: anniversaries, celebrations, official visits, etc.

The mission also reviewed new construction projects within the property and considers that the State Party should not permit any reconstruction and/or development projects within the

inscribed property. The State Party should provide information on any projects and activities, such as the Touristic Complex or the School of Dionysos, which may impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. All illegal and inappropriate structures and constructions within the property and its buffer zone should be removed.

The State Party should elaborate four integrated plans to ensure efficient management and protection of the property:

- A detailed urban plan, which would establish construction regulations in the buffer zone in accordance with existing detailed protection regimes;
- A detailed development plan of the property and its landscape, including specifications for land use, house facilities, urban equipment, lighting, planting trees and advertising;
- A conservation master plan which would allow for regular planning of all conservation activities on the property;
- A management plan that would co-ordinate the impacts of all management instruments, including legal protection and all development plans, and result in a realistic and comprehensive action plan with resources and responsibilities established.

Following an analysis of the current situation, the mission recommended that the State Party should consider submitting an official request for possible modification of the boundaries of the inscribed property and its buffer zone in order to ensure a proper protection of the property and to conform to the boundaries actually in use for the property management. The State Party should develop and adopt a detailed protection regime for the buffer zone of the property, including specific regulations for constructions and land use, and strengthen the system of development control within it.

e) Tourism

The mission did not receive any information on this issue. The land located in the vicinity of the property is designated in the Master Plan for the construction of a tourist complex "The School of Dionysus" but no detailed information on this project was provided. The project appears to represent a potential threat to the traditional panorama dominated by the monastery Ferrapontov and its construction should be suspended until a thorough assessment is carried out concerning its impact on the Outstanding Universal Value.

All potential tourist facilities and services should not negatively affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and should be developed in the buffer zone by using already existing buildings. Altogether, the State Party should develop a comprehensive tourism strategy and program of tourist visits.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies stress the importance of strengthening the overall co-ordination among all key property stakeholders, including religious authorities, museum operators and tourism developers and site manager. This can be supported by establishing a Special Board, including all stakeholders concerned, as previously requested by the World Heritage Committee, and by putting in place a series of new planning mechanisms (including urban and development plans, a conservation master plan and a management plan).

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also stress the need to ensure permanent monitoring of the property in order to halt and prevent any structural degradation of property components.

They note that the boundaries of the property and buffer zone do not correspond to the operational boundaries used by the property's managers, and suggest that the State Party address this contradiction urgently. They also consider that protection mechanisms need to

be introduced for the buffer zone to allow for the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are also concerned about potential negative impact of planned tourism development facilities, such as 'The School of Dionysus' project, and also those in place, and suggest that all tourism development be evaluated to ensure that they will not negatively impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value and that inappropriate structures are removed.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.106

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.97**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Requests the State Party to implement all the recommendations of the 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, including:*
 - a) *Establish a series of integrated planning such as urban and development plans, a conservation master plan and a management plan, including tourism strategy,*
 - b) *Ensure a permanent monitoring of the property with a view of halting and preventing any structural degradation of its components,*
 - c) *Establish a protection regime for the buffer zone of the property and strengthen the system of development control within it,*
 - d) *Ensure that all tourism development plans be subservient to the overall master plan, and that control mechanisms be established for the buffer zone and be developed in ways which will not negatively impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value,*
 - e) *Remove or demolish all illegal and inappropriate structures within the property and its buffer zone;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to establish a special board, including all stakeholders concerned, as well as representatives of the Patriarchate of Moscow and All-Russia, in order to develop appropriate legal measures and rules for specific conservation, restoration and use, as well as a joint management system for the religious World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation;*
5. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre of any construction, reconstruction, restoration projects and activities which may threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of a property inscribed on the World Heritage List in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to halt work on the "The School of Dionysus" tourism complex until a cultural heritage impact assessment on the Outstanding Universal Value is carried out, in line with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties, and submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;*

7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a progress report on the state of conservation of the property, including the management structure, legal and institutional mechanisms and information or studies related to ongoing developments at the property, as well as the revised draft management plan of the property and a progress report on the implementation of the abovementioned requests and mission's recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

107. Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

108. Tower of Hercules (Spain) (C 1312)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2009

Criteria

(iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

33 COM 8B.27

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Urban and outer urban development
- b) Tourism pressures

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1312>

Current conservation issues

On 27 January 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report which addresses the concerns raised by the Committee at the time of inscription as well as how the State Party will deal with each of them. The State Party has indicated that a commitment of 3

million euros has been made for the ongoing conservation, monitoring and presentation work at the property.

a) *Relationship between Tourism Consortium and Tower Management Plan Monitoring Committee*

According to the report, the function of the Management Plan Monitoring Committee is to improve control and monitoring of the management of the property. It is made up of key institutions, and coordinates the activities of all agencies. The Tourism Consortium is only one of the agencies which the Monitoring Committee works with. Any plans by the Tourism Consortium or other stakeholders must be approved by the Monitoring Committee.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the setting up of the Monitoring Committee. Given its important role in the protection of the site, it would be useful to have a more detailed description of its mandate, composition, and activities.

b) *Production of a more comprehensive and detailed management plan, to be examined by the World Heritage Committee in 2011*

The State Party has submitted to the World Heritage Centre a comprehensive management plan, which forms part of a larger Master Plan for the property. The Advisory Bodies will review the management plan and send any comments to the State Party, which will then need to ensure that the plan is approved and implemented by the relevant authorities.

c) *Scientific responsibility for the future museum and visitor centre*

The State Party has indicated that professionals from the Municipality of La Coruña, those related to the Management Plan Monitoring Committee, and those involved in drawing up the management plan will hold the scientific responsibility for the future museum and visitor centre. The municipality has indicated that it has established a temporary reception centre until the permanent visitor centre is completed.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the scientific responsibility of the Municipality professional staff for the museum and visitor centre. They suggest, however, that the responsibilities and the job descriptions are clearly defined to ensure that the staff has the necessary background and training in order to carry out the work.

d) *Installation of permanent monitoring of the hygrometry in the rooms associated with water infiltration and condensation phenomena, and planning of the measures for ventilation and possibly limiting visits*

The State Party indicates that action has already been taken to deal with the problem of moisture in some of the rooms. The State Party considers that there is no need to limit visits at this stage.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that this problem is being dealt with but strongly recommend an ongoing monitoring whether to ensure that the humidity remains at an acceptable level and in order to decide whether further measures will be necessary.

e) *Development and strengthening of control over urban and outer urban development in the buffer zone*

The State Party reports that there are currently no activities or urban developments planned, both in the property or its buffer zone. The Municipal Council has pledged to strengthen the monitoring of the setting surrounding the tower.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the comments about the property and its buffer zone but underscore the need for the wider setting of the property to be protected beyond the buffer zone. Urban growth was identified as one of the main threats at the time of inscription linked to lack of building space in the urban area of the city of La Coruña.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have taken note of all the activities outlined by the State Party concerning the protection of the property. The creation of the Management Plan Monitoring Committee is seen as a positive step as well as the completion of the management plan. It will now be crucial to ensure its implementation as well as the setting up of an ongoing monitoring programme, not just at the level of the physical conservation of the tower, but also of the tourist and urban pressures which may have a negative effect on the property. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies underscore the need for the wider setting of the property to be protected beyond the buffer zone.

Draft Decision: **35 COM 7B.108**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 8B.27**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Takes note of the measures taken by the State Party for the protection of the property, in particular the setting up of a Management Plan Monitoring Committee and the development of a management plan;
4. Requests the State Party to ensure, through the Management Plan Monitoring Committee, the implementation of the management plan and the monitoring of the physical condition of the tower, in particular its relative humidity;
5. Notes the financial resources that the State Party is providing for the protection of the property;
6. Also requests the State Party to provide detailed information on the mandate, composition and activities of the Management Plan Monitoring Committee as well as on the Municipality professional staff holding the scientific responsibility for the future museum and visitor centre;
7. Further requests the State Party to ensure that both tourist and urban planning pressures are also included in the overall monitoring programme for the property;
8. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation and information on

the above and to keep the World Heritage Centre informed about any future developments, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines.

109. Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1984; extension in 2005

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.108; 33 COM 7B.121; 34 COM 7B.98

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2010: Technical Reactive Monitoring Mission (ICOMOS)

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Infrastructure project for a high-speed train tunnel

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/320>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2011, the State Party transmitted a report from the national company operating the Spanish railway system (ADIF) on progress made in implementing the recommendations, and also providing detailed technical documentation on the work conducted. This documentation is in addition to monthly technical information that the State Party submitted on the progress of work.

In its report, the State Party addresses the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee by providing the following information:

- a) The Monitoring Committee was established with 19 international and independent experts from different disciplines. At the time of writing the report, the Committee met three times -- twice before the start of the work in front of the Sagrada Familia and once after the completion of the work. It is mentioned that the experts also carried out continuous monitoring during construction.
- b) A detailed monitoring of progress of the tunnel boring machine (TBM) was implemented with technical vibration surveys before and after the passage of the TBM. Its passage at the level of the Sagrada Familia occurred in early autumn 2010, without notable consequences in terms of soil compaction. Recordings of vibrations and soil compaction were made in the immediate proximity of the foundations and beyond the

row of protection pillars. During the construction period, a vibration control device was introduced near the Casa Mila. The recordings have remained well within the safety standards in force.

- c) The procedure for suspension of the work by the Committee is documented: it was implemented as from September 2010, based on 24/24h monitoring of the technical surveys of the work.
- d) A vibration monitoring programme is planned for when the high speed trains will begin running in 2012, and will be submitted for evaluation before its implementation. For now, no additional reinforcement measures for the vibration absorber systems is considered necessary. There is no monitoring programme for the subway lines, and the ADIF directing the work of AVE (Alta Velocidad Española) is not responsible for subway lines.
- e) It is envisaged that the Monitoring Committee shall continue its work until completion of the project in July 2011. The ADIF does not anticipate a longer-term monitoring programme.
- f) The report nevertheless proposes to establish another monitoring committee following the construction phase in order to sustain a monitoring programme.

In its monthly reports of December 2010 and January 2011, the State Party provides the following additional information:

- a) Cubic blocks of concrete will be employed to buttress the row of protection piles of the foundations and its bracing, at the level of the Sagrada Familia, below the surface of Mallorca street.
- b) The Bureau of Experts met on 26 August 2010 and approved the project to build a row of concrete piles along the facade of the Casa Mila, based on a model similar to that already existing alongside the Sagrada Familia, to protect and isolate the foundations of this building. The 37 piles were placed in late January 2011.

The World Heritage Centre continues to receive complaints from local NGOs expressing their concern about the work of the tunnel. For example, the NGOs provided information that in January 2011 a stone had fallen from the heights of the Sagrada Familia, thereby suggesting possible ground vibrations.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies find that the work of isolating the foundations of the Sagrada Familia by rows of reinforced concrete piles appears so far to provide protection in conformity with the previsions already provided. The results, as reported by the State Party, during the passage of the TBM, and in the months following, seem satisfactory in terms of soil compaction and vibrations observed during construction. However, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the following points:

- Lack of information on a permanent monitoring programme of soil compaction and vibrations at the level of the structures of the two buildings servicing the underground railway for the two existing subway lines (Recommendation 5.d).
- The Monitoring Committee did not meet during the construction of the tunnel in front of the Sagrada Familia -- between August 2010 and January 2011.
- Vibration recordings appear to be neither exhaustive nor continuous, notably during the passage of the TBM.
- Studies for enhanced anti-vibration technical devices during the installation of the underground railway line and information on the regulation of its use by high speed trains are not specified.

It is recommended that an independent committee be set up permanently to ensure the monitoring programme and specifically the monitoring of soil compaction and vibration at the level of the structures of the two buildings concerned.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.109

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.98**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note of the technical documentation provided by the State Party concerning the conditions for continuing the tunneling works in progress;*
4. *Notes the progress on the railway tunnel under Mallorca street, in conformity with the predictions of soil stability and structural vibration at the Sagrada Familia;*
5. *Also notes the placing of a row of concrete piles to protect the foundations of the Casa Milà, in conditions similar to those of the Sagrada Familia;*
6. *Urges the State Party to implement the following points in order to improve monitoring of the drilling near the Sagrada Familia and Casa Mila, and to facilitate their immediate halt at the slightest alert or the least uncertainty in the soil behaviour to ensure the structural integrity of the Sagrada Familia and Casa Milà:*
 - a) *Identify technical programmes underway or planned on the following:*
 - (i) *The timetable for progress of the boring towards the Casa Milà,*
 - (ii) *The status of the permanent monitoring programme for soil compaction and structural vibration effects related to rail traffic (subway and / or AVE (Alta Velocidad Española)) at the Sagrada Familia and Casa Milà,*
 - (iii) *A monitoring programme for structural vibration effects linked to the rail traffic of the Sagrada Familia and Casa Mila subway,*
 - (iv) *The technical anti-vibration systems foreseen at the time of the installation of the underground railway,*
 - (v) *Regulations to limit the speed of high-speed trains in the tunnel, to make vibrational effects completely negligible in the long term,*
 - b) *Confirm that the Monitoring Committee will remain permanent in order to ensure ongoing monitoring of soils and structures at the Sagrada Familia and Casa Milà,*
 - c) *Provide the information requested above to the World Heritage Centre by **31 October 2011** at the latest;*
7. *Requests the State Party to continue to regularly inform the World Heritage Centre of the work in progress and conclusions of the meetings of the Monitoring Committee;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to immediately inform the World Heritage Centre in the event of soil compaction or other events that could have a negative impact on any of the components of the World Heritage property;*

9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a progress report on the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

110. Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

111. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of complementary information from the State Party)

112. Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral, Kiev Pechersk Lavra and Related Monastic Buildings (Ukraine) (C 527 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1990

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 8D; 33 COM 7B.125; 34 COM 7B.103

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: (1998-2009), USD 44720

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
May 1999: ICOMOS expert mission; April 2006: expert mission (Italian Funds-in-Trust); November 2007: World Heritage Centre information meeting for site managers; March 2009 and November 2010: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
Urban development pressure

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 28 January 2011. This addresses the recommendations of the Committee at its 34th session and other conservation issues.

A joint UNESCO/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited the property from 8 to 13 November 2010, as requested by the Committee at its 34th session. A report of the mission is available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM/>.

a) Rehabilitation programme for the Varangian caves

The State Party reports that the main parts of the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra caves that are open to the public are in good condition but the lesser branches including the Varangian Caves are not. The report states that surveys of the Varangian caves have been undertaken, and also work on 'fixing' ancient inscriptions and remains of frescoes, and that these will lead to the development of a rehabilitation project. This will include 'possible clearing' of the near caves ruined in mediaeval times. No further details or timescale are provided, and no copy of the complex rehabilitation programme for the Varangian caves, as requested by the Committee, has been supplied.

The mission noted that the multi-disciplinary surveys of the caves provide for the first time a comprehensive analysis and assessment of their state. This reveals that although the condition of the main caves is better, there are problems in the nearby caves and the state of the Varangian caves is critical. There is an urgent need to re-build the soft red stone that has been destroyed by a landslide. The mission was informed that a programme of work was ready for nearby caves and that the section on the Varangian would not be completed until late 2010. Problems related to the landslide near the caverns, noted by the 2009 mission, have been partially neutralised.

b) Moratorium on building construction and proposed major projects

The State Party reports that construction of a 150-metre tall building at Klovsy descent has started in the buffer zone. As this threatens the dominance of the property's silhouette along the river, the Scientific Methodical Council of State Cultural Heritage has passed a resolution to review the project.

The State Party did not provide detailed information on the following projects which the Committee had requested to be halted, further to the recommendations of the 2009 mission: buildings on the territory around the Arsenal and the earth fortification, hotel complex around Saint Spas of Berestove Church, hotel and residential complex on the land of the former military factories near the Arsenal, buildings in the buffer zone of the Saint Sophia Cathedral, and other high-rise buildings that could compromise the panorama of the historical monastic landscape along the Dnieper.

However, the mission noted that due to the moratorium on projects, currently no project has obtained a building permit. For example, construction around the Arsenal is currently suspended.

The policy on new construction in the buffer zone of the Lavra monastery is due in some measure to the comprehensive approach to management. The mission did not find such a positive development in the buffer zone of Saint Sophia. This is largely due to the absence of effective instruments for management of the area. In the absence of strict rules, conflicts arise constantly in the area and these absorb a considerable amount of institutional and social energy.

The mission was informed that there were plans for 30 new buildings in the buffer zone of Saint-Sophia. Among these are proposals at Gonchar 17/23. ICOMOS had commented on the height, building shape and size of this building in 2010 when it was referred to the World Heritage Centre. The mission considered that the pretentious scheme with pseudo historical elements does not respect the local architectural context at all and recommended reducing the overall height of the building and re-designing it to reflect the scale of neighbouring buildings.

The mission took note of a proposal to re-build the Orthodox Cathedral (Desyatinnaya Zerkov) destroyed in the 1930s where archaeological remains have been abandoned. There is no complete documentation of the earlier building (originally built in the 11th century and re-built several times, lastly in the 1840s). The mission considered that such a building would change the horizontal line of the existing urban landscape and could impact on the visual integrity and Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Moreover, as this construction has divided the opinions of scholars, policy makers and the public, this supposed place of unification could become a place of discord.

c) Legal protection

The State Party reports that the Law on 'Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of Ukraine on Protection of Cultural Heritage' was approved on 9 September 2010.

The mission noted that, in addition to this law, several other protection laws had been passed since the previous mission in 2009 and now regulatory measures are in place to ensure the protection of the World Heritage properties, including against infringements. This represents considerable progress.

There are now means in place to create a system of integrated planning of the historic urban centre and its protected areas. A "historic urban area" will be created for the historical centre of Kyiv, including the property and its buffer zone. However, the mission noted that currently the lack of regulatory and practical mechanisms to ensure implementation of the above laws, could actually render them inefficient.

d) Submission of finalised management plan and approval of new Urban Master Plan, including conservation Master Plan

The State Party has not submitted a management plan, as requested by the World Heritage Committee. The mission did not obtain any information on the intention to develop such plan.

The State Party reports that 'General Plan of Kyiv' (the new City Urban Master Plan) is being developed by the Institute of Urban Development, Architecture and Urban Environment Design of Kyiv. The mission reported that the first phase of a Master Plan for City Planning has been adopted in principle, and should be approved in 2011 by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

The mission observed worsening contradictions between the two main management authorities, namely the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the Ministry of Regional Development and Construction. In 2009, there was only a lack of coordination between ministries in sharing strategic spheres of influence, it appears that currently there is a conflict between two departments, which distorts the pattern of financing and investment policy concerning the property; there seems to be no willingness to establish a National Coordination Council and a unified management system that includes all stakeholders; and the role of voluntary associations in the management of the property remains vague and unregulated.

The mission noted very clear intentions to break with the fragmented management of the property and to establish a unified and coherent approach. The mission also noted that a draft decree of the President of Ukraine provides for the transfer of management to the

Ministry of Culture and Tourism of all museums-reserves that are state property. This should put an end to the conflict between different Ministries and administrations.

The mission considered that it is essential that the fragmented and dysfunctional management of the property is addressed in order to prevent further damage to the property and its buffer zone.

A considerable improvement in the relations between the national and religious authorities can be noted. The religious community at the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra actively participated in the organisation of the International Seminar on the role of religious communities in the management of the World Heritage properties, organised, further to the recommendation of the 2009 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, under the high patronage of the President of Ukraine and UNESCO in Kyiv in November 2010.

e) Possible extension of the buffer zone boundaries and a study on views of riverside landscape

The mission noted problems with the existing buffer zones which do not fulfil their role as protection for the setting of the property as there is a lack of protective arrangements that would allow detailed consideration of urban development plans. The most serious problem is the buffer zone of Saint Sophia. The current zone can no longer be seen as a reliable basis for the control over development of the area. The mission reported that nothing was being done to redefine these buffer zones in response to previous requests of the Committee. It is unclear why the studies on the area undertaken before 2008 by the Institute for Research on theory and history of urban planning and architecture have not been pursued.

The State Party in its reports states that the Preservation Institute has drafted a proposal to extend the buffer zone on the north, west and eastern side to cover an overall area of over 280 ha. This proposal has not been formally submitted for evaluation. Further the State Party reports that an extension of the buffer zone of Saint Sophia Cathedral ensemble will be implemented during the realisation of the Master Plan.

The study of views is not addressed in the report. The mission noted that there have been no studies on monastic river landscape and the mission received no information about possible preparations for such a study.

The mission also noted a real deterioration of the current panorama along the Dnieper. A tall building that has a strong negative impact on the view and the silhouette of the Lavra monastery has been constructed. The building is in the area of regulated buildings and is a clear breach of the status of the area. There are also plans to build a new 30-storey building on Boulevard Krechtchatik that will have a strong negative effect on the landscape. The restaurant near the river that the 2009 mission cited as a negative example still exists. Moreover, the construction there has continued despite assurances that the restaurant would be demolished.

f) Conservation of Lavra monastery and Saint Sophia

The mission reported that at the Lavra monastery regular conservation activity is underway. Uncontrolled construction noted by the 2009 mission had been substantially reduced. At Saint Sophia, the "Program of preservation of properties of Hagias Sophia 2003-2010" includes conservation work on the mural in the Apostolic Church, the Gate of Zabrov, reconstruction and modernization of technical infrastructure, monitoring construction. Conservation work in the Church of Saint Andrew continues. However, there is still no master plan for conservation. The mission requested details of authorised conservation work but was not provided with details.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the surveys undertaken of the Varangian caves but regrets that no detailed documents have been provided of the rehabilitation project, as requested by the Committee, and that these details were not provided to the mission.

They also note that progress has been made with new protective legislative regulatory measures that will strengthen the protection of museums-reserves and allow integrated planning of designated historic urban areas. They note the intention to define a historic urban area for the historical centre of Kyiv to include property and its buffer zone. However they also note the concern of the mission that the lack of regulatory and practical mechanisms to ensure implementation of the new laws could render them inefficient.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned that there appears to be no commitment to create a management plan for the property and that there is still no single management authority. They are extremely concerned that the mission considered that there were worsening contradictions between the two main management authorities, and that as a result of dysfunctional management, the property was suffering – particularly the lack of planning control in its buffer zone and setting.

They note an important improvement in relation between the national and religious authorities, and congratulate the State Party and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church for the organisation of the International Seminar which resulted by adoption of the Kyiv Statement on protection of religious properties within the *World Heritage Convention*.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies invite the State Party to continue actively participate in the development of a new Thematic Programme on Religious and Sacred Heritage presented to the World Heritage Committee in item 5A (Document *WHC-11/35.COM/5A*). This Programme seeks to create an action plan for the protection of religious and sacred heritage world-wide aiming to enhance the role of communities and prevent any misunderstandings, tensions or stereotypes. Due to the huge challenges that religious heritage and sacred places pose and taking into account all activities undertaken by the Advisory Bodies, it is particularly crucial at this moment to define jointly and in coordination with all States Parties an Integrated Strategy for the development of this new World Heritage programme.

They also note with alarm that the mission considered that the most pessimistic prognosis mentioned in the 2009 mission report on the panorama along the River Dnieper is becoming a reality, as tall buildings are being constructed even in regulated areas. Furthermore no survey of the monastic river landscape has been undertaken or is even planned.

Within the buffer zone there are also concerns over buildings where the architectural design and scale were considered by the mission to be totally unsympathetic to the local urban landscape.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that currently the property and its setting are vulnerable to irreversible changes in their urban context and that there is an urgent need to control the scale and design of building development in the buffer zone. They also consider that there is a need to impose a moratorium on high-rise buildings that may have a negative effect on the panorama along the Dnieper River, until, as previously requested by the Committee, a study has been completed on the vistas of the property within the monastic river landscape that could form the basis of approved restrictions throughout the historic urban area to ensure that new construction do not have a negative effect on the property and its setting.

On 28 March 2011, Ukrainian authorities informed the World Heritage Centre that the President of Ukraine instructed the Cabinet of Ministers on 17 March 2011 to speed up amendment to Law “On Protection of Cultural Heritage”, as well as that the Prime Minister of Ukraine charged the City Administration to inspect all disputable constructions in the

historical part of the city from the point of view of their compliance with acting legislation. He also instructed a special commission composed by all stakeholders to be created. The State Party underlines that this issue remains under the special control of the Prime Minister of Ukraine.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.112

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.103**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Notes the progress made with the adoption of protection laws since the 2009 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and urges the State Party to define a protected historic urban area for central Kyiv as soon as possible;*
4. *Also urges the State Party to strengthen the regulatory and practical mechanisms to ensure the satisfactory implementation of the above laws;*
5. *Also notes progress with the development of a Master Plan for Kyiv and requests the State Party to submit it once approved;*
6. *Regrets that no management plan has been provided, as requested by the Committee, and that currently there are no plans to produce one, and further urges the State Party address this issue as a matter of urgency;*
7. *Further notes the increasing contradictions between management in the two parts of the property, as highlighted by the mission, and also requests the State Party to put in place a unified system of management for the property as soon as possible;*
8. *Welcomes the important improvement in the relations between the national and religious authorities, commends the State Party and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church for the organisation of the International Seminar which resulted by adoption of the Kyiv Statement on protection of religious properties within the World Heritage Convention and invites it to actively participate in the development of a Thematic Programme on religious and sacred heritage;*
9. *Expresses its great concern at the degradation of the panorama along the Dnieper river, and reiterates its request to the State Party to introduce a moratorium on tall buildings until a survey has been conducted of the overall monastic river landscape;*
10. *Notes furthermore that the issue regarding urban development pressure is now under special control of the Prime Minister of Ukraine, that the City Administration has been charged to inspect all disputable constructions in the historical part of the city from the point of view of their compliance with acting legislation, and that a special commission composed by all stakeholders concerned is being created;*
11. *Also requests the State Party to submit the final revised plans for all ongoing projects to the World Heritage Centre as well as all information and documents of any other proposed major developments, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*

12. Notes moreover the multi-disciplinary study that has been carried out on the Varangian caves, and reiterates its requests to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre details of the proposed rehabilitation plan for the caves;
13. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, 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 37th session in 2013.

113. L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C 865)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1998

Criteria
(ii) (v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 8B.69; 33 COM 7B.126; 34 COM 7B.104

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
2004: ICOMOS-German World Heritage Foundation mission; March 2010: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) New constructions within the historic centre;
b) Lack of valid detailed planning documents;
c) Inadequate infrastructure including the sewage system

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/865>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted the state of conservation report on 28 January 2011.

a) *Management plan and Master plan*

At its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to submit the Strategic Management Plan and the Master plan of the property to the World Heritage Centre, along with the state of conservation report. The report states that, following approval and confirmation by the L'viv City Council Deputies, the Strategic Management Plan and Integrated Concept of Central Part of L'viv Development will be transmitted to the Centre by May 2011. Approved by the L'viv City Council, the Master Plan of L'viv was submitted to the World Heritage Centre, along with the report.

b) *State of conservation*

The State Party report assures the World Heritage Centre that, in response to the World Heritage Committee concerns, the urban structure of the property has not changed since its last session. The report also confirms that all new construction projects have been submitted to the World Heritage Committee for recommendations, and no steps towards their implementation have taken place. Furthermore, it states that restoration works are planned in agreement with the project documentation developed according to the State Restoration Standards and Rules, and are examined and approved by the Ministry of Culture and the Tourism Central body for heritage protection. With a view to creating a supervisory board for the constant monitoring of World Heritage properties in Ukraine, a draft amendment to the Cultural Heritage Protection Act of Ukraine is currently under discussion.

c) *Development projects*

The State Party report informs that the investor of the Citadel area hotel project has halted all construction activities. The State Party underlines that any action on the Citadel site will occur only after analysing the potential impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), and following submission of all plans to the World Heritage Centre. The report also assures that no construction has taken place on the site of the former Franciscan monastery, and that all future projects that may affect the OUV of the property will be carried out in consultation with the World Heritage Committee, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

d) *Conservation and preservation issues*

Two international restoration and conservation projects are currently being carried out in cooperation with the Polish Ministry of Culture and the German technical cooperation (GTZ). In addition, programmes for the provision of financial aid to historical building apartment owners were introduced in 2010 when 37 house balconies were repaired and restoration work on the Armenian cathedral and Jesuit church was completed. All projects were carried out in accordance with established procedures, and conducted under the supervision of restoration professionals.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note progress in the creation of the Strategic Management Plan and expect its completion and submission to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible. They welcome the submission of the Master Plan of L'viv that is currently under review by ICOMOS.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the report's intimation that the urban structure of the property has not been changed, and that no construction works have begun on the property. In particular, they note that construction activities within the property and its buffer zone that may affect the OUV of the property have been halted.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recognise the State Party's efforts to initiate conservation and rehabilitation projects with the international community, and encourage the State Party to continue with these in order to safeguard the World Heritage property. They acknowledge the efforts being made to protect the OUV through freezing development projects and by the definition of appropriate restoration and conservation work procedures. Nevertheless, they consider that more substantial progress is needed in addressing the recommendations of the March 2010 mission in order to remove the threats to the property which were acknowledged by the World Heritage Committee at its last session and led the World Heritage Committee to envisage the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.113

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.104**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Notes the progress made with the development of a Strategic Management Plan and requests that it be sent to the World Heritage Centre immediately upon completion;
4. Acknowledges that major development projects which could adversely affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and specifically the construction of a hotel and construction on the former Franciscan monastery site within the historic centre and buffer zone, have come to a complete halt;
5. Also acknowledges the progress of restoration works in accordance with established procedures, and reiterates that all future plans for restoration and new development must be submitted to the World Heritage Centre in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
6. Recognises the value of restoration projects implemented in coordination with the international community, and encourages the State Party to continue in such efforts;
7. Urges the State Party to fully address the recommendations of the 2010 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in order to achieve substantial progress towards removing the threats to the property;
8. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess progress in the implementation of all necessary measures in compliance with its decisions, prior to its 37th session in 2013;
9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012** (prior to the mission) and by **1 February 2013**, progress reports on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

114. Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.90; 32 COM 7B.112; 32 COM 8B.98; 33 COM 7B.127

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Construction proposals in the immediate vicinity of the Tower of London that could harm the setting, related vistas and integrity of the World Heritage property;
- b) Lack of an in-depth visual impact study on possible impacts of development projects, as well as the lack of an approved management plan;
- c) Lack of protection of the immediate surroundings of the Tower of London through an adequate and commonly agreed buffer zone; and statutory protection of the iconic view from the South Bank of the River Thames towards and beyond the Tower.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/488>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the Tower of London was submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre. The report addresses the issues raised in accordance with Paragraph 8 of Decision **33 COM 7B.127**, in particular measures taken to strengthen the protection of the setting of the property and views from and to it, and includes a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for approval by the World Heritage Committee.

a) *Dynamic Visual Impact Study (DVIS)*

The State Party reiterates that one view of the Tower has been designated to protect its silhouette from the south. Although the '*Seeing the History in the View: Assessing Heritage Significance within Views*' by English Heritage, to be published in spring 2011, is mentioned (as is the case with Westminster), no further non-statutory views have been considered.

The State Party also reports that the publication '*The Setting of Heritage Assets: English Heritage Guidance*' is due in summer 2011. It will be part of the publication *Seeing the History in View* and should serve as a basis for visual impact studies.

Further Supplementary Planning Guidance is currently being prepared that will set out guidance for defining the setting of World Heritage properties in London.

b) *London View Management Framework (LVMF)*

The State Party reports that the '*Revised Supplementary Planning Guidance – London View Management Framework*' was published in July 2010. This guidance designated the Tower of London as a 'Strategically Important Landmark'. The guidance requires development in the background of a designated landmark to respect the view.

The State Party also reports that policies to protect the property are set out in the emerging '*Local Development Framework*' of the City of London, London Borough of Tower Hamlets and London Borough of Southwark local authorities.

c) *Tower of London Consultative Committee*

The State Party reports that the collaborative '*Tower of London Local Setting Study*', commissioned by the Tower of London Consultative Committee, was developed with reference to the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 1 February 2011. It is reported that discussions are underway with

the relevant planning authorities to include the recommendations as part of their planning policies. The *'Tower of London Local Setting Study'* comprises an analysis of the significance of eleven individual views in the surrounding of the Tower with recommendations how they might be sustained or improved in terms of public realm, etc. No further protection of these views is envisaged in the report. However, these vistas are largely irrelevant from a conservation point of view: five are within the boundaries of the property, three extend just a couple of metres beyond the boundaries and three run across the river. Consequently, none of them affects any building area. The study also defines a 'local setting'. This is a small area immediately outside the boundaries of the property and cannot be said to define even the immediate setting of the property.

d) *Buffer Zone*

The State Party notes that, according to paragraph 103 of the *Operational Guidelines*, buffer zones are not necessary where adequate layers of protection already exist. It also informs that the finalized report on the local setting, together with the policies in the emerging planning documents, will provide a wider framework to ensure that the property and its setting are conserved. The State Party also notes that the London Borough of Southwark is currently preparing a consultation supplementary planning document for Bankside, Borough and London Bridge.

e) *Other Issues*

The State Party reports that the substantial conservation work programme on the White Tower is now complete and that a tree strategy is now in place. However, the State Party also reports that there is an intense change occurring in the commercial area surrounding the property, including a number of high-rise buildings such as the approved 160m high building at 20 Fenchurch Street; the Shard of Glass at London Bridge; the proposed 31 storey building, The Quill, at St Thomas's Street (currently called in by the Secretary of State); and the granting of permission for a 21 storey tower at Pottersfield directly opposite the property on the South bank of the river.

f) *Guidance*

The State Party reports that the protection of World Heritage properties in England has been strengthened by the recent release of three publications – *'Circular 07/09 Circular on the Protection of World Heritage Sites'*; accompanying *'English Heritage guidance to Circular 07/09'*; and *'PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (March 2010)'* – and that other related policy documentation, such as *'The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London'* is in production with more specific reference to the protection of the property.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre, and the Advisory Bodies note with great concern that since the 2009 *state of conservation* report, the setting of the property, both the immediate setting that would normally be covered by a buffer zone, and the wider setting, have not been given specific formal protection, apart from one designated view that was already in place.

The State Party reports that further guidance for settings is being prepared, and that the results of the local setting study will be acknowledged in Local Authority Plans but neither appears to offer definition of the wider setting and wider views to and from the property, nor formal protection of a buffer zone or equivalent.

The Tower is not better protected than it was two years ago and meanwhile, as the State Party acknowledges, development projects with tall buildings that could have an impact on the property, continue to be approved whilst all the policy issues associated with the property and its setting have not yet fully been resolved or promulgated. The setting of the Tower has seen drastic changes in the last decade and appears not to have been 'managed' to respect

the OUV of the Tower. Building work has impacted on the setting of the Tower on three sides and the resulting glass structures do not enhance the presence of the Tower or allow it to project its former role.

The recommendations of the 2006 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to put in place 'protection of the immediate surroundings of the Tower through an adequate and commonly agreed buffer zone, which would allow better guidance as regards height and bulk of future planning applications' and that 'This plan must be incorporated in the Greater London Authority's London Plan', have not been achieved.

Furthermore, the recommendation of the Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) to ensure that the 'new sub-group of the Tower of London World Heritage Site Consultative Committee, fully considers the need for protection of the immediate surroundings of the Tower of London through an adequate and commonly agreed buffer zone'; that '*progress towards a buffer zone as soon as possible and bringing together guidance on visual impact in order to put in place a coherent approach*', and that 'the Mayor's review of the supplementary planning guidance, the London Views Management Framework, fully takes into account the relevant views of the November 2006 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission' have not been achieved.

In view of the above, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note with deep concern that no substantial progress has been made to protect the setting of the property and that the property remains under threat. They therefore suggest that the World Heritage Committee examines the state of conservation of this property, with a view to inscribing the World Heritage property of the Tower of London, United Kingdom, on the List of the World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.114

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.127** adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Acknowledges the completion of the "Tower of London Local Setting Study", however, expresses great concern that this study only addresses individual views and a very narrow local setting, while the overall setting of the Tower in relation to the Outstanding Universal Value has not been defined and provided with protection in line with Decision **33 COM 7B.127** adopted by the Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009);*
4. *Considers that the incremental developments around the Tower over the past five years have impacted adversely the property, its visual integrity and its ability to convey its meaning as a fortress to such an extent that the property is under threat;*
5. *Strongly reiterates its request to the State Party to define a buffer zone considering that adequate layers of protection are not in place;*
6. *Requests the State Party to refrain from approving new construction projects in the vicinity of the property without assessing their potential impact on the property;*
7. *Regrets that the State Party has not complied with all of the requests expressed by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **33 COM 7B.127** and that therefore the property is in Danger in conformity with Chapter IV.B of the Operational Guidelines and decides*

to inscribe the Tower of London, United Kingdom, on the List of World Heritage in Danger;

8. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to discuss with national and local authorities the overall situation of the property with regard to the state of conservation of the site in its urban context and how current and proposed construction projects in its neighbourhood may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and to develop a proposal for the Desired state of conservation and corrective measures for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement all the decisions of the Committee, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

115. Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom) (C 426bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1987

Criteria
(i) (ii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.91; 32 COM 7B.113; 33 COM 7B.128

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
November 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Construction proposals in the immediate vicinity of Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church that could have an adverse impact on the setting, related vistas and integrity of the property;
- b) Lack of an in-depth visual impact study on possible impacts of development projects, as well as lack of an approved management plan;
- c) Need for protection of the immediate surroundings of the property through an adequate buffer zone.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/426>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. The report addresses the issues raised in paragraph 5 of Decision **33 COM 7B.128**, in particular measures taken to strengthen the protection of the setting of the property and views from and to the property.

a) *Dynamic Visual Impact Studies*

The State Party reports that the five key views that relate to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property have been identified and assessed under the methodology set out in “*Seeing the History in the View: a method for Assessing Heritage Significance within Views*”, due to be published by spring 2011. This general publication can serve as a basis for visual impact studies. The analysis of the five views, once finalized, should provide a baseline study identifying the relevance to the OUV, and to other significances/values encapsulated in each view, for use by developers and decision-makers. Other views will be assessed as resources permit. These views appear not to be protected in any way.

The State Party further reports that the publication of ‘*The Setting of Heritage Assets: English Heritage Guidance*’, will be published in summer 2011. It will be a part of the publication ‘*Seeing the History in View*’.

b) *Guidance*

The State Party reports that the ‘*Revised Supplementary Planning Guidance – London View Management Framework*’ was published in July 2010. This guidance designated the Palace of Westminster as a ‘Strategically Important Landmark’, and a new designated view of the property in Parliament Square is proposed for inclusion. The guidance requires developments in the background of a designated view to respect the view. The precise nature of the proposed designated view or its scope is not set out.

The State Party reports that the protection of World Heritage properties in the United Kingdom has been strengthened by “Circular 07/09 on the Protection of World Heritage Sites”, the “Accompanying English Heritage guidance to Circular 07/09 The Protection and Management of World Heritage Sites in England and Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (March 2010)” and the “PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (March 2010)”. Furthermore, the State Party reports that “The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London” and the “City of Westminster and London Borough of Lambeth planning documents” that are both currently undergoing statutory revision contain policies to protect heritage in general as well as the World Heritage properties.

In addition to the revised ‘*Supplementary Planning Guidance – London View Management Framework*’ the State Party offers extracts and links to further documentation, including the ‘*Consolidated Revisions to the October 2009 London Plan*’ and ‘*The English Planning System and Dynamic Visual Impact Studies for development affecting World Heritage Sites*’. It also reports that publication of the Westminster City Council draft ‘*Supplementary Planning Guidance Metropolitan Views 2009*’ has been delayed pending completion of the ‘*Local Development Framework*’, and publication of the ‘*London View Management Framework*’.

c) *Buffer Zone*

The State Party reports that, in following the *Operational Guidelines*, it considers that where adequate layers of protection already exist, buffer zones are not necessary in every case. It also reports that further work following the *5 Views Baseline Study* will assess existing and possible additional, protective measures for the property with a view to informing the 2012-13 management plan review.

The submitted extract from the draft London Plan states that the Mayor will work with relevant stakeholders to define the setting of World Heritage sites.

d) Development

The State Party reports that there are no major conservation issues currently within the property, although it does report that a number of development applications have been made that could have a potential impact on the property. These include the 22- and 27-storey high Elizabeth House development at Waterloo across the River Thames; developments at Victoria Transport Interchange 1; those near Battersea Power Station and Nine Elms; and developments at Vauxhall Broadway, pending a public enquiry in 2011.

e) Other issues

The management plan of the property was published in 2007. In 2008, the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **32 COM 7B.113** regretted the 'lack of clarity on the management system set out in the management plan for addressing conflicts between conservation and development, particularly in the setting of the property'. This issue still seems not to have been addressed.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party has addressed the visual threats to the property in a variety of publications and strategy papers that have already been or will be published in the near future. However, they note with concern that, since the last report to the World Heritage Committee, the setting of the property, both the immediate setting that would normally be covered by a buffer zone, and the wider setting and views have not been given formal specific protection. Although five views have been identified by the Westminster World Heritage property Dynamic Visual Impact Study Steering Group in connection with the publication '*Seeing the History in the View*,' this measure does not provide any specific protection for the property. The '*Revised Supplementary Planning Guidance – London View Management Framework*' offers the possibility of a designated view of the property, but this has not yet been put in place and it is not clear how one view will have a substantial impact on the protection of the whole setting. This guidance does not incorporate the original intentions of the suggested "Skyline Study" that was said to be in preparation at the time of the 2006 reactive monitoring mission. Accordingly, no additional protection is provided.

Although the State Party states that a buffer zone is not necessarily needed as there is adequate protection in place, it is not clear what this protection is – particularly as it is stated that a number of development applications have been made that could have a potential impact on the property as the State Party itself acknowledges. There is a mention of possible additional protective measures for the property that might be included in the 2012/2013 revision of the management plan, but it is not clear what these are or how the plan could give them effect. The draft London Plan mentions definition of the setting, but not the protection this setting will have.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that given the acknowledged vulnerabilities of this property from development near its tight boundaries, there is an urgent need to define the immediate setting of the property and to give it protection as a buffer zone, to define the wider setting in relation to the OUV, and to put in place appropriate protection for longer key views, in order to provide a framework for development and avoid confusion amongst stakeholders, as highlighted by the 2006 mission.

The World Heritage Committee requested that the '*review of the supplementary planning guidance, and the London Views Management Framework, should fully take into account the relevant recommendations of the November 2006 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS*

reactive monitoring mission'. This mission stated that it was 'essential for the UK authorities to close the existing gap between theory and practice, between UK national policy on World Heritage and its interpretation and implementation at the local level, which has recently lead to inconsistencies and confusion'. It also stated that 'the comprehensive skyline study currently in preparation should determine which views to and from the site are critical for maintaining the site's integrity and for appreciating its setting to the fullest. Until this study has been finalized and further protective measures are in place, proposed new development could impact adversely on the values of the World Heritage site'. It further stated that "a dynamic visual impact study" to facilitate a thorough and rapid assessment of future planning applications,' needed to be put in place.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee deeply regret that none of these concerns have yet been addressed and that it cannot be stated that substantial progress has been made. The possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger might be considered at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in case of further deterioration of the property's state of conservation.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.115

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.128**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Notes the intention of the State Party to address issues related to the protection of the visual integrity of the property;
4. Notes with regret that although five non-statutory views have been identified, no specific measures have been taken to formally protect both the immediate setting of the property by establishing a buffer zone and its wider setting and views;
5. Notes with concern that the State Party acknowledges that major developments currently being considered could have a potential impact on the property;
6. Urges the State Party to protect the immediate setting of the property by defining a buffer zone as well as to define the wider setting of the property in relation to its Outstanding Universal Value and to put in place appropriate protection for key views in and out of the property including long-distance views;
7. Requests the State Party to halt all new development projects until an adequate protection of the immediate and wider setting of the property is in place;
8. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to review and discuss with national and local authorities the overall situation of the property with regard to the state of conservation of the site in its urban context, how current and proposed construction projects in its neighbourhood may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and how appropriate protection for its setting may be put in place, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012;
9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and in particular on how

*protection could be strengthened for its setting and related vistas, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

116. Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom) (C 373bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.104; 32 COM 7B.114; 33 COM 7B.129

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Closure of route A344 not accomplished;
- b) Lack of visitor management.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/373>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011 the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property which sets out the progress made in the resolution concerning the closure of road A 344 and the issues related to the relocation of the visitor facilities.

The State Party report states that the Stonehenge Environmental Improvements Project (SEIP) was launched with a view of establishing a new visitor centre within the framework of a new management plan in 2009. The project is chaired by English Heritage.

In October 2009, English Heritage submitted a Full Planning Application to Wiltshire Council, including the following elements:

- the construction of the new visitor centre, parking and associated facilities at Airman's Corner, within the property;
- the removal of existing visitor facilities and parking at the Stones.

The Wiltshire Council granted full planning permission for this application on 23 June 2010.

The State Party informs that the timeframe for the completion of the project will depend on funding. An alternative funding strategy of English Heritage to raise the £ 27 million required for the project has been approved in principle by the government. Currently, a grant of £ 10 million from the Heritage Lottery Fund towards the cost of the project has been secured by English Heritage. In addition, English Heritage will be allowed to access £ 2 million of historic reserves raised from philanthropic sources according to a press release of 4 April 2011 by the Department for Culture Media and Sport. Further funding of around £ 3.5 million will be made available for improvements to Highways Agency roads close to Stonehenge, subject to the completion of statutory processes and confirmed go-ahead of the Stonehenge improvements. In principle, the State Party plans to commence the construction works early in 2012 and to finalize them with the opening of the new visitor centre in July 2013.

a) *Closure of A 344 trunk road*

After Wiltshire Council granted the full planning permission, English Heritage presented to the Secretary of State for Transport applications for stopping and grassing over parts of road A 344 which runs immediately adjacent to the property between the main A303 road and Byway 12, some half a kilometre to the north, and the B 3086 road (near the proposed visitor centre) which are currently subject to public consultation and might become the subject of a public inquiry. These two public inquiries may take place at the same time. The visitor centre cannot be finalized until these road issues have been resolved.

b) *Visitor facilities*

Apart from the information concerning the full planning permission granted by Wiltshire Council, the State Party has not provided specific details on this issue.

c) *Other current conservation issues*

English Heritage have commissioned a condition survey of known archaeological sites within the property which will update previous condition surveys and provide a revised baseline for assessment of the condition of the property for the next round of Periodic Reporting. Natural England is carrying out a survey on the impact of burrowing animals on the World Heritage property and has commissioned further work on the research framework for the property.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge the specific measures taken to ensure the implementation of the Stonehenge Environmental Improvements Project, in particular concerning the visitor centre and closing of road A344 between Stonehenge Bottom and Byway 12. However, the efforts put forth have been, as in previous years, rather administrative, whereas no physical progress has occurred on the site.

They are concerned that no details have been provided for the visitor centre scheme in terms of precise location within the property or details of its design. Nor has an impact assessment been supplied.

They note that the implementation of the planned projects depends partly on approval of traffic orders and mainly on the funding which remains to be secured and call upon the State Party to secure funding in order to start and complete the on-site works as planned.

No further report is requested for the next Committee session as the progress in the implementation of the projects will be outlined within the forthcoming Periodic Reporting Exercise for Europe and North America to be launched in 2012. The State Party is requested, however, to keep the World Heritage Centre informed about any progress or modification related to the road closure and the visitor facilities issues.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.116

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.129**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Acknowledges the measures taken in the resolution of the road closure and the visitor facilities issues, in particular the approval of the English Heritage Full Planning Application by Wiltshire Council in June 2010;
4. Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with details of the location and plans of the proposed visitor centre for evaluation by ICOMOS;
5. Notes that the funding for the implementation of the development project has almost been achieved;
6. Also requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed about any development related to the road closure and the visitor facilities and to report any implementation activities within the Periodic Reporting exercise to be launched in 2012.

117. Old and New Towns of Edinburgh (United Kingdom) (C 728)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1995

Criteria
(ii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
28 COM 15B.101; 32 COM 7B.117; 33 COM 7B.132

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
November 2008: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Major development projects;
b) Traffic regulations.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/728>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation describing the current situation of development projects, providing an overview of the implementation of measures requested by the World Heritage Committee and explaining the reasons for not establishing a buffer zone as requested by the World Heritage Committee in 2009.

a) Development projects

Caltongate: The lead developer of this project had gone into receivership in 2009 and discussions regarding the purchase of the creditor's ownership are under way. The State Party expects that the potential purchaser will consider using the existing planning consent.

Haymarket: Further to a public local Inquiry held in 2009 a planning consent was not granted due to the impact of the tallest element of the scheme, a hotel, on the wider city. The State Party also reported that a revised development has been recently granted planning permission and that the 17-storey hotel has been redesigned as a 6-storey office building.

St James Centre: According to the 2008 reactive monitoring mission report this 1970s shopping centre is a visual barrier and its demolition will enable a new vision for the area. The State Party reports that due to economic circumstances the replacement of the building has been delayed. The report also informs that the outline planning permission for the replacement was approved in June 2009 and that the detailed planning application is expected to be presented over the next two years.

b) Buffer Zone

The State Party reports that the establishment of a buffer zone has been included in the current review of the Management Plan, but the work undertaken by Edinburgh World Heritage (EWH) concluded that a buffer zone would not necessarily provide effective protection of the site's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), especially because adequate layers of protection already exist. According to the report, the implementation of the "Guidance on the Protection of Key Views" and the existing statutory protection would provide a more efficient and responsive mechanism to protect the OUV of the property.

Considering that 40 conservation areas have been recognized by the City of Edinburgh Council and that they cover not only the World Heritage property but nearly all adjacent land, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the State Party should study the feasibility of integrating them under a buffer zone scheme to develop a more effective protection.

c) Policies in relation to height controls

The State Party informs that the "Guidance on the Protection of Key Views" was adopted by the City of Edinburgh Council in June 2008. The report also informs that the Edinburgh City Local Plan, adopted on 28 January 2010, includes a policy on tall buildings which establishes a presumption against new buildings that are visibly higher than their neighbours. Proposals for development that would be conspicuous in wider views of the city will be subject to special scrutiny.

d) Awareness-raising

The State Party reports that the management plan, which is currently under revision, includes measures to increase the understanding of the OUV. The report also provides information about the consultations on the management plan held in 2010, with two workshops and written responses from a range of stakeholders. While the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recognize that a participatory framework has been developed for the revision of the management plan, they expect that specific awareness-raising strategies about the OUV would be developed as part of the revised management plan.

e) *Edinburgh Tram*

The report informs that the detailed elements of the project are subject to planning consents and that an agreement concerning the details of associated infrastructure has not been reached yet. In reply to concerns raised by citizens of Edinburgh concerning displacement of general traffic to some residential and historic streets, the State Party has informed the World Heritage Centre that this situation is part of the reconfiguration of traffic flows in relation to works for the tram system and subsequent road closures. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the State Party should carefully consider whether these traffic displacements may negatively affect the OUV of the property and undertake impact studies to that effect.

f) *Other issues*

The State Party also informs about other development projects:

Leith Docks: Works have not yet begun.

South Bridge Fire Site: Planning consents are in place for a mixed-use development and according to the report will not have any adverse impact on the OUV of the property.

Princes Street: The project is currently being developed. The 2008 reactive monitoring mission did not raise any major concern about this project.

Royal High School: Edinburgh City Council has identified a development partner to take on the re-use of the building. A planning workshop in 2011, with all key planning stakeholders, will assess the development potential of the building.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the State Party has made good progress in the implementation of the recommendations made by the 2008 reactive monitoring mission and the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session. They note that the Caltongate site is looking for a new purchaser and consider that the State Party should do all it can to encourage any new developer of this highly prominent site to produce a revised scheme that reinforces the spatial layout of the Old Town and takes account of the mission's recommendations in respect of the current plans.

At the same time, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the development and implementation of policies and measures pertaining to the conservation of the property, including height limits, and the protection of key views, but still recommend that the State Party consider the feasibility of establishing a buffer zone through the integration of the existing conservation areas, as a means for providing more effective protection for the immediate setting of the property.

While the tram system might be a positive development for the city, further information on the project should be provided for evaluation. Impact assessment studies and protective measures should be undertaken, including on implications of this project on the displacement of traffic to historic and residential areas.

No further report is requested for the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee as progress in the implementation of development projects will be outlined within the framework of the Periodic Reporting exercise for Europe and North America to be launched in 2012.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.117

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.132**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009);
3. Notes the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations made by the 2008 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission;
4. Welcomes the application of the “Guidance on the Protection of Key Views” and the policy on tall buildings included in the Edinburgh Local Plan in 2010 as important tools for the evaluation of future developments;
5. Acknowledges the efforts undertaken in awareness-raising during the revision of the management plan and encourages the State Party to continue developing strategies to enhance awareness of World Heritage among stakeholders and developers;
6. Also encourages the State Party to study the feasibility of integrating the current conservation areas recognized by the City of Edinburgh Council in a future buffer zone;
7. Urges the State Party to do all it can to ensure that revised plans are produced for any future development of the Caltongate site that respects the spatial layout of the Old Town;
8. Requests the State Party to provide further information to the World Heritage Centre about the tram system project for evaluation by the Advisory Bodies, undertake an impact assessment of the displacement of traffic to historic and residential areas and implement corresponding protective measures;
9. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre any revised designs of current developments, as well as plans and details of any major new development projects for evaluation by the Advisory Bodies;
10. Further requests the State Party to report about the progress in the implementation of the projects within the Periodic Reporting Exercise for Europe and North America to be launched in 2012.

118. Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party’s report received on the state of conservation)

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

119. Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia) (C 567 rev)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

120. City of Potosi (Bolivia) (C 420)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

121. Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1987

Criteria
(i) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
28 COM 15B.108; 33 COM 7B.133; 34 COM 7B.106

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 42,000 for conservation, culture and symposium

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous Monitoring Missions
November 2001: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Urban pressure that may affect the original city plan (*Plano Piloto*) that warranted inscription in the World Heritage List;
b) Lack of a Master Plan.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/445>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 1 February 2011 which only partially addresses issues raised in prior decisions of the World Heritage Committee.

The State Party indicates that 2010 was an atypical year for the city, which had a severe political crisis ending with the resignation of the Federal District Governor and his succession by two other Governors within a short time frame. The political crisis has resulted in significant delays in the implementation of projects and also in a shifting of priorities that did not necessarily meet the needs of the property. A new government has taken office as of 1 January 2011 and new discussions and negotiations are foreseen to continue for the implementation of projects previously started.

The State Party did not submit the draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value in the framework of the Periodic Reporting exercise.

a) Federal District Territorial Development Plan

Federal District Territorial Development Plan (PDOT) was approved and constitutes the main tool to drive decision-making in regard to urban development.

Brasilia's Urban Ensemble Preservation Plan, a component of the PDOT, continues to be implemented and the assessment of the protected area is being carried out to ascertain issues affecting the different components. No indication is given as to whether this will result in a conservation plan.

b) Buffer Zone

Studies concerning the buffer zone continue, and apparently a draft ordinance is to be prepared by June 2011 to determine uses, densities and volumes, so that the visual setting of the inscribed property is protected. The report includes a map which indicates the restricted areas of construction for Brasilia's Horizon Visibility Protection.

c) Roads W3 and VLT- Light Vehicles on rails

The State Party reports that the Project for W Street revitalization has been halted and no new specifications have been drawn up, although a presentation at the *Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional* (IPHAN) is foreseen by the end of June 2011. As for the Light Vehicles on Rails Project, this has also been suspended as no specification project was submitted; further studies are expected to be requested by the new government.

d) Orla Project

This project is reported to have issues although they were not specified. The State Party reports that a meeting is foreseen with the new Secretary for Housing and Development, however no details were provided regarding the nature or objectives of this meeting. Additional information received indicates that privatization continues along the Paranoa Lake Rim, which goes against the Costa project according to which the area should be accessible to all. Additionally, construction of buildings up to three stories high continues and problems with sewage at Paranoa Lake remain unaddressed.

e) Southern local commerce area regulations

The State Party reports that the deadline for the regularization process has been extended until 30 April 2011. With the changes in office at the Federal District and the Pilot Plan administrative offices it is foreseen that new rounds of negotiation with both governments will need to occur to continue with the regularization process. However, it was also indicated by the NGOs that the adopted Complementary Law No. 766/2008 is being questioned by prosecutors and that expansions in the green areas have continued to occur.

f) *Interventions at buildings*

Conservation and restoration processes continue at the Metropolitan Cathedral, the facade of the Claudio Santoro National Theatre and the Pantheon of Liberty, while works at the Presidential Palace have been concluded. No technical information was submitted by the State Party.

g) *Vila Planalto*

The State Party reports that the Revitalization Action Plan is not been implemented, and that precise boundaries have not yet been set to identify the protection area. Although the area maintains its basic characteristics, significant changes have occurred since June 2010, with an increase in buildings by a third level, which has eroded the character of the Three Powers Square. These issues require further negotiations with the Federal District Government.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that recent developments at the property would have a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and hence, recommend that the World Heritage Committee express its concern. Additionally, the implementation of important actions focused on sustaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been halted and these need to be continued as soon as possible. They consider that the lack of precise information and clear action lines for conservation and development, could potentially pose a threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. There is also no evidence that the recommendations of the 2001 mission have been implemented; a reactive monitoring mission is therefore recommended to assess the present conditions at the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.121

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.106**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and requests the State Party to submit it to the World Heritage Centre;*
4. *Notes the information provided by the State Party and urges it to commence negotiation and the necessary evaluation processes for the definition and implementation of planning tools and regulatory measures to ensure the protection of the property;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to continue with the implementation of the regularization process for the southern local commerce area, with the revitalization plan for Vila Planalto and the control and enforcement of regulations along the Paranoa Lake rim to ensure the protection of the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*

6. Also requests the State Party to finalize the establishment of the buffer zone, including the corresponding regulatory measures to control and regulate further development, and submit them to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review;
7. Reiterates its request, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to submit detailed information and technical studies, as they become available, on planned interventions with special attention on land use, transportation systems and new urban interventions, for consideration and review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, prior to approval and implementation;
8. Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to evaluate the existing management arrangements, the status of pending projects and unregulated activities and to assist in the development of appropriate lines of action related to the property's conservation and development;
9. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, 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 36th session in 2012.

122. San Augustin Archaeological Park (Colombia) (C 744)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1995

Criteria
(iii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.124; 33 COM 7B.134

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 10,400 for Conservation and management

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
November 2006: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) State of conservation of the fabric of the megalithic sculptures;
- b) Lack of a management plan;
- c) Lack of buffer zone;
- d) Ongoing challenges by local communities with regards to the use of illegally constructed roads which traverse the archaeological park.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/744>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 2 February 2011 which details the actions implemented in response to Decision **33 COM 7B.134**.

a) *Delimitation of the inscribed property and definition of buffer zones*

The State Party reports that in 2010 archaeological zoning for the component of the property located within the Municipality of San Agustín was completed, while zoning for the components located within the Municipality of Isnos will be conducted in 2011. This has allowed for the definition of different uses so as to minimize potential human and natural impacts. The State Party also reports that a process for the legalization of land titles has started and will address conflicts in ownership and land use, and better protect archaeological remains at both components of the inscribed property and their buffer zones. A class action suit is foreseen for the protection of the archaeological causeway that currently links the administrative headquarters of San Agustín Park to archaeological sites known as Mesitas A and B, an area that has been affected by constant vehicular traffic and livestock. An alternate route outside the boundaries of the Park is being explored in consultation with stakeholders, so as to provide access for the local communities. Other actions are foreseen to better protect the property's boundaries and to enforce established zoning to minimize informal developments and commercial activities at adjacent properties. Upon finalization of the current process for legalization and definition of boundaries, the State Party foresees that the zoning maps for the heritage property will be included in the municipal zoning plans to ensure their articulation with territorial and municipal planning tools.

b) *Alternative roads for the local community*

With regard to the illegal road built by the Yanacona communities in the sector of *La Estacion* in 2006 which warranted the 2006 World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, the State Party, through the Instituto Colombiano de Anthropología e Historia (ICANH) has continued efforts to ensure that the roadway remains closed and its use discontinued, and that communities utilize the existing road which is a viable alternative. ICANH has also allowed access through the La Estacion area via a footpath which does not affect the property's integrity. Several consultation meetings have been carried out with the involved parties, as well as judicial processes to address the situation. The communities had however remained adamant in their use of the illegal roadway, and had continued to hinder works on the 2010 project for the rehabilitation of the footpath. Judicial authorities have determined that the alternative (pre-existing) road is adequate although in need of improvements and that consequently closing the illegal road does not impinge on the community's fundamental rights. The State Party considers that this decision, along with resolutions issued by the Municipal Government and favourable public opinion, have created adequate conditions for the road's closure. Works for the rehabilitation of the footpath will be restarted in February 2011.

c) *Management plan*

The State Party has submitted its management plan '*Plan Integral de Manejo Parque Arqueológico de San Agustín y Alto de los Idolos*' which was formulated between 2007 and 2008 and revised in 2010, and comprises 8 programmes and 53 projects. These have been systematically carried out and resources have been allocated for the Plan's sustained implementation. Socialization and consultation workshops have been conducted as part of the ongoing participatory process for the formulation and implementation of the plan. The State Party reports that ICANH has committed USD 1,073,236 for the related activities in 2011.

Progress is also reported in negotiations and actions with national entities at the regional and local levels and with communities for the holistic conservation of archaeological heritage in

the area, through the implementation of guidelines and regulations set forth in the management plan, which is also strengthened through outreach activities.

d) Other issues

The State Party also reports that an assessment of the Park's infrastructure has been carried out and actions have been identified for their expansion, retrofitting and intervention to improve the existing facilities for public and administrative use, in accordance to provisions set forth in the Management Plan. Project implementation is expected to continue through 2011.

In 2011, it is planned to construct an alternative walkway to the archaeological sites of Mesitas A and B, to prevent further use of the pre-Hispanic causeway, which assessments have indicated is unstable from a conservation point of view.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party has effectively implemented a series of measures to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property and welcome the broad participatory nature of the efforts. They would reiterate the importance of finalizing the formal definition of boundaries and buffer zones of the inscribed property and encourage the State Party to continue efforts to ensure that established zoning is thoroughly articulated with planning tools at the territorial and municipal levels.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.122

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.134**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the efforts made by the State Party to ensure the safeguarding of the property and encourages it to continue such efforts in co-operation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, in particular reaching a final solution to the closure of the illegal road through San Agustín;*
4. *Urges the State Party to increase its outreach activities with the communities in regard to discontinuing the use of the illegal road above;*
5. *Requests the State Party to finalize the delimitation of the components inscribed on the World Heritage List, including zoning activities scheduled for 2011, and to submit to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies the defined boundaries, including appropriate cartography as well as the legal framework for examination by the World Heritage Committee within the framework of the Retrospective Inventory process;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, 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 37th session in 2013.*

123. Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1990

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.125; 33 COM 7B.135; 34 COM 7B.108

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 50,000 for Emergency measures at the *Palacio Diego de Herrera* in Santo Domingo and 24,207 USD for a study on Cultural Tourism in the Historic Centre of Santo Domingo (conservation and management assistance).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1993, 1995, 1998; August 2001: ICOMOS monitoring mission; December 2009: World Heritage Centre site visit; December 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Undefined and unregulated buffer zone leading to urban development pressure and inadequate control of land use;
- b) Pressures derived from tourism;
- c) Inadequate and inefficient management and conservation arrangements (including legislation, regulatory measures, technical capacity for conservation and service infrastructure);
- d) Lack of interpretation and presentation of the property;
- e) Natural vulnerability to earthquakes and hurricanes;
- f) Deterioration of historic structures derived from natural and social factors (including environmental pollution and lack of sensitisation of local residents);
- g) Urban development project SANSOUCI.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/526>

Current conservation issues

The state of Conservation report was received by the World Heritage Centre on 1 February 2011.

a) Strategic Plan for the Integral Revitalization of the Colonial City of Santo Domingo

The report indicates that the Municipality of the National District submitted a Draft Ordinance to the Municipal Council for the creation of a Special Commission for the evaluation of the draft Strategic Plan. Based on the evaluation, it is expected that the Ordinance would be approved during the first quarter 2011. A copy of the Plan and draft Ordinance were enclosed with the submitted report. The Plan includes regulatory and strategic sections with guidelines on conservation of urban and architectonic heritage, land use, building regulations, among others as well as proposals for transit related studies and improvement options, priority actions to be undertaken and description of specific projects related to environmental quality, housing, tourism, infrastructure and others.

Concerning the implementation of a Steering Committee for the preservation of the property, the report indicates that the Director Committee for the Colonial City of Santo Domingo was reactivated in July 2010. The first draft of its statutes is ready for revision by the Juridical Council Office of the Municipality. To secure the necessary resources for the operation of the management system, funds from the National District Municipality, the Ministry of Culture,

and the Fund for the Protection of Santo Domingo, private donors and international organizations have been allocated. A sustainable tourism project of the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) amounting to USD 30 000 000, is planned for implementation in 2012. No detailed information on this project or its terms of reference were included in the report

b) SANSOUCI development project

One of the three parts of the SANSOUCI development project (the Port) has been finalized. The 2009 reactive monitoring mission did not express concern regarding this part of the development. As for the SANSOUCI Real Estate Development Project, the State Party states that it is willing to implement the required measures to avoid inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It included in the report a letter from SANSOUCI Holdings, the Company in charge of the project that states its commitment to respect national regulations for the preservation of heritage as well as the *World Heritage Convention*. It indicates that no other proposals have or are being studied although no additional information is provided on the current status of the project or on alternative designs and technical specifications for the project as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010).

In relation to the future developments foreseen in the buffer zone, the report states that the North and West sectors have been developed in harmony with the Colonial City. The East Sector has currently a low density but it is expected that the SANSOUCI project will increase it. According to the Municipality of Santo Domingo East, for the moment no changes in the height regulations have been made. The regulations for this sector will be established by the Ministry of Culture and the Municipality of the Colonial City. No timeframe for these actions was indicated.

c) Other issues

With respect to the zoning regulations and interventions for the Colonial City, an Ordinance has been finalized and submitted to the Municipal Council for approval. The regulations have been adopted by the administration of the National District Municipality, in agreement with the Ministry of Culture, and are applied to all projects in the Colonial City examined by the Direction of Monumental and National Heritage. The regulations and Ordinance were attached to the report and are available on the website of the Municipality.

Regarding the approval of the proposed buffer zone, a draft resolution has been elaborated by the National District Administration and has been included in the Ordinance related to regulations of the Colonial City. The document was sent to the Municipality in July 2010, to be presented to the Municipal Council. It was indicated that the resolution could be approved during the first quarter 2011. The regulations for Gazcue area are currently being elaborated and that it has a 30% progress.

The new National Constitution was promulgated on 26 January 2010. The update of the cultural legislation for the protection, safeguarding and development of cultural heritage, including the creation of a State Secretary for Culture has started (using Law 41-00 as a base). The update will be submitted to the National Council for Culture during the first months of 2011. The protection mechanisms, in particular those related to incentives and sanctions have been included in the updating of the Law.

The report indicates that the Regulations for Archaeological Research have been submitted to the National Council of Culture for analysis and should be approved during the next session of the Council in February 2011.

Other issues included in the report concern advances in the recovery of the Santa Barbara neighbourhood, several activities described (no graphic information attached), evaluation of the state of conservation of the Santa Barbara church for its restoration, lighting of the Colonial City monuments and streets, works for the conservation of the San Carlos church,

heritage diffusion programmes, conservation and capacity building for staff in charge. In addition, new interventions for housing in the Colonial City and the buffer zone has been undertaken (no photos or technical information attached). No map including the location of the mentioned projects was submitted.

According to press reports, a debate has been proposed by the Minister of Culture in regard to the pertinence of the demolition/renovation of the wall surrounding the back part of the Ozama fortress (called the Trujillo wall). The main issues are related to the fact that the wall was built during the 1940's and that it is blocking the view to the fortress. Others claim that the wall now is part of the history of the city and has become part of its architectural ensemble.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made by the State Party in the approval of the proposed buffer zone, Strategic Plan for the Integral Revitalization of the Colonial City of Santo Domingo and its regulations. Nevertheless they remain concerned regarding the limited information provided regarding the current status of the SANSOUCI Real Estate Project and the planned future measures regarding height regulations to be undertaken in Santo Domingo East.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the Ozama River and its left bank are an essential component of the Colonial City. The situation of the surroundings has preserved its values especially in relation to the colonial urban nucleus. It is crucial to preserve the visual perception of the existing relationship between the city, the river and the sea, a situation that would not be possible with the construction of the SANSOUCI Real Estate project as it was originally planned.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.123

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.108**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Recognizes the efforts made by the State Party in improving the management and conservation arrangements for the property and urges the State Party to finalize the approval process for the delimitation of the buffer zone and its regulations as previously requested by the World Heritage Committee;*
4. *Reiterates its request to submit, by **30 November 2011**, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, the following information:*
 - a) *Alternative designs for the SANSOUCI project which take into account the scale of the inscribed property and the impacts that the urban and touristic development may have in the conservation of the attributes that sustain its Outstanding Universal Value,*
 - b) *Progress on the definition of height regulations for Santo Domingo East, taking into account the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*

5. Also requests to continue to implement the recommendations of the 2009 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, with special attention to:
 - a) Halting future developments foreseen in the buffer zone, mainly affecting the area of Santo Domingo East, that could impact adversely on the property,
 - b) Finalize the approval process for the new law for the protection, safeguarding and development of cultural heritage and the regulations for archaeological investigations,
 - c) Finalize the process of approving the Strategic Plan for the Integral Revitalization of the Colonial City of Santo Domingo and the Steering Committee and to secure the necessary resources for the operation of the management system currently in place;
6. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, 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 37th session in 2013.

124. City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1978

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.121; 33 COM 7B.136; 34 COM 7B.109

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 371,500 for the consolidation and preservation of some of the historic ensembles of the city as well as management and risk preparedness activities.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2009: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Development pressures which impact the authenticity of the site;
- b) Weaknesses in the decision-making process regarding conservation;
- c) Works in the Tower of the Society of Jesus Complex.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/2>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 26 January 2011. The report succinctly responds to the decisions made by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions.

a) *Works at the Compañía de Jesús (Society of Jesus) Complex and to recover the use of the bell tower.*

The State Party reports that the works on the tower have been halted and that future interventions would be included as part of an overall and comprehensive evaluation of the Jesuit Complex, as requested by the World Heritage Committee. To date no project or comprehensive evaluation has been carried out and no information has been submitted to the World Heritage Centre. The *Fondo de Salvamento del Patrimonio Cultural de Quito* (FONSAL), now called Metropolitan Institute of Cultural Heritage, and the Society of Jesus have agreed to send a proposal to the National Institute of Cultural Heritage (INPC) in agreement with the Municipality. However, no report has been submitted to date, neither has a timeframe been established for its submission.

The State Party indicates that the Metropolitan District Municipality, through the Metropolitan Institute of Cultural Heritage, and in coordination with the representatives of the Society of Jesus in Quito, have established the terms of reference for the tourism operation studies. To date, these have not been carried out and no information has been provided on the timeframe for implementation or and completion. There is no existing report on the matter.

b) *Definition of limits and buffer zone*

The report mentions that the limits for the property have been established along with the buffer zone, and that the proposed maps have been included with the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, submitted to the World Heritage Centre in November 2010. The information submitted will be analyzed by the World Heritage Centre during the Retrospective Inventory process starting in 2011. The World Heritage Centre will also contact the State Party once the revision is completed.

c) *Decision-making processes for the property and legal and administrative frameworks*

The report indicates that the decision-making processes for the property have been enhanced and are fully functional at this time. At the national level, the focal point is the *Instituto Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural* (INPC), which co-ordinates and maintains a strong relationship with managers of World Heritage properties in Ecuador. Decisions are further submitted for consideration and review by the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry for Heritage Co-ordination; upon approval at the local and national levels, they are communicated to the World Heritage Centre through the State Party's representation at UNESCO.

Existing legislative arrangements and regulatory frameworks continue to be implemented although the Law for Culture is pending approval by the National Assembly. No indication was provided on expected timeframe for completion, and the legal structure relating to culture and heritage remains under review. At the local level, Municipal Ordinances are currently being enforced for the protection and safeguarding of heritage under the direct supervision of the INPC.

d) *Other issues*

The State Party reports that an Inventory Directorate has been created within the structure of the Metropolitan Institute of Cultural Heritage. The Directorate is now in the process of carrying out the inventory of built cultural heritage, as requested by the World Heritage Committee. No further information is provided as to the expected timeframe for its conclusion.

Regarding the *Tren Ligero*, the report states that no official project has been submitted at this time. However, it indicates that the Municipality of the Metropolitan District of Quito has commenced studies for a subway project; however no report has been submitted by the national authorities.

Regarding the planned activities for 2011, the State Party has indicated that the calendar would be submitted to the World Heritage Committee once INPC has met the new Director of the Metropolitan Institute of Cultural Heritage.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made by the State Party in improving the overall framework for the conservation and protection of the property and consider that the approval and enforcement of the Law of Culture will serve to consolidate these efforts. Although they recognize the progress made, they note that the recommendations made by the 2009 reactive monitoring mission have yet to be significantly implemented and that many of the proposed actions are still in the planning stages. Particularly important are the finalization of the inventory and the development of the conservation plan for the built heritage of Quito.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.124

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.109**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Acknowledges the progress made by the State Party in improving the overall framework for the conservation and management of the property and encourages the State Party to finalize the approval of the Law of Culture;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to finalize the inventory of the built heritage of the property and to develop a holistic conservation plan for it, including regulations and principles for intervention, and to submit this to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for consideration and review;*
5. *Requests the State Party, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to submit to the World Heritage Centre:*
 - a) *Detailed information on major projects, such as the potential subway proposal, that may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, as soon as they become available,*
 - b) *The proposal for the new intervention in the architectural ensemble of the Society of Jesus, including the alternative proposals to restore the use of the bell tower and the tourism studies;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, 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 37th session in 2013.*

125. National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

126. Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.126; 32 COM 7B.122; 33 COM 7B.137

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 167,825 for the elaboration of the, nomination file, management plan equipment, emergency measures for the protection and rehabilitation of the Maya Site of Copan, replacement of a protective canopy over the hieroglyphic stairway at the Maya Site of Copan, and a seminar.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2003: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; 2005: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) The foreseen construction of an airport in the vicinity of the World Heritage property, in a national protected area;
- b) Deterioration of construction materials due to natural decay phenomena;
- c) Risk of structural failure of archaeological complexes resulting from the excavated tunnels for archaeological purposes;
- d) Deterioration derived from uncontrolled visitation and potential to exceed carrying capacity at specific time periods;
- e) Legal issues concerning the ownership of the land in the property and its buffer zone and the delimitation of the property and its buffer zone

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/129>

Current conservation issues

The state of conservation report of the Maya Site of Copan was received by the World Heritage Centre on 1 February 2011. Additional information was received on 24 February 2011, as requested by the World Heritage Centre on 3 February 2011 (letter WHC/74/217.1/NS/na/40).

- a) *Submission of further details on the implementation of the management plan*

The report indicates that no further steps have been taken since the last state of conservation report. The State Party has previously submitted a management strategy which does not address conservation policies, disaster preparedness, involvement of the local communities and visitor management. However an official management plan has never been submitted.

It was reported that a Public Use Plan which has been pending since 2005 and financed by the Inter-American Development Bank (IBD), is being commissioned to monitor the carrying capacity of the site; It was stated that this plan will be drafted between May and September 2011. No terms of reference for the plan have been submitted.

b) Implementation of the conservation interventions at the property

Conservation measures in the form of protective shelters have been implemented for three steles. As for the hieroglyphic stairway, interventions have continued for the last three years for surface stabilization and mortar repairs, as well as preventive measures and monitoring. The State Party indicates that the protective shelter that exists since 1987, a canvas tarpaulin, has been replaced several times and a larger one installed in April 2010. Based on the report done in 2007 by the Getty Conservation Institute (GCI), which was not submitted, it has now been approved to substitute this with a long term sustainable shelter which will be financed by the Santander Bank of Spain. No technical information on the proposed new alternative design has been submitted for review.

A conservation laboratory for sculptures is also scheduled to be opened in the Sculpture Museum by the end of 2011. This will also be funded by the Santander Bank of Spain. No technical details or maps for the location of the approved project were submitted.

c) Issues related to the tunnels

The State Party reports that conservation issues persist at the tunnels. Although there are regular inspections and no serious damage has been registered so far, there is still the need to create a comprehensive programme of preventive and corrective measures to improve their conservation. As part of the documents later received by the World Heritage Centre in February 2011, the State Party sent a report on the *Consolidation and the Waterproofing of the Weak Areas of the Acropolis*, which was prepared in response to the heavy rains of 2010. This report provides limited information on the implementation of the institution's activities, timeframes and funding. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that for the past three years, this issue has been a point of focus. They consider that this report from the State Party may be an emergency measure rather than a suitable long-term conservation strategy.

d) Official submission of the boundaries of the World Heritage property and its potential buffer zone, in light of the requirements of the Retrospective Inventory

The report states that the World Heritage area comprises 3 different zones: zone 1 – the property, zone 2 – the *El Bosque* residential area and zone 3 – an adaptation area used for tourist facilities. Four maps were submitted with the report and will be considered under the item corresponding to minor boundary modifications.

The report states that some of the land in the buffer zone is under the control of the Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History (IHAH) and that the long term goal is to purchase all the land in the buffer zone. Specific indications on when and how this goal will be achieved have not been provided.

e) Definitive decision on the location for the construction of the airport and related tourism management issues

The 2003 and 2005 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions to the property made several objections to the construction of the airport at the *Rio Amarillo* site, and identified alternative locations. In 2006 the World Heritage Centre congratulated the State Party for the decision to halt the construction of the airport at the *Rio Amarillo* area.

However in 2007, the State Party informed the Committee of plans to construct an alternate airport at the old air strip in the village of *Concepción*. The 2009 state of conservation report indicated that a final decision on the construction of an airport in *La Concepción* was still pending and that IHAH was reviewing the Environmental Impact Assessment to make an official statement. No further information was received on its decision. On 30 September 2010, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the Honduran Delegation indicating its concerns regarding the reconsideration of the construction of the airport at the Rio Amarillo site after reviewing information from the published press. The 2011 state of conservation report submitted by the State Party indicates that the Ministry of Tourism had cancelled the option of *La Concepción* for financial reasons and that it is once again evaluating the Rio Amarillo option. It also reported that prior to making further decisions the IHAH will analyze by October 2011, an updated assessment of impact on cultural heritage and the Public Use Plan, which will include the potential impact of the airport, particularly as it relates to the visitor management programme.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that sufficient information has been provided to the World Heritage Committee over the past 5 years, and Decisions of the World Heritage Committee have indicated clearly that the construction of an airport at Rio Amarillo, could have an adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

f) *Other conservation issues*

Conservation measures foreseen by the IHAH include training in risk management in cooperation with the Fire Department of *San Pedro Sula*, the construction of a new roof over the visitors' centre and of a small booth close to the *Nuñez Chinchilla* group for the exhibition of interpretive material. IHAH is monitoring land use at the buffer zone and is showing concern regarding the land use of the areas just outside the buffer zone, with possible threats being the likely construction of telecommunication antennas.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the state of conservation report received in February 2011 from the State Party is not exhaustive, and does not provide all the information requested by the World Heritage Committee. Important information on the airport, tunnels, boundaries of the site and the ownership and regulations for the buffer zone are still missing. They note the insufficient information submitted for the management plan, particularly as it relates to conservation and practices; and that important projects, such as the construction of infrastructure for the conservation laboratory and the new design for the protective shelter for the hieroglyphic stairway, have been approved without being submitted, as required by Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for consideration and review.

They further note that the site of Rio Amarillo is still being considered for the construction of the airport. Previous Decisions of the World Heritage Committee have made it clear that an airport in this location could have an adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.126

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,

2. Recalling **Decision 33 COM 7B.137**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party regarding the measures implemented to address the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee, and urges it to submit an official management plan, including provisions for public use and risk management and to secure the necessary resources to ensure its full implementation;
4. Also urges the State Party to develop and implement a comprehensive conservation programme for the tunnels and to establish conservation guidelines for interventions at the property;
5. Reiterates its deep concern that the site of Rio Amarillo is still being considered for the construction of the airport, in spite of previous World Heritage Committee Decisions at its sessions from 2003 to 2009 that this location could have an adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
6. Requests the State Party to halt plans for the construction of the airport at Rio Amarillo site; and to submit to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, alternate proposals for the construction of a new airport along with their respective environmental impact assessments, including a heritage impact assessment, for their consideration and review prior to approval of the proposed project;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, the related technical information for the new protective shelter for the hieroglyphic stairway and for the conservation laboratory for sculptures, prior to approval and implementation;
8. Further urges the State Party to officially submit information on regulatory measures, land tenure, related cartography for the protection and management of the property and the buffer zone by **30 November 2011**;
9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

127. Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv) (v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.128; 32 COM 7B.124; 33 COM 7B.139

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 5,000 for the preparation of guidelines for a management plan.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2002: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; January 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Demolition of historical buildings in the protected area of the Historical Centre;
- b) Urgent implementation of the management plan in Xochimilco;
- c) Infrastructure works (new subway line).

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/412>

Current conservation issues

The state of conservation report was received by the World Heritage Centre in two portions on 31 January and 1 February 2011. One part is for the Historic Centre of Mexico City, the other one is for Xochimilco. Additional information was also received on 22 February 2011 regarding the intervention at the Bellas Artes Theatre.

a) The Historic Centre of Mexico City

Regarding the formulation of an integrated management plan, the State Party has made substantial progress in the drafting of the plan for the Historic Centre of Mexico City in co-ordination with several public and private institutions at the local and federal levels, including universities. The report indicates that the contents of the plan will be made available by spring 2011. The table of contents has been included in the report for reference. To support the implementation of the plan, two tools are foreseen. The first one is a Draft Law, to be published during the second quarter of 2011, will include guidelines and regulations to be established in the management plan. The second relates to the establishment of an integrated information system for the area with a view of strengthening decision-making. The report also provides information on the process undertaken by Mexican authorities regarding the participatory development of the management plan.

Regarding the 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission recommendations, the report describes preservation actions undertaken within the Historic Centre. The actions, implemented with public and private funding, focus largely on the recovery and rehabilitation of close to 50 monumental sites which are destined for social and cultural purposes. Actions have also included the revitalization of public spaces, restoration of historic buildings, the implementation of alternative non-contaminant means of transportation, a façade restoration programme and awareness-raising and dissemination programmes. It was also indicated that the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH) has finalized an updated catalogue of historic monuments which will be published in 2011. New regulations in the fiscal code and fiscal incentives for owners have been put in place to avoid empty or neglected buildings, and the elaboration of a strategy and a decree for housing recovery within the Historic Centre have been drafted which have both been included in the report. No further demolitions have occurred since 2007. The report indicates that co-ordination efforts between INAH and the Federal District Government (FDG) have been strengthened and regulations have been established for reuse, restoration and adaptation of buildings.

The programme for the reorganization of street vendors was also enclosed in the report. It states that 26 000 vendors have been relocated to commercial squares, some of which are located where historic buildings were demolished in 2007. A second part of the programme

aims to regulate the legality of their merchandise; ongoing follow-up from the “*Fideicomiso for the Historic Centre*” is being undertaken in this regard. The programme will be consolidated between 2011 and 2012 and will also cover other areas in the city.

It was indicated that three architectural projects for the street vendors would be constructed at three of the demolished building sites, including the area located in Regina 97. The projects will be carried out in conjunction with normal approval procedures, and the FDG has ratified its commitment to constructing high quality buildings intended for social and cultural purposes as agreed during the 2009 Mission. It is expected that works will commence in 2011. No information regarding the projects has been included in the report.

In a May 2010 report (attached to the state of conservation report), the State Party mentions the project of a tramway system that would extend from the Historic Centre to Buena Vista, with an investment of USD 1.3 billion. It states that on 29 September 2009, INAH approved the final route of the tramway and the project was sent by the selected company in May 2010 (the project was not attached). It is expected that the tramway will be finalized by the second half of 2011. In the state of conservation report of February 2011, no information is provided on the current status of implementation; technical specifications or graphic information

On 8 February 2011, the World Heritage Centre received from ICOMOS Mexico an extensive evaluation concerning the works undertaken at the *Palacio de Bellas Artes*. The report indicates that the restoration of this emblematic structure was not in accordance to international standards for conservation and the authenticity and integrity of certain significant elements of the ensemble have potentially been compromised. The State Party has also provided further official information on 25 February 2011 explaining the process undertaken for the renovation of the theatre. No technical information relating to the project was submitted to the World Heritage Centre prior to its implementation as required by Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

b) *Xochimilco*

The Inter-dependent Commission has been acting as the Management Unit for Xochimilco pending the formal creation of the Management Unit. A technical team created by the Inter-dependent Commission met to analyze the appropriate model for a Management Unit for Xochimilco. It was agreed that the Head of the Management Unit could also assume the role of Co-ordinator of the Natural Protected Areas, and work in cooperation with the Technical Unit (currently under the Direction of Conservation of Natural Resources) and the Departmental Unit of Wetlands of Xochimilco-Tlahuac as the Operative Unit. The organizational chart has been included. It was not indicated when the Management Unit would be operative or what the process would entail for its creation.

A description of the activities undertaken for the implementation of the management plan has been included. The activities include the re-opening of the reforestation programme, plague control, soil retention and preservation, rural reforestation, control of invasive species, recovery of native and endemic species in Xochimilco and Tlahuac (*ajolote*, *charal*, *acocil* crayfish, Tlaloc frog, Mexican nymph, among others), social participation programmes, prevention and combat of forest fires, drain water management, drainage of the Xochimilco towns and community outreach activities.

Regarding the construction of Line 12 of the metro, the State Party indicated that its construction was planned 25 years ago. The original route has however been changed in order to avoid agricultural zones near the wetlands and *Chinampas*. It was indicated that the new route borders the Tlahuac Triangle out of the *Chinampa* areas (included in the 2006 Management plan) however appropriate measures are foreseen to reduce the impact within the zone. A location map has been included and it is indicated that the Tlahuac triangle is a low environmental evaluation zone; there are no chinampas, wetlands or presence of native flora. The Federal Government has acquired 106 Ha of land to be integrated as a lacustrine and Chinampa ecotourism conservation zone in order to stop urban growth and promote visits to the World Heritage property. An investment of 85 million pesos (around USD 7

million) from the collective transportation system will be used for the creation of a lagoon area as a buffer zone for the terminal. Landscape architecture, vigilance, environmental projects have also been taken into account. The State Party indicates that environmental studies were carried out and careful planning has been undertaken. The Line 12 route and 3D graphics of the future metro stations have been included. No information was submitted on the Environmental Impact Assessment, related technical documentation or the proposed timeframe for the implementation of these projects

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the progress made by the State Party in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, particularly as it relates to the development of a management plan for the Historic Centre of Mexico City, the update of the inventory and the regulations regarding the demolition of historic buildings. They consider that the projects to be constructed where historic buildings were demolished, the Tramway and other projects planned in the property should be sent to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, prior to their approval and implementation as requested by Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. With regard to Xochimilco, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the State Party should be urged to finalize the process to create the Management Unit and secure funding for its operation, and to continue implementing the recommendations of the Participatory management plan. They take note of the information submitted regarding Line 12 of the metro and request that the State Party submit detailed information, including the environmental and heritage impact assessments, related to planned projects in the Tlahuac Triangle.

Draft Decision: **35 COM 7B.127**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.139**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party regarding progress made in the implementation of recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee and the 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, and requests the State Party to continue with their implementation;
4. Recognizes the efforts made by the State Party in the participatory development of the management plan for the property and encourages it to continue such efforts by putting into action the Plan for the Historic Centre of Mexico City and the Management Unit in Xochimilco and also requests the State Party to submit, by **1 September 2011**, three printed and electronic copies of the final management plan for the Historic Centre of Mexico City, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
5. Expresses its concern that no information was submitted, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies prior to the renovation works undertaken at the Palacio de Bellas Artes and further requests the State Party to submit a request for technical International Assistance to the World Heritage Centre for the organization of an international meeting to examine

interventions undertaken and provide technical interdisciplinary recommendations to ensure the conservation of this twentieth century masterpiece;

6. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, detailed and updated technical information on:*
 - a) *Urban projects for the three spaces where historical buildings were demolished in 2007, including the area located in Regina 97,*
 - b) *The tramway project and its current status,*
 - c) *The Environmental Impact Study, including the heritage impact assessment, of Line 12 of the metro;*

7. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2013, 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 37th session in 2013.*

128. Camino Real de Tierra Adentro (Mexico) (C 1351)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2010

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

34 COM 8B.41

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

New nomination

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1351>

Current conservation issues

On 28 January 2011, the State Party submitted a report responding to Decision **34 COM 8B.41** which relates to the property's inscription on the World Heritage List by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). At the time of inscription, it was noted that there was a need to: more clearly explain the choice of sites and how each one contributed to the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV); define and protect the

setting of the nominated sites beyond the proposed buffer zones when related to landscape structures; as well as to establish legal protection for all the individual sites and to establish an overall coordinated management system that encompasses all the component parts.

a) Selection of the component sites

The State Party provided information regarding the methodological approach utilized for the selection of the component sites, which was based on the ICOMOS Charter on Cultural Routes. The process entailed identifying the functionality of the cultural route, in this case mining, and the intangible and tangible heritage expressions associated to this function. The process resulted in the identification of 54 component sites that were considered to have met the conditions to substantiate the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as a whole, also meeting authenticity and integrity requirements. It was stated that some sites were not included as they were lacking the adequate conservation framework or they did not meet the necessary requirements of the International Charter.

This information is similar to that submitted in the nomination dossier and does not provide any further explanation as to how each of the component sites contributes towards the OUV of the property as a whole.

b) Buffer zone

The report mentions the process used to define the limits of the proposed components and their respective buffer zones. It includes maps to illustrate the boundaries of the core and buffer zones for the following components: Bridge of Atongo, Historic Centre of the City of San Juan del Rio, former convent of San Francisco in Tepeji del Rio and Bridge, the portion of the Camino Real between the Bridge of La Colmena and the former hacienda of La Cañada, the Historic Centre of the City of Lagos de Moreno and Bridge, the historic ensemble of the town of Ojuelos, Bridge of Ojuelos, Bridge of El Fraile, Bridge of San Rafael, Bridge La Quemada, portion of the Camino Real between Nazas and San Pedro del Gallo and the cave of Avalos.

These proposals will be considered under the item corresponding to minor boundary modification. No additional information was provided on the regulatory measures that will support the protection and management of these buffer zones or how they will be implemented.

c) Legislative protection of cultural routes and coordinated management framework

The State Party reports that the components of the property will benefit from two ongoing initiatives: the initiative of General Law on the Protection of Cultural Routes and the National Conference of Governors (CONAGO).

Regarding the legislation, an Internet link was included which indicates that in April 2009, the proposal to create a General Law on the Protection of Cultural Routes was submitted to the Commission of Culture for consideration. According to the information provided, the law was presented in August 2008, and will have the purpose of regulating the identification, preservation, conservation, restoration and research of the national system of cultural routes. It will also establish the process for gazetting routes and will create a Technical Council for Cultural Routes as an advisory body to the authorities. It is believed that the approval of this legislation is still pending and no additional information was provided on the expected timeframe for its completion.

Regarding CONAGO, during its 37th Ordinary session held in November 2010, the creation of a Trust for the Camino Real de Tierra Adentro was approved and work schedules established for the formulation of a management and administration plan, as well as a plan for sustainable tourism development which would include three interpretation centres. No additional information was provided on expected timeframes for completion, or on the development of a management plan and funding sources for implementation.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the information provided to justify the sites chosen needs to be completed to include how each contributes towards the Outstanding Universal Value. Information should also be provided on the proposed management strategy. They consider that although the component sites have some level of protection via existing legislation and regulatory frameworks, effective conservation and management of the overall route and its components will not be sufficiently ensured until ongoing initiatives have been finalized and implemented. They wish to underscore the importance of formulating a management plan and in defining overarching policies for conservation, protection and management for the route and also in identifying specific regulatory measures at the site level for the components that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, particularly as it relates to the management of the buffer zones. This will require significant levels of co-ordination and resources to sustain these efforts and thus a long-term commitment by all involved stakeholders.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.128

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 8B.41**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Notes the information provided on the choice of component sites but considers that this has not yet defined how each of the sites contributes towards the property's Outstanding Universal Value;*
4. *Also notes the information provided regarding buffer zones for the components under Item 8 of the Agenda of the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee (Document WHC-11/35.COM/8B);*
5. *Further notes the information provided by the State Party and encourages it to establish a management strategy with the necessary legislative framework to effectively sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and the conditions of integrity and authenticity;*
6. *Requests the State Party to develop a management plan for the property, including a public use component, based on an understanding of how the component sites contribute to Outstanding Universal Value; and to provide upon completion, three printed and electronic copies, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, 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 37th session in 2013.*

129. Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(i) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.125; 33COM 7B.140; 34 COM 7B.112

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 73 888 (conservation and preparatory assistance)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2001: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; March 2010: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Deterioration and destruction of the fabric of the property by environmental factors, lack of a maintenance programme, as well as polluted water;
- b) Erosion;
- c) Absence of management policies included in management plans;
- d) Uncontrolled urban development;
- e) Tourism pressures (in particular at Portobelo);
- f) Torrential rains.
- g)

Illustrative material

a) <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/135>

b)

Current conservation issues

A report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party on 11 February 2011. The report provides information on the measures implemented to address the conditions at the property. A report sent by the State Party on 14 December 2010, included information on the damages caused by the torrential rains which occurred during the same month. It was reported that the majority of the damages occurred in Portobelo's *Fort Santiago*, where landslides affected already damaged structures, destroyed 30 meters of wall, structures and drains collapsed and a significant portion of the central plaza of the fortification was covered by 1 300 cubic metres of mud and trees. Other areas of Portobelo also suffered destruction due to the landslides. The heavy rains and resulting landslide also demonstrated that previously undertaken conservation works were inadequate and did not contribute significantly to the property's conservation

a) Emergency conservation measures

The report indicates that conservation actions have been implemented, and interventions have been carried out on minor structures at risk of collapse by a field conservation team based at Portobelo. At *Fort Santiago*, the south sentry box and the vaulted entryway have been reinforced and the north sentry box is still being conserved. In *Fort San Gerónimo*, some interventions have been undertaken at the south sentry box. In the case of *San Lorenzo* the only maintenance activity conducted has been the removal of vegetation.

Structural support elements have been designed for areas where major structural problems were identified due to diverse factors, and which have been identified as at risk of collapse in the Emergency Plan. Actual intervention in these areas is pending the finalization of the relevant design and will be undertaken by a conservation contractor. Architectural measurements and drawings are also being developed for the fortifications at *San Fernando* and *San Lorenzo*.

As aforementioned, in Fort Santiago several sections of the northern end of the fort collapsed and the area was littered with debris, mud and rocks at the central plaza as a result of torrential rains. In response, a task force has been created to clear the area, evaluate the extent of damages and propose further mitigation measures for future landslides as well as the required conservation measures. No additional information has been submitted on when and how these conservation measures are expected to be implemented.

b) Management Plan

No Management Plan has been submitted by the State Party. The terms of reference for its development are currently being formulated and the process is scheduled to begin in June 2011. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would wish to focus the World Heritage Committee's attention on the fact that the property's Management Plan has been pending since the 2001 reactive monitoring mission recommended its drafting.

c) Boundaries and buffer zones for the inscribed components

The State Party indicates that the de-limitation process is ongoing at San Lorenzo, and a proposal has been developed by the Ministry of Economy and Finance to transfer the management of this component of the property to the National Institute of Culture (INAC). It was not indicated when this action will be completed. Currently land use regulations are established by the Management Plan for San Lorenzo's natural protected area, however they are expected to be enhanced with the development of the built heritage Management Plan for the property. General maps of the property have been submitted and the geo-referencing of the protected area will be undertaken. No specific timeframe for the finalization of this activity has been included.

As for Portobelo, the report indicates that prior initiatives to define the boundaries of each fortified structure as part of the National Programme for Land Administration were started with cadastral registration in 2001; however the work was never completed. Portobelo's Historic District has legally approved boundaries, and zoning regulations exist for the National Park of Portobelo, which was established in 1976 and includes the inscribed fortifications. However, no additional efforts have been carried out to define specific boundaries and buffer zones for the inscribed components, in spite of it being considered in the 2011 work plan of the *Patronato Portobelo y San Lorenzo* (the entity in charge of the management of the property).

d) Conservation policy for the property

The property has some level of protection through the Executive Decree no. 43 of 1999 for the National Park of Portobelo, an area under the administration of the National Environment Authority. Other planning tools include the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Province of Colon which was drafted in 2007. The report indicates that a proposal has been drafted for the creation of a National Commission on World Heritage however no further details on its creation and implementation have been received.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies want to underscore the inadequate efforts made to address the poor state of conservation of the property; despite previous recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee over ten years. Furthermore, this vulnerability has increased dramatically as a result of the damage caused to the property by the December 2010 landslide. Although some actions have been implemented to address the recent emergency, no complete assessment of damages has yet been undertaken. Critical conservation measures still need to be implemented, such as a sustained course of action to address the conservation of the built fabric, urban expansion and encroachment and reforestation.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the prevailing conditions will take significant time and resources to be reversed, and that the property currently faces significant ascertained threats as indicated in Paragraph 179 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The World Heritage Committee might wish to inscribe this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to allow for appropriate measures to be undertaken immediately addressing the situation.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.129

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.112**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Notes the limited efforts undertaken by the State Party to adequately address the state of conservation of the property;*
4. *Expresses its deep concern regarding the state of conservation of the property, in particular the significant and accelerated degradation of the historic fabric which directly impacts on its Outstanding Universal Value;*
5. *Regrets that the State Party has not complied with all the requests expressed by previous Committee Decisions, and **decides, in conformity with Paragraphs 177 and 179 of the Operational Guidelines, to inscribe the Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;***
6. *Adopts the following Desired state of conservation for the property, for its future removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger:*
 - a) *The Emergency plan, a preventative conservation strategy and maintenance measures at San Lorenzo and Portobelo approved and implemented,*
 - b) *National laws and policies for the conservation of built heritage at San Lorenzo and Portobelo defined and in place,*
 - c) *Long-term consolidation and conservation through annual plans for the components of the inscribed property ensured,*
 - d) *The Operational and participatory management system, including its related public use plan, approved and implemented,*
 - e) *The Management plan fully integrated within territorial and urban development plans,*

- f) *Encroachments and urban pressure adequately controlled,*
 - g) *The boundaries and buffer zone of all component parts of the World Heritage property precisely clarified,*
 - h) *Budgets for the preparation, implementation and follow-up of the management structures and conservation measures secured;*
7. *Also adopts the following corrective measures and the timeframe for their implementation:*
- a) *To be carried out immediately (September 2011-March 2012)*
 - (i) *Emergency plan for all the components of the property in coherence with the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission and defined timeframe and phasing for their implementation finalized,*
 - (ii) *Operational management arrangements and budgets for its implementation ensured,*
 - (iii) *Budgets for the implementation of the emergency plan (first stage) secured,*
 - (iv) *Encroachments and urban pressure adequately controlled and reforestation undertaken,*
 - (v) *Technical Office in Portobelo to secure the implementation of the conservation measures and management arrangements set up and functioning.*
 - b) *To be carried out within one year (Until September 2012)*

First phase of the Emergency Plan implemented:

Protection

 - (i). *Boundaries and buffer zones for each of the component parts of the property defined,*
 - (ii). *Regulatory measures for the established buffer zones for controlling development and addressing existing threats finalized and approved,*
 - (iii). *Monitoring indicators as a tool to assess the state of conservation of the fortified built heritage put in place.*

Management and Planning

 - (i). *Development of a management plan begun,*
 - (ii). *Awareness raising activities within the local communities to identify opportunities for eco and cultural tourism to contribute to the improvement of living conditions of the surrounding communities undertaken in full coherence with the conservation measures for the property.*
 - c) *To be carried out within two years (Until September 2013):*

Second phase of Emergency Plan implemented

Protection

 - (i). *National laws and policies for the conservation of built heritage at San Lorenzo and Portobelo developed,*

- a) *Management and Planning*
 - (i). *Management plan for the property, including scheduled and costed provisions for conservation, preventative conservation and maintenance of built heritage, public use, and risk management finalized, approved and adopted,*
 - (ii). *Management, territorial and urban development plans integrated,*
 - (iii). *Annual conservation plans for each of the components of the inscribed property developed and in place,*
 - d) *To be carried out within two-three years (Until September 2014):*
 - (i) *Implementation of the Emergency Plan completed,*
 - (ii) *Operational management arrangements and budgets for the continued implementation of the approved management plan secured;*
8. *Reiterates its request* to the State Party to finalize, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, a draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which should be submitted within the framework of the Latin America and the Caribbean Periodic Reporting exercise;
9. *Also requests* the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the recommendations set out above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

130. Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1997, extension in 2003

Criteria
(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 7B.126; 33 COM 7B.141; 34 COM 7B.113

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
March 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; March 2010: On the occasion of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to Portobelo and San Lorenzo, a technical

visit to the Archaeological site of Panama Viejo and the Historic District was undertaken, as requested by the authorities of Panama; October 2010: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Severe deterioration of historic buildings that threatens the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
- b) Conflicting interests of different stakeholders with regard to the use, management and conservation of the historic centre;
- c) Limited capacity for the rehabilitation and maintenance of historic structures;
- d) Deficiencies in the implementation of the legislative framework for protection;
- e) Lack of implementation of clear conservation and management policies for the property;
- f) Demolition of urban ensembles and buildings;
- g) Forced displacement of occupants and squatters;
- h) Urban development projects within the protected area (i.e. Cinta Costera).

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/790>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 11 February 2011. From 27 to 31 October 2010, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM/>

a) *Buffer zone*

The State Party reports that the buffer zone for one of the property's components, the Archaeological Site of Panama Viejo, was legally established in 2007 along with regulatory measures which include restrictions for land use. The mission reports that the buffer zone is being adequately managed and regulations are being enforced.

As for the other component, the Historic District of Panama, the State Party reports that work has continued on cartographically identifying the potential limits, establish zoning and define regulatory measures that would allow for a controlled transition between the historic centre and the modern city. As part of the process, public hearings have been held to gain feedback and consensus on the proposal. An action plan for the creation of the buffer zone was included in the report which foresees continuation of works through September 2011. However, no potential date for completion, which would entail the Enactment of the Act and publication on the Official Gazette, has been included. The mission noted that the proposal has not been concluded and no legal support exists yet. It highlighted concerns about proposals for large scale developments in the area foreseen as a buffer zone.

b) *Legislative framework and policies for the property*

The report provides information on the existing laws and decrees for the property and indicates that currently Law No. 9, pertaining to tax incentives, and Law No. 14, related to protection measures and management, are under review. The mission noted that additional means to legally protect the property are being explored, including the potential declaration of the Historic Centre as a *special district*, as a recommendation given by the mission to the President of Panama. A recent agreement has been signed between the Office of the Historic District (OCA) and the Patronato of Panama Viejo to enhance coordination of actions undertaken for the conservation and rehabilitation of both component sites of the property. The mission notes however that this has yet to be operational.

The State Party also reports that the creation of a National Commission for World Heritage has been decided. The mission noted that this Commission is currently undergoing legal approval to get the status of a Presidential Decree.

As for preservation and protection policies, the report notes that criteria and guidelines for intervention have been established and are enforced for Panama Viejo. In the case of the

Historic District, regulations and guidelines are based on an Executive Decree which calls for Normative and Procedures for restoration and rehabilitation of the Historic District. New proposals are currently being developed to make their implementation, and the sanction process for transgressions, more effective. The mission notes that although this framework exists, there are important deficiencies in its enforcement and a clear and overarching policy for the Historic District is still missing.

c) *Management arrangements and resources*

The State Party provided figures for interventions at both components of property, including rehabilitation and restoration, social programmes, dissemination and cultural activities. It also reports that human resources have been increased and teams have been created to address diverse issues. Additional staff benefited from diverse training activities throughout 2010.

The mission underscored that although progress has been made, management arrangements are still not efficiently operating. Factors that hinder the efficacy of the management system include the lack of sufficient authority to enforce regulations and apply sanctions in various processes that occur at the Historic Centre, the insufficiency, complexity and overlaps in existing legal instruments and the lack of an updated and legally supported Master Plan for the Historic Centre. In addition, other planning tools have not been articulated with those for the World Heritage property, resulting in conflicting agendas and priorities and significant challenges remain in addressing issues such as property ownership. Finally, the mission considers that the technical and financial resources available for the Historic District are largely insufficient to adequately deal with the threats to the property.

The situation is different with the management of the Archaeological Site of Panama Viejo. In that case, the Patronato adequately and efficiently functions and has adequate resources for conservation, protection and research activities, largely in part to fund-raising efforts.

d) *State of conservation of the property*

The mission expressed its concern regarding the Historic Centre particularly in regard to the existence of a significant number of largely deteriorated and neglected historic buildings, the continuing gentrification process, and issues of poverty and living conditions, insecurity and vehicular traffic.

As for Panama Viejo, the mission noted that the overall state of conservation is satisfactory and reiterated that the *Avenida Cincuentenario* remains the main threat. New proposals have been identified for the deviation of this avenue and there are indications that the Ministry of Public Works will implement the alternative presented by the *Patronato*.

e) *Cinta Costera Project*

No information was provided by the State Party on this decision by the World Heritage Committee. The mission verified that the Cinta Costera Phase 2 project is currently under accelerated construction at the Historic District's former harbour area known as Terraplén. No environmental and heritage impact assessments have been submitted for review in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The mission also visited the underground parking area presently under construction as part of the project and noted the massiveness of the structure and its impact on the scale of the surroundings.

The mission considers that Phase 3 of the project would pose an even larger threat to the integrity of the property. There are currently two alternatives for the route, the first one surrounding the Historic District and the second one traversing the Historic District with a tunnel. The mission considers that the first alternative is unacceptable as it would transform the District's traditional form and image on its coastline, an important part of the values for which warranted inscription on the World Heritage List. The second alternative, besides being too expensive, could entail risks to the structural stability of the old and deteriorated built heritage. No studies on their physical, social or functional impacts and risks have been undertaken at the present time.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are deeply concerned about the state of conservation of the property and the threats that remain unaddressed including the ineffectiveness of the management system and governance, the lack of conservation of historic buildings, the increase in real estate speculation, inappropriate new developments and the gentrification process at the Historic Centre. They further consider that on-going development of the Cinta Costera, in spite of the decisions made by the World Heritage Committee and the recommendations of reactive monitoring missions, constitutes a threat to the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the World Heritage Committee might wish to include the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to assist the State Party in addressing the significant threats to the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.130

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.113**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Expresses its deep concern regarding the state of conservation of the property, in particular unaddressed issues including the inefficiency of the management system, the limited conservation of historic buildings, the increase in the gentrification process and the continued implementation of the Cinta Costera project, which might impact adversely the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
4. Regrets that work has continued on the Cinta Costera despite the request of the World Heritage Committee to halt the project;
5. Notes the results of the October 2010 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; endorses its recommendations and requests the State Party to:
 - a) *Develop a comprehensive and legally supported policy for the property,*
 - b) *Approve the establishment of the Historic District as a special district, and delimit and define the boundaries of the property for submission to the World Heritage Centre, and define its buffer zones including its regulatory framework for approval by the World Heritage Committee,*
 - c) *Make operational a single responsible management authority for the property to ensure the coordination of activities at both components of the property and the enforcement of regulatory measures,*
 - d) *Revise the Emergency Plan submitted in 2009, identify priority measures for implementation and a practical plan for implementation, including required resources,*
 - e) *Halt the construction of the Cinta Costera Project Phase 3 and submit to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, in line with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, alternatives including technical specifications for the project, as well as heritage impact assessments for review prior to approval;*

6. ***Decides, in conformity with Paragraphs 177 and 179 of the Operational Guidelines, to inscribe Archaeological site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panama) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;***
7. *Also requests the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a proposal for the Desired state of conservation and corrective measures for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, 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 36th session in 2012.*

131. Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru) (C 700)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1994

Criteria
(i) (iii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
30 COM 7B.99; 31 COM 7B.130; 33 COM 7B.144

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 50,000 for conservation assistance

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Damage caused by illegal mining and farming activities;
- b) Continued vehicle traffic through the geoglyphs;
- c) Lack of systematic monitoring of the property;
- d) Insufficient air traffic security measures;
- e) Lack of a management plan;
- f) Planned infrastructure projects (i.e. Interoceanic highway, new airport construction).

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/700>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted its state of conservation report on 2 February 2011 which responds to issues raised by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

- a) *Finalize the development of the management plan for the property and secure adequate resources to sustain its implementation*

The report states that the drafting of the management plan commenced in 2009 with co-operation between the National Institute of Culture (INC) and the Executive Unit from the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Commerce (COPESCO) National Plan, and was financially administered by the UNESCO Lima Office through an agreement with the INC. In October 2010 a cross agency meeting was held and a final document '*Management System for the cultural and natural heritage of the Nasca and Palpa territory*' was produced and submitted to the public and private authorities of the Nasca and Palpa provinces and the Ica Region for review. Final editing is now taking place. The State Party has submitted an executive summary which indicates planned action lines for the research and dissemination of knowledge, conservation and management of cultural and natural heritage, public use and management of the territory, and human development. The report also indicates that the completed management plan will include a risk management component aimed at preventing possible impacts of seasonal and or cyclical phenomena. No timeline was provided for the submission of the finalized management plan or information on the resources to ensure its implementation.

The report also indicates that a mining extraction quarry was found in 2010, and that plans are underway to remove it from the site and to tighten surveillance. No further information was provided on this, or how this tightened monitoring relates to or fits in with current surveillance which falls under the responsibility of the Ministry of Culture. The site's systematic monitoring has proved to be an ongoing issue for several years. The submitted executive summary has also not indicated how or if this issue will be dealt with in the finalized management plan.

b) Planned projects that might impact the property, in particular the Interoceanic Highway, the national airport and the proposed investment by the Regional Government

The State Party reports that the Interoceanic Highway segment running through Puquio, Nasca and Marcona has been upgraded and concluded. The report states that the highway runs south of the World Heritage property and does not impact it. A map has been submitted with the report which shows the location of a portion of the highway in relation to the property. No other technical information was submitted to enable a proper assessment of the removal of this threat, particularly maps indicating the previous trace of the highway, including points of access as they relate to the inscribed property. There was also no information on any archaeological assessments conducted relating to the construction of the highway.

The State Party has also indicated that plans for the National Airport at Nasca have been discarded. No other information was provided regarding proposed investments by the Regional Government.

c) Other conservation issues

The report indicates that there was an aeronautical accident at the site in February 2010 resulting in the loss of life of the plane's passengers. An inspection conducted by staff of the Ica Cultural Department revealed that none of the geoglyphs were damaged.

Also highlighted in the report are the various institutional initiatives which have been undertaken regarding protection and conservation, such as the cleaning of the South Pan-American Highway road shoulders and the dredging and cleaning of sewerage.

The State Party has submitted project documentation on the '*New Tourist Metal Gazer Project*' for evaluation in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* of the *World Heritage Convention*. The proposal includes the technical specifications for the project, as well as the environmental impact assessment and feasibility study carried out. The proposed project entails the construction of an 80 m viewing tower that would include three major levels for the observation of the glyphs and multimedia facilities along with new parking facilities. It would be located at the area where the existing one is located. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that although there is a pressing need to improve public use at the property, particularly in regard to presentation and improvement of

facilities, the proposed project would have a significant impact on the attributes that sustain the property's Outstanding Universal Value. Such a massive development would compromise the integrity of the landscape and the relationship between the glyphs and its setting.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the progress made in the development of the property's management plan, particularly as it relates to the participation of various stakeholders; and to the inclusion of a risk management component. Although the State Party's report indicates that the management plan is in the final stages of editing, no timeframe has been provided with regards to its completion. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also consider it prudent that the issues relating to the property's monitoring and security be fully addressed in the plan, as this has been an ongoing concern for several years. They remain concerned regarding the growing number of aeronautical accidents at or close to the site, and recommend that effective security measures be implemented to ensure that there is no loss of life or continued threats to the geoglyphs. They also express their concern about the potential construction of a viewing tower that would compromise the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and consider that alternative designs which minimize the height of the tower, need to be explored.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.131

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.144**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Acknowledges that plans for the construction of a National Airport in Nasca have been discarded;*
4. *Recognizes the efforts of the State Party in working to finalize outstanding issues related to the property's management and recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee, and urges it to finalize the property's management plan and to secure the necessary resources for its full implementation;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit by **30 November 2011**, three (3) printed copies of the management plan to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review;*
6. *Expresses its concern about the potential plans to construct a new tourist viewing tower at the property and also urges the State Party to develop, in collaboration with the heritage authorities, alternative designs that take into account the conservation of the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
7. *Also requests the State Party, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to submit new designs and technical specifications for the viewing tower for consideration and review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies prior to approval and implementation;*

8. Further requests the State Party to provide updated information on progress achieved in the removal of illegal settlements and mining quarries at the property by **30 November 2011**;
9. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, 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 37th session in 2013.

132. Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2000

Criteria
(i) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 7B.127; 33 COM 7B.142; 34 COM 7B.114

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 75000 for emergency assistance for the restoration of Cathedral of Arequipa

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous Monitoring Missions
February 2000: ICOMOS Expert Mission; April/May 2008: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS joint reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a Disaster Preparedness Plan;
- b) Ongoing planned development projects which impact the Historic Centre, such as the planned construction of the Chilina Bridge;
- c) Illegal demolitions involving historical buildings;
- d) Urban sprawl.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1016>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 2 February 2011, in response to the decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010).

a) Chilina Valley prehispanic terraces and Chilina Bridge

The report indicates that the Ministry of Culture is preparing the delimitation and its related report (with field verification in process), for the farming terraces of Lari Lari and Los Tucos, so as to list them as national cultural heritage. This nomination is a necessary action to

protect Chilina Valley, the connection between the city and the countryside of Arequipa. No indication was provided on when this process will be concluded.

Regarding the construction of the Chilina Bridge and the *Via Troncal Interconectora*, the State Party indicates that no works have been carried out. On 14 October 2010, the Arequipa Regional Government submitted the revised version of the Chilina Bridge and the *Via Troncal Interconectora* project, including the observations made throughout the various reviews by the Technical Committee. The proposal was rejected by the World Heritage Committee which noted that the design could impact the terraced and Yanahuara monument areas, among other observations. According to the report, a new revision of the proposal was submitted based on the objections made, including a lighter design for the bridge. This new proposal has been included in the state of conservation report and is currently with ICOMOS for revision. It was indicated that the Architectural Regional Technical Committee has to evaluate the project; however no clear indication was submitted on when this will be completed. According to media reports, the construction of the Chilina Bridge will start in April 2011.

Reports on the evaluation of the impact of the bridge in relation to cultural heritage and a new Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) carried out in 2010 have been included. The EIA focuses only on the potential impacts of the Chilina Bridge and provides it a positive review. It includes a comprehensive action plan on how to mitigate the potential impacts that could arise during construction. However, no information or EIA has been submitted on the potential impacts of the components that pertain to the connection roads (*Via Troncal Interconectora*). They remain as a matter of concern as they can potentially impact the cultural and natural landscape of the terrace areas which have yet to be declared as national cultural heritage. The road would now border the terraces, however no provisions have been made as to how to mitigate potential impacts or prevent urban sprawl and uncontrolled development once communication ways are readily available. The impacts of the Chillina Bridge and the *Via Troncal Interconectora* should also take into account the new delimitations of the property and its buffer zone prepared by the State Party, which will need to be adopted by the World Heritage Committee within the framework of the Restrospective Inventory and the Periodic Reporting Exercise.

b) Management and regulations

The State Party indicates that the Provincial Municipal Government of Arequipa is currently in the process of redesigning the Urban Development Plan. As of 2010, a Multisectorial Consultative Commission has been established for the process, and the assessment phase has now been concluded. The Master Plan for the Historic Centre is being updated including provisions for the Urban Development Plan. It was indicated that the demarcation of boundaries launched in July 2010, and the inventory of heritage properties, need to be finalized and approved prior to the final update of the Plan. A map with the new de-limitation of the property (property and buffer zone) has been included. The current status of the definition of limits is not clear, nor have the proposed boundaries and buffer zone been officially submitted to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review. With regards to the heritage inventory, the report indicates that the first stage of the process that began in 2010 has been completed, while the second stage has 35% completion. The report includes a sample of the inventory sheet and will serve to update the property's cadastre. According to the submitted chronogram of activities the project has an eight months schedule and should be finalized by the end of 2011.

Co-operation between the various agencies continues to develop and is mandated through different Municipal agreements. The report indicates that the revised Management Plan will include the creation of a single regulatory body, which would incorporate citizen representation and bodies in charge of the property. A proposal, which was included in the report, has been made "Regulatory Framework for Arequipa's Historical Centre and Monument Area" which includes regulations for the conservation, protection and

management of the property. No further data is provided on whether it has been approved or is currently in force.

The Risk Management Plan included with the report is currently being assessed to become a Municipal Ordinance, although it is not clear when this will be accomplished. It includes maps identifying risk areas, an assessment of threats derived from anthropogenic factors including changes in land use, inadequate interventions as well as vulnerabilities from the social perspective, and provides proposals to mitigate these factors. However, no precise assessment or actions have been developed on how to address natural threats and vulnerabilities, the measures to mitigate effects and the actions to undertake in case of an emergency. It is largely focused on social threats, but completely lacks the natural component which is critical, particularly at a property with a long history of seismic events and vulnerability derived from volcanic activity.

c) Interventions on built heritage

The State Party reports that demolitions and deterioration of built heritage has been controlled and additional properties were declared historical monuments. Actions undertaken include interventions at historic convents, urban renewal projects, capacity building and awareness raising activities. Changes in construction regulations have been included and new sanctions have been proposed for neglected or demolished buildings.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge the progress made by the State Party in addressing conservation concerns at the property. However, they note the limited progress that has been achieved on matters such as the heritage inventory, the final delimitation of boundaries and buffer zone for the property and the definition and enforcement of regulatory measures to ensure their integrity and authenticity. Although they recognize that better decision-making mechanisms are currently in place, they reiterate the importance of securing the means for full formal operation including the passing and enforcement of the proposed regulatory framework. Also of crucial importance will be the final declaration of the Chilina Valley and the associated terraces and archaeological sites as cultural heritage which will enhance the protection of the area. They also take note of the threats derived from the potential construction of the *Via Troncal Interconectora* and the impacts of the construction of the Chilina Bridge.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.132

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.114**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the efforts made to ensure the conservation of the property, and encourages it to continue with this work in co-operation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
4. *Notes the submission of the risk preparedness plan, however expresses its concern that the developed plan does not include provisions to address threats and vulnerabilities derived from natural factors, and urges the State Party to develop this*

component and to submit three printed and electronic copies to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review by **1 February 2012**;

5. Requests the State Party to undertake the following activities as indicated by the 2008 World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS joint reactive monitoring mission:
- a) Finalize the heritage inventory,
 - b) Finalize the delimitation of the property and the establishment of the buffer zone and submit the proposed new boundaries, including appropriate cartography and legal framework, for examination by the World Heritage Committee,
 - c) Conclude the declaration of the Chilina Valley and the associated terraces and archaeological sites as national cultural heritage to ensure their adequate protection,
 - d) Carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment for the Via Troncal Interconectora project as a whole, including the assessment and potential mitigation measures for the landscape areas of Lari Lari, Los Tucos, Cayma and Yanahuara, and submit the assessment for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies prior to the approval and implementation of the project,
 - e) Submit the evaluation of the Architectural Regional Technical Committee on the new proposals for the Chilina Bridge, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, for consideration and review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies prior to the approval or construction of the project,
 - f) Finalize the approval process for the proposed "Regulatory Framework for Arequipa's Historical Centre and Monument Area";
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, 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 36th session in 2012.

133. City of Cuzco (Peru) (C 273)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the English version of the State Party's report on the state of conservation and Late mission report)

134. Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1988 extension in 1991

Criteria
(iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.120; 33 COM 7B.145; 34 COM 7B.116

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 48,000 for emergency works in the historic centre; USD 56,500 for conservation works.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1994: Systematic monitoring report UNDP/UNESCO; March-April 2003: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; January 2010: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Non-formalization of the procedures to set up a Management Coordination Unit to implement the Strategic Plan;
- b) Revision of the Master and Strategic Plans;
- c) New development projects within the Historic Centre including urban transportation systems (*Corredor Segregado*) and interventions in historical buildings;
- d) Development of the cable car project for tourism purposes.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/500>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre received the state of conservation report on 2 February 2011. The report presented a summary of the activities undertaken by the Municipal Government of Lima, which included the inauguration of the Municipal Theatre, the finalization of restoration projects which had been ongoing in monumental buildings (Metropolitan Museum, Bodega y Cuadra House and the Eclectic Balcony House), the issuing of 58 new licences to conduct work on several buildings within the Historic Centre (eight of them in monumental buildings and seven in buildings of monumental value). It was indicated that all licences were approved by the National Institute of Culture (INC). Brief information on projects related to the maintenance of roads, traffic lights, gardens and public infrastructure have also been included. It was also indicated that between 2003 and 2010, a total of 506 works (private and public investments) had been carried out. The report also included information on the Municipality continuing with the declaration of 17 monumental buildings in "ruinous conditions" in order to allow prompt recovery and necessary interventions. A chapter on intangible heritage was also included.

a) High Capacity Segregated Corridor

Regarding the Corredor Segregado de Alta Capacidad (High Capacity Segregated Corridor) transportation system, the station Jiron de la Unión has been built in spite of the commitment made by the Municipality of Lima during the 2010 reactive monitoring mission and the Committee's Decision to halt the construction of the station at Jirón de la Unión. The INC and the mission had expressed their concern regarding the construction of this station as it would create a rupture of the visual setting of this monumental area. No alternative designs for the route of the Corredor Segregado within the Historic Centre, including studies of specific transportation systems for the inscribed property have been included even though they were requested by the 2010 mission.

b) Decision making process

No information has been included regarding the options to streamline decision-making processes for the approval of projects at the inscribed property, especially within the framework of the creation of the Ministry of Culture. Also, there is no information on the status of the development of appropriate guidance tools and precise policies for interventions at the Historic Centre for decision-makers and property owners.

c) Cable Car project

Regarding the proposed cable car project, no information has been included in the report, however media reports indicate that the project is still of interest of the Municipality and the Ministry of Culture is currently evaluating the project. During the 2010 reactive monitoring mission, the Municipality agreed to postpone this project and evaluate other routes that would not affect the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

d) Other issues

The reactive monitoring mission also requested information on the following planned projects: Linea Amarilla, Commercial Centre in Rimac, Montserrat Urban Renewal Project, the Plaza Acho Project, and other projects that may be undertaken within the protected area; no information was submitted regarding these. Additional information was also requested on the inclusion of Rimac in the valorization plans of Cercado, however this was also not provided. No information was included regarding the construction of the metro in Lima, also called Tren Eléctrico (Electric Train), even though part of its route may go through the Historic Centre.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the World Heritage Committee regret that the State Party has not provided all the information it had requested, and has not fully implemented the recommendations of the 2010 World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission. They also note that the station at *Jirón de la Unión* was built and re-named Camana-Carabaya station, despite the Municipality's commitment and the assessments made by the INC. This location is a very important urban junction of the Historic Centre of Lima. It was indicated by the mission that the station's construction at this location would create a rupture in the visual setting of this monumental area and have a negative impact on the urban character and setting of this section of the property. More information on the impact of the construction of the Tren Eléctrico in Lima needs to be submitted in order to evaluate the impact of its construction in the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further recommend that the Committee also regret that no information has been submitted in relation to the cable car project, taking into account that this touristic development is still under consideration by the National Authorities. The UNESCO Office in Lima has been contacted by the investor in charge of the construction of the cable car who confirmed the intent to carry out the project.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.134

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision 34 COM 7B.116, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),

3. Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the actions being taken in the property, and requests the State Party to fully implement the recommendations of the 2010 World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, with special attention to:
 - a) *Developing appropriate guidance tools and precise policies for interventions at the Historic Centre both for decision-makers and for property owners,*
 - b) *Enhancing collaboration among specialized agencies to streamline decision-making processes and to secure the required resources to have a fully operational management system in place,*
 - c) *Submit the required information on other urban projects to be undertaken within the property, such as Linea Amarilla, Commercial Centre in Rimac, Montserrat Urban Renewal Project and the Plaza Acho Project;*

4. Regrets that the station Jirón de la Unión has been built despite the commitment of the Municipality and the Committee Decision, and also requests the State Party to:
 - a) *Complete all the necessary actions to return the area between Camana and Carabaya Streets to the state in which it was prior to the construction of the station Jirón de la Unión,*
 - b) *Develop alternative plans for the High Capacity Segregated Corridor, including studies of specific transportation systems for the inscribed property and submit them to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies by **30 November 2011**;*

5. Further requests the State Party to send complete technical and graphic information,
 - a) *Regarding the construction of the Tren Eléctrico and the impact of its trace in the protected area,*
 - b) *Confirming the halting of the Cable Car project that was presented to the 2010 mission and the alternative routes identified, and carry out visual and environmental impact studies and develop plans that do not impact the attributes sustaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*

6. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, 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 37th session in 2013.

135. Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (C 747)

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)