



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

36 COM

WHC-12/36.COM/7B

Paris, 11 May 2012

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-sixth session

Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation

24 June – 6 July 2012

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/36COM/>

Table of content

I.	INTRODUCTION	5
	ELABORATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS	6
	STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT	7
II.	REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	9
	NATURAL PROPERTIES	9
	AFRICA	9
	1. Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407)	9
	2. Taï National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 195).....	9
	3. Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis).....	13
	4. Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N 684)	13
	5. Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199).....	17
	6. Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156).....	17
	7. Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe) (N 509).....	21
	ASIA-PACIFIC	26
	8. Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154)	26
	9. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Area (China) (N 1083 bis)	26
	10. Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India) (N 338)	30
	11. Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)	30
	12. Shiretoko (Japan) (N 1193)	33
	13. Phoenix Islands Protected Area (Kiribati) (N 1325)	37
	14. Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120)	40
	15. East Rennell (Solomon Island) (N 854)	43
	16. Central Highlands of Sri Lanka (Sri Lanka) (N 1203).....	47
	17. Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590).....	47
	EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	51
	18. Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)	51
	19. Gulf of Porto: Calanche of Piana, Gulf of Girolata, Scandola Reserve (France) (N 258).....	55
	20. Natural System of "Wrangel Island" Reserve (Russian Federation) (N 1023) ...	55
	21. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765bis)	57
	22. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754).....	58
	23. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)	58
	24. Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719)	62
	25. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation (N 768rev)	62
	26. Henderson Island (United Kingdom) (N 487).....	62
	27. Yellowstone National Park (United States of America) (N 28)	64

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	70
28. Iguazu National Park (Argentina) (N 303).....	70
29. Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N 355).....	70
30. Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1032).....	70
31. Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205bis).....	70
32. Galápagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1bis).....	70
33. Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) (N 1138 rev).....	74
34. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161)	75
MIXED PROPERTIES.....	76
AFRICA.....	76
35. Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (C/N 39).....	76
ASIA-PACIFIC.....	77
36. Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia).....	77
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA.....	78
37. Pyrénées – Mont Perdu (France / Spain) (C/N 773 bis).....	78
38. Mount Athos (Greece) (C/N 454).....	81
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	82
39. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274).....	82
CULTURAL PROPERTIES	83
AFRICA.....	83
40. Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323 bis).....	83
41. Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15).....	85
42. Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia) (C 18)	89
43. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055).....	91
44. Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev)	96
45. Aapravasi Ghat (Mauritius) (C 1227)	99
46. Island of Mozambique (Mozambique).....	99
47. Saloum Delta (Senegal) (C 1359)	99
48. Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099).....	101
49. Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173rev).....	101
ARAB STATES.....	105
50. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87).....	105
51. Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)	105
52. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299).....	105
53. Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab) (Lebanon) (C 850).....	105

54.	Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)	105
55.	Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 287)	105
56.	Ancient <i>Ksour</i> of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750)	106
57.	Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433).....	106
58.	Ancient Villages of Northern Syria (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 1348).....	106
59.	Archaeological Site of Carthage (Tunisia) (C 37).....	109
60.	Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) (C 385).....	111
ASIA-PACIFIC.....		112
61.	Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodh Gaya (India) (C1056 rev)	112
62.	Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115)	115
63.	Town of Luang Prabang (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 479rev)	117
64.	Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 481)	118
65.	Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666 rev).....	118
66.	Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121).....	121
67.	Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)	121
68.	Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451)	121
69.	Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603rev)	121
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA		125
70.	Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley (Andorra) (C 1160bis)	125
71.	Walled City of Baku (Azerbaijan) (C 958)	127
72.	Historic Centre of Brugge (Belgium) (C 996)	127
73.	Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616)	130
74.	Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay (France) (C 80 bis)	132
75.	Provins, Town of Medieval Fairs (France) (C 873 rev).....	132
76.	Villa Adriana (Tivoli) (Italy) (C 907).....	135
77.	Portovenere, Cinque Terre and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto) (Italy) (C 826).....	135
78.	Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994)	137
79.	Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro) (C 125)	140
80.	Centennial Hall in Wroclaw (Poland) (C 1165)	143
81.	Alto Douro Wine Region (Portugal) (C 1046).....	143
82.	Historic Centre of Sighișoara (Romania) (C 902).....	147
83.	Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)	149
84.	Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslav (Russian Federation) (C 1170)	150
85.	Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540).....	150

86.	Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632).....	153
87.	Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev).....	154
88.	Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev).....	156
89.	Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356).....	156
90.	Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis).....	161
91.	Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488).....	162
92.	Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom) (C 426bis).....	162
93.	Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150).....	162
94.	Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape (United Kingdom) (C 1215).....	162
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.....		163
95.	Historic Bridgetown and its Garrison (Barbados) (C 1376).....	163
96.	City of Potosi (Bolivia) (C 420).....	165
97.	Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445).....	165
98.	Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia) (C 285) ...	165
99.	National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180).....	166
100.	Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129).....	166
101.	Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414).....	169
102.	Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135).....	171
103.	Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis).....	176
104.	Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016).....	176
105.	Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (C 747).....	176

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-12/36.COM/7A and WHC-12/36.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) and was adopted by the Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011) (see Decision 35 COM 12B para.10).**

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-12/36.COM/7A, WHC-12/36.COM/7A.Add, WHC-12/36.COM/7B and WHC-12/36.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.

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 10 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 **27 COM 7B.106** para 4, as well as Decisions **29 COM 7C** and **35 COM 12E** para. 13:

“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-12/36.COM/7A and WHC-12/36.COM/7B, and considering the further delays due to late missions or late receipt of complementary information, an important number of reports (75) 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)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

2. Taï National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 195)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

Criteria

(vii) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/195/documents/>

International Assistance

Global amount granted to the property: USD 49,500

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/195/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous Monitoring Missions

June 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Poaching;
- b) Agricultural encroachment;
- c) Artisanal gold mining.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/195>

Current conservation issues

On 14 February 2012, the State Party submitted its report on the state of conservation of the property. The State Party also submitted an evaluation report dated May 2011 on the services of the Ivorian Office of Parks and Reserves (OIPR) following the events of the post-electoral crisis. This report indicates that the different services of the OIPR sustained serious damage, notably looting of all equipment, office furniture and vehicles. An assessment of the

damage for all the OIPR services was estimated at 944,495,000 CFA francs (USD 1.89 million).

In its February report, the State Party provides the following information concerning the implementation of the joint IUCN/World Heritage Centre reactive monitoring mission of 2006.

a) Strengthen control and surveillance of poaching and improvement of information gathering

The State Party report notes that between 2009 and 2010, the surveillance of the property was maintained at an acceptable level despite conservation problems, but a low period of activity was noted at the end of 2010-beginning 2011 due to the post-electoral crisis in Côte d'Ivoire. A plan of operation established in 2011 enabled the resumption of surveillance activities but greatly increased poaching was noted in 2011 in comparison to 2010. The State Party indicates that during a workshop for the management of the property in July 2011, it was decided to make a mobile brigade responsible for surveillance and to depend more on Village Surveillance Committees (CVS), which are being created. In addition, the anti-poaching teams and cooperation with the legal authorities in the pursuit against delinquents has been strengthened, and an education and information policy has been developed.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN appreciate that the State Party has undertaken measures to recommence surveillance activities with the support of these partners. However, they note that to halt reduction in the populations of certain threatened species such as the primates (see b) further reinforcement of effective surveillance is required. They note that a study jointly carried out with international cooperation, Ivorian universities and OIPR (to be published in 2012 in the journal "Conservation Biology") shall better enable the identification of Primate hunting zones under pressure and consider that the results of this study should provide for a reinforced and better targeted organization of patrols which in turn should reduce poaching.

b) Ecological monitoring

The report of the State Party mentions a stabilization of the animal populations between 2008 and 2011, notably the primates and the elephants. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received a copy of the report on the bio-monitoring results from September 2009 to March 2010 produced by the OIPR that confirm that the chimpanzee, duiker and elephant populations show an increase in comparison to 2005. Nevertheless, they also show a considerable decrease (more than 50%) of populations of other primates in general and the Diana monkey in particular, which is in contradiction with the State Party report.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that this report describes the situation before the increase of pressure in 2011 during the post-electoral crisis, mentioned by the State Party and that there is no available data on the impact of this crisis on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They consider that the increase in illegal activities must be rapidly taken into account to halt the negative tendency on the primate populations. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN emphasize that the most recent inventories of rare species, endemic and threatened, are very outdated preventing a clear picture of the situation concerning the values for which the property was inscribed. IUCN however, notes that it has received information that an ecological monitoring of the property is currently underway.

c) Clarification of the boundaries of the property

The State Party report indicates that the Decree modifying the territory of the National Park with an extension to include the N'Zo Wildlife Reserve has not been promulgated, consequently not authorizing the State Party to make modifications to the boundaries. The State Party undertakes to submit a proposal for modification of the boundaries of the property to a future session of the World Heritage Committee as soon as the revised decree is signed.

d) Extension of socio-economic activities, partnerships and education with neighbouring communities

The State Party report mentions the role the CVS could have in the framework of the Village Conservation and Development Associations (AVCD) in anti-poaching activities. The report notes that these committees are still in the very early stages of development in that only 50% of the AVCD have been created.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party report does not deal with any development activities concerning neighbouring populations, whereas the good management of the Park greatly depends on activities carried out in its periphery. It would appear, according to comments received by IUCN that activities undertaken to date have not always had the expected impact on the conservation of the property, in particular through the lack of participation by populations in decision-making, the Management Committees concerned with these measure being more places of information rather than a sharing of decisions. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN underline the difficulty of establishing an effective development and conservation policy linked to the neighbouring populations and consider that the experiences carried out around the property should be evaluated to assess the impact on the conservation of the site and, in view of the results, to make the necessary adjustments.

e) International cooperation and sustainable funding

In its report on the state of conservation, the State Party underlines the considerable support received from the German Cooperation Agency. With regard to sustainable funding, the State Party mentions a debt conversion project with German Cooperation. A business plan is foreseen for 2012 that should enable the updating of the strategy for sustainable funding. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the Foundation for the Parks and Reserves of Côte d'Ivoire and its branch FPRCI-UK have established the first endowment fund dedicated to Tai National Park since October 2009, for an initial amount of 2.3 million Euros and that the debt conversion project with Germany could provide 9.5 million Euros.

f) Other conservation problems – illegal agriculture and artisan gold mining activities

The State Party report recognizes that agricultural encroachments have increased in 2010-2011 linked to the post-electoral crisis. However, the report notes that the comparison of satellite images indicate that the degree of forest area was 97.7% in 1998 and is 97.6% in 2011.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN warmly welcome the low level of deforestation in the property, which is exceptional in the regional context of deforestation, including the classified forests. However, they note that the report confirms the intensified agricultural pressure on certain parts of the Park, and consider that provisions should be made to clearly indicate the boundaries of the protected area in the zones under strong pressure.

According to the State Party report, artisan gold mining continues in the Park and is on the increase. There is no precise information on this illegal activity, no recorded violations or impacted zones. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that a focused monitoring of this activity should be established to quantify the extent and the impact of this activity on the integrity of the property.

The State Party report does not provide information on the implementation of the other recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission of 2006, including the evaluation of the feasibility of ecological corridors to the protected areas of Liberia, the extension of research in the functioning of the ecosystem and the development of an eco-tourism strategy.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the stability of the forest canopy and the maintenance of the populations of certain flagship species, but are concerned by the important reduction in the population of certain primates. They consider that the State Party report does not enable an evaluation to be made regarding the impact of the post-electoral crisis on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and the current level of threats, including poaching, agricultural encroachments and gold mining. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee congratulate the State Party for having resumed, with support, conservation activities following the post-electoral crisis.

The World Heritage Committee and IUCN note the important progress achieved by the State Party with in particular support from Germany, to ensure the sustainable funding of the Park and recommend to continue these efforts.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend the completion of the modification of the decree concerning the extension of the Park, without delay, and to submit a proposal for the modification of the boundaries of the property to the World Heritage Committee.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.2

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.2**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Congratulates the State Party for resuming, with support from international cooperation, conservation activities following the post-electoral crisis;*
4. *Welcomes the initiative of the State Party to establish Village Associations for Conservation and Development and Village Surveillance Committees to improve the participation of neighbouring populations in decisions concerning activities and development;*
5. *Notes with satisfaction the results of bio-monitoring of 2009-2010 indicating the maintenance of flagship species including chimpanzees, deukars and elephants but expresses its concern as regards the reduction in the populations of certain species of primates, the increase in poaching, gold-mining and agricultural encroachment since the post-electoral crisis;*
6. *Requests the State Party to evaluate the impact of the post-electoral crisis on the Outstanding Universal Value, quantifying the threats of poaching, agricultural encroachment and gold mining and providing an updated ecological monitoring report showing the evolution of the populations of primate species, including the Diana monkey, by **1 February 2013**, to be transmitted to the World Heritage Centre;*
7. *Strongly urges the State Party to strengthen its action against poaching by concentrating efforts on surveillance of the vulnerable zones, agricultural encroachment and gold mining noted in the Park;*
8. *Encourages the State Party to continue its efforts to establish a sustainable funding mechanism and a business plan for the Park;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to publish as soon as possible the decree formalizing the extension of the territory of the Park and to submit, following publication, a request to*

modify the boundaries of the property to the World Heritage Centre for examination by the World Heritage Committee in this respect;

10. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a report on the state of conservation of the property with particular emphasis on the evolution of poaching, the animal populations (notably monkeys), the implementation of sustainable funding and the publication of the decree modifying the boundaries of the Park in view of a proposal for modification of the boundaries of the property, as well as on the implementation of the other recommendations of the 2006 mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

4. Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N 684)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(vii) (x)

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

1999 – 2004

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/684/documents/>

International Assistance

Global amount granted to the property: USD 96,749

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/684/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2003: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Mining activities inside the property;
- b) Staffing and budgetary deficiencies;
- c) Degradation of buffer zone;
- d) Impact of tourism and climbing expeditions;
- e) Climate Change.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/684>

Current conservation issues

On 16 February 2012, the State Party submitted a comprehensive report on the state of conservation of the property covering progress made during the 3 year period since the previous State Party report in January 2009. The report provides a general update on the

implementation of park programmes in relation to park operations, resource conservation, transboundary collaboration, community conservation, cultural values and tourism development, as well as specific information in response to Decision **33 COM 7B.7**.

a) *Management*

The State Party reports that a mid-term review of the park's ten-year General Management Plan (GMP, 2004-14) was carried out in 2009 to adapt its provisions to changing circumstances. The GMP envisages an increase in staffing from 62 in 2004 to 111 by 2014, but the State Party reports a reduction in staffing levels from 74 in 2009 to 64 in 2012. Furthermore, the transport facilities are reported to be inadequate, with just two ageing vehicles and five old motorcycles deployed. The State Party notes that support is needed in order to address this issue.

The State Party also reports that, despite an increase in the number of park visitors and revenues, the amount of internally generated revenue is still inadequate and supports only about 48% of the park's recurrent expenditure (compared to 50% in 2008/09 and 47% in 2006/07). The shortfall is provided by donors, notably the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), WWF (through the Rwenzori Mountains Conservation and Environmental Management Project, RMCEMP), the MacArthur Foundation and Fauna and Flora International (FFI).

The State Party notes that one new single-room outpost was constructed for staff at Mihunga with financial support from WWF, and the Environmental Conservation Trust of Uganda (ECOTRUST) is supporting the construction of a new visitor information centre. Private sector visitor accommodation facilities have been constructed near the park's main gate, but other investment costs remain unmet.

b) *Community collaboration*

The State Party reports a strong programme of collaboration with local communities which has resulted in significant benefits for a wide range of stakeholders. Particular initiatives include continuation of tourism concessions to local community-based groups, a new programme aimed at strengthening cultural values and their links with biodiversity conservation, a climate sensitisation programme, and introduction of climate change mitigation measures, including community-based tree planting to stabilize the banks of the Nyamwamba River which have been subject to erosion attributed to floods resulting from climate change effects (glacial melt).

c) *Resource conservation and protection*

Despite the budgetary, staffing and logistical constraints noted above, the State Party reports a 50% increase in patrol effort, covering 65% of the park. Patrol efforts are focussed in the lower-lying areas of the park where the threats are higher, mainly illegal hunting, tree felling and collection of forest products such as bamboo and honey.

The State Party also reports that resource harvesting within the property by local communities has been initiated on a pilot basis. 14 Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) allowing members of neighbouring parishes access to park resources, were signed during the 2009-2012 reporting period.

The State Party further reports significant progress in trans-boundary coordination between the management of Rwenzori Mountains National Park (RMNP) and that of Virunga National Park (VNP), two adjoining World Heritage properties. Two senior-level park warden committee meetings have been held to forge working alliances and plan for coordinated patrol efforts in the border areas. Six coordinated patrols have been carried out on a quarterly basis. Despite this progress, the State Party notes that some earlier identified challenges, such as communications, cross-border movement restrictions and lack of understanding of the respective wildlife laws, remain unresolved.

The State Party notes that the insurgency activities which led to the closure of the park for six years (1997-2003) have now abated and there is good coordination between the park management and other security agencies in intelligence gathering and running joint patrols to maintain park security.

d) *Mining*

The State Party reports that efforts by Kilembe Mines Limited to re-open the Kaolin quarry in the Kasitoha area were halted in July 2006 and that no mining has taken place within the property since then. It notes that Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) is in on-going consultation on the matter with the parent Ministry.

e) *Tourism management*

The State Party reports a 20% annual increase in visitor numbers since 2003, and notes a number of significant developments to satisfy this demand and improve the visitor experience, including development of a new 67 km hiking circuit from Kilembe, with a new management concession and eight tented camps, expansion of the overnight visitors' cabin at Nyabitaba on the central circuit trekking route, and upgrading of the tourist trails and erection of three information boards. The State Party recognises, however, that visitor satisfaction is still inadequate and there is room for further improvement.

f) *Research and monitoring*

The State Party reports that current monitoring efforts are focussed on three areas of concern, namely resource inventories and off-take monitoring in the designated harvesting zones, impacts of climate change including measurement of the retreat of the glaciers, weather data and monitoring of river water quality, and status of chimpanzees. A further 11 priority research topics have been identified to assist management decision-making, but these remain to be implemented.

g) *Forest fire*

The World Heritage Centre received reports from the Park management that during February 2012, wild fires started in the Heather/Rapanea zone (3000-4000 m) and spread to the Afro-alpine moorland zone (4000-4500 m). Due to the high humidity and low pressure, the occurrence of fire in this zone was deemed unlikely and therefore not envisaged in the draft fire Management Plan 2007-2014. Park management responded to the threat by ensuring the safety of the visitors present in the area, creating fire lines around infrastructure susceptible to fire, dispatching thirty additional community members to extinguish the fires, and diffusing a fire awareness campaign on two local radio stations, which generated support from 100 volunteers in extinguishing the fires. The fire burnt an area of 4800 ha, which amounts to approximately 5% of the property. Impacts on vegetation, slow moving animals, micro-biota, ecological conditions of the habitat, and ecosystem structure and functioning are reported as significant.

This fire exposed some of the operational challenges in the ability of park management to fight such high altitude fires, including the inadequacy of fire fighting equipment, a poor communication network, and the absence of fire-prevention measures.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the increase in coverage of the recurrent expenditures through increased revenue but note that further efforts are needed to ensure the financial sustainability of the management activities.

They also note that it would be valuable in future State Party reports to include figures derived from the ranger-based monitoring programme to indicate the level and trend of specific illegal activities and resource use from within the property as well as further details of

the extent and location of pilot resource harvesting zones, and the procedures for regulating off-take and monitoring their impact.

They further note the significant progress made by the State Party in engaging local communities in the conservation of the property, in monitoring and addressing the impacts of climate change, and in increasing transboundary collaboration with the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) in managing the two adjoining World Heritage properties of Rwenzori Mountains and Virunga National Park. They recommend that the Committee encourage the State Party to identify and implement further climate change mitigation and adaptation measures in consultation with the Mountains Specialist Group of the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) and other experts, and to further strengthen transboundary management efforts by developing a more formal protocol in order to address unresolved challenges such as communication barriers and cross-border movement restrictions.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note the positive adaptive management approach adopted by the State Party as exemplified by the conduct of a mid-term review of the Management Plan. However, the implementation of this Management Plan has been slow due in part to on-going funding constraints. They therefore recommend that the Committee requests the State Party to develop a sustainable financing strategy and business plan for the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have not yet had the opportunity to review the ecological monitoring plan requested at the Committee's 33rd session (Seville, 2009), and also recommend that the Committee requests the State Party to submit a copy, together with additional information on the location and extent of the 14 new resource harvesting zones and the preliminary results of ranger-based monitoring within these zones.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note that exploration activities are currently on-going in the Kilembe Copper Mines concession which appears to overlap with the southern portion of the property. They recommend that the Committee should request the State Party to halt these activities, and re-iterate its request to the State Party to confirm the permanent cessation of mining activities and licenses within the property, in line with the Committee's established position that mineral exploration and mining are incompatible with World Heritage status, which is supported by the international policy statement of the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) of not undertaking these activities in World Heritage properties.

Finally, they note that the management report of the fire includes recommendations for addressing these challenges. They recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to implement these recommendations as soon as possible, particularly to update the fire Management Plan to include provisions for fire occurrences at the full altitudinal range covered by the property, and also urge the State Party to ensure that adequate fire fighting equipment is made available.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.4

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.7**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Welcomes the progress made by the State Party in engaging local communities in the conservation of the property;*

4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to continue its efforts to establish a sustainable financing strategy and business plan for the property, and calls on the international donor community to strengthen its support for the management of the property;*
5. *Also welcomes the transboundary collaboration between the States Parties of Uganda and the Democratic Republic of the Congo in coordinating protection activities in the border areas between the two adjoining properties of Rwenzori Mountains National Park and Virunga National Park, and encourages the States Parties to further strengthen this collaboration through the development of a formal protocol to address unresolved challenges such as communication barriers and cross-border movement restrictions;*
6. *Recognizes the efforts made by the State Party to monitor the impacts of climate change and initiate mitigation and adaptation measures, and also encourages the State Party to consult with the Mountains Specialist Group of the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) and other experts, in order to identify and implement further measures to safeguard the property's Outstanding Universal Value over the long term;*
7. *Notes with concern the damage caused by the recent wild fire in the property, indicating that park management is not adequately equipped to respond to high-altitude wild fires, and urges the State Party to implement the recommendations from the management report, as well as to ensure that adequate fire fighting equipment is made available;*
8. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to revoke any existing licenses for mining within the property and ensure that no further mining licenses are issued within the property, in line with the Committee's established position that mineral exploration and mining are incompatible with World Heritage status and the international policy statement of the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) of not undertaking these activities in World Heritage properties;*
9. *Requests the State Party to confirm the permanent cessation of mining activities and licenses within the property, and to submit a copy of the park's ecological monitoring plan to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2014**, together with additional information on the location and extent of the 14 new resource harvesting zones, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Minor boundary modification also submitted by the State Party – see Document WHC-12/36.COM/8B.Add)

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1981

Criteria
(vii) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/156/documents/>

International Assistance

Global amount granted to the property: USD 42,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/156/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Potential impacts of a hydro-electric project in Kenya;
- b) Poaching;
- c) Reduced and degraded water resources;
- d) Potential impact of optical cables' installation;
- e) Proposed road crossing the northern part of the Property

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/156>

Current conservation issues

At the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee (UNESCO, 2011), the State Party announced its decision to reconsider the North Road and to maintain the stretch of 53 km from Kleins Gate to Tabora B traversing the northern wilderness area of the property as a gravel road under the management of the Tanzania National Parks (TANAPA) and reserved for tourism and administrative purposes. This decision was welcomed by the World Heritage Committee, who called upon the international community and the donor agencies to consider providing support for the construction of a southern alignment, which avoids Serengeti National Park.

On 1 February 2012, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. This report includes an update on the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for the North Road proposal and on the implementation of the 2011 World Heritage Centre/ IUCN reactive monitoring mission recommendations, as requested by the Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011).

a) North Road and railway proposals

The State Party reports that following the Government's decision to abandon the part of the road project initially planned to traverse the property, the finalization of the ESIA for the revised North Road proposal has been slowed down. It notes that to conduct the larger Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SEA) for the northern Tanzanian road network recommended by the Committee, the State Party is looking for outside funding. The report does not provide information on the plans for the southern alignment.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that in December 2011, Uganda and Tanzania entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with a China-based company for the development of three ports and a railway line linking the coast via Musoma to Kampala. The MoU enables the Chinese Civil Engineering Construction Company to conduct a feasibility study for the proposed railway route, which forms part of the East African Cooperation transport strategy and regional road sector development programme. Following press reports that the planned railway could traverse the north of the Serengeti, Government and East

African Cooperation officials have stated that the route will go south of the property and will not traverse it.

They also note that on 15 March 2012 the East African Court of Justice ruled that a legal case against the North Road proposal across the Serengeti will proceed to a full trial. The suit seeks to permanently restrain the construction of a trunk road or highway across the property and to prevent de-gazettement of the property for the purpose of road construction, among other points.

b) Poaching

The State Party reports a rise in elephant poaching in recent years, with 33 elephants poached in 2011 compared to 12 in 2010 but notes that long-term data over 20 years indicate a demographically healthy and increasing elephant population of over 3000. No case of rhino poaching was recorded in 2011. Another 19 mammal species, including wildebeest, are stable or increasing. The State Party notes that about 40% of the park's budget is normally spent on anti-poaching efforts, and that in 2011 the Department of Law Enforcement was allocated 42% of the budget, with a separate budget committed to protecting rhinos. Forty-three new rangers were employed during 2011 and the ranger force now constitutes 57% of the total 422 staff. Overall, the State Party considers that its anti-poaching commitment is adequate to respond to the recent rise in elephant poaching. The report also highlights the active involvement of Tanzania in different international and regional agreements to combat illegal harvesting and trafficking of wildlife resources and notes the launch of a new Elephant Management Plan 2010-2015. The State Party also reports that alternative livelihoods have been promoted and supported since 1992, with mixed results, through the Park's Community Conservation Programme. During 2011 a total of 180,350 USD was allocated to community support. However, the State Party considers that it is difficult to determine whether community support is helping to reduce poaching.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that populations of key species have been stable and are currently not threatened but also note that subsistence poaching, poaching for commercial meat markets, and high-value poaching for ivory and rhino horn within the property have all increased in recent years. IUCN notes that there may be opportunities for park management to collaborate with private concessionaires of neighbouring game reserves on law enforcement.

c) Management of the Mara River Basin

The State Party reports that the Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC) is undertaking studies to determine the most effective options for implementing the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP) for the Sustainable Management of the Mara River in a transboundary context (Kenya/Tanzania). Based on these studies, detailed action plans and budgets will be developed.

d) Implementation of other recommendations

The State Party report also provides details on progress in the ongoing implementation of the mission's recommendations in relation to managing human-wildlife conflict, controlling the spread of alien invasive species, dialogue with communities in Speke Gulf, determining the maximum carrying capacity of water use in the property and to developing a comprehensive plan to address water shortage issues, evaluating options to improve the road from Naabi Hill to Seronera, strengthening funding for the General Management Plan, and re-activating the Serengeti Ecosystem Forum.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall the State Party's announcement at the 35th session to reconsider the North Road, but note that the current report does not provide any details on concrete plans to develop the southern alignment. They welcome the commitment of the State Party to seek funding for a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment of the northern Tanzania road network. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also take note of the announcement by the State Party that the route of a planned railway connection linking the coast to Musoma will go south of the property and will not traverse it.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note that the State Party has made substantial efforts to implement Decision **35 COM 7B.7** and some of the recommendations of the 2011 mission and consider that the World Heritage Committee might encourage the State Party to continue its efforts to fully implement them.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN wish to highlight the rise in poaching within the property and recommend that the Committee request the State Party to continue strengthening its anti-poaching efforts, by increasing the resources allocated and by improving their efficiency. They request the State Party to provide poaching statistics in its next state of conservation report.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the worrying reports received by IUCN of ongoing deforestation of the Mau catchment area of the Mara River and other rivers vital to the northern Serengeti ecosystem and recall that substantial progress has been achieved by the State Party of Tanzania in addressing water management in the Mara Basin, in cooperation with the State Party of Kenya. They consider that the timely implementation of the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP) for the Sustainable Management of the Mara River is key to address this threat.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.6

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.7**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Welcomes the substantial efforts made by the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 2010 mission as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session, and encourages the State Party to continue its efforts to fully implement them;*
4. *Notes the commitment of the State Party to solicit funding for a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SEA) for the northern Tanzanian road and calls on donors to provide funding for this study as well as for the construction of a southern alignment, which will avoid Serengeti National Park;*
5. *Also welcomes the announcement by the State Party that the planned railway linking the coast via Musoma to Kampala will not traverse the property but will go south of it;*
6. *Remains concerned by the rise in poaching within the property, and requests the State Party to continue strengthening its anti-poaching efforts and to provide specific information on the extent and impact of poaching in its next report;*

7. Takes note of reports of on-going deforestation of the Mau catchment area of the Mara River and other rivers in Kenya vital to the northern Serengeti ecosystem, and also requests the State Parties of Tanzania and Kenya, via the Lake Victoria Basin Commission to step up their efforts to implement the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP) for the Sustainable Management of the Mara River to address this;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, in particular on progress in implementing the recommendations of the 2010 mission as well as detailed information on the evolution of poaching in the property, for examination by the World heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

7. Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe) (N 509)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1989

Criteria

(vii) (viii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/509/documents/>

International Assistance

Global amount granted to the property: USD 124,500

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/509/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Unplanned tourism development;
- b) Uncontrolled urban development driven by population increase;
- c) Invasive species;
- d) Pollution (water, air and visual);
- e) Reduced water flows over the falls due to drought and/or upstream hydropower production.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/509>

Current conservation issues

On 15 February 2012 the States Parties of Zambia and Zimbabwe submitted a comprehensive joint state of conservation report covering progress made during the two-year period since their last report in February 2010. The report addresses the specific issues raised in Committee Decision **34 COM 7B.6** and provides a general update on the implementation of measures taken to satisfy the 2006 mission recommendations. The State Party of Zambia also submitted on 14 October 2011 three environmental project briefs for a five passenger tethered balloon, an amphicoach, and a tent sanctuary and spa lodge facility. The environmental project brief functions as an Environmental Impact Assessment under

Zambia's Environmental Protection and Pollution Control (Environmental Assessment) Regulation, Statutory Instrument No 28 of 1997.

a) *Transboundary management co-ordination*

The States Parties report that the Joint Technical Committee (JTC) and the Joint Site Management Committee (JSMC) each met twice during 2010 and twice in 2011. The Joint Ministerial Committee is yet to meet. Through the work of these committees annual action plans have been developed and the States Parties' report details progress made against nine areas of activity in 2010, whilst also providing details of the intended work programme for 2011. The States Parties note that funding remains a challenge and that high staff turnover, prolonged staff vacancies and 'economic meltdown' in one State Party have limited the effectiveness of joint operations.

b) *Site monitoring*

The States Parties report the development of 57 benchmarks and indicators that are being used to monitor progress in maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value and ecological integrity of the property. Details of these benchmarks and indicators are tabulated and progress towards the achievement of each benchmark is summarised. Work on most is still ongoing.

c) *Control of invasive species*

The States Parties report an intensification of efforts to control invasive species in the falls area using mechanical, chemical and biological methods. A total of 2.5 ha of land was cleared of the invasive weed *Lantana camara*, but the States Parties note that they face significant challenges due to its rapid regeneration. The slopes of the gorges are now becoming infested and control work is dependent on State Party funding, which is inadequate.

d) *Tourism development and regulation*

The States Parties report an increase in visitor numbers over the 2009 figure, with a total of 232,400 visitors in 2010 and 215,380 during the first 11 months of 2011. A new helipad has been completed away from the falls so that helicopter operators can be relocated and noise pollution reduced. Both State Parties have upgraded their visitor centres and installed electronic ticketing equipment. Other visitor facilities have been improved on the Zimbabwe side, with a new ticket office and upgrading of ablution facilities.

As noted above, the State Party of Zambia submitted a new project brief for a smaller tethered balloon at a different location. The project brief for this proposal notes that the new location is south of the Eastern Cataract, meaning that the balloon would not appear in the viewing corridor of visitors viewing the Falls from the Zambian side.

e) *Other conservation issues of concern – water abstraction, poaching, pollution, and urban development*

In respect of other threats and recommendations of the 2006 mission, the States Parties report as follows:

An agreement has been reached to reduce water abstraction for hydro-electric power generation by the Zambia Electricity Supply Corporation (ZESCO), which entails a 40% reduction in power generation and correspondingly stronger flow of water over the falls for five hours daily during the critical dry months, when water flows in the Zambezi drop below 400 m³/s. This is intended to ensure that water flows over the eastern cataract (on the Zambian side of the falls) during these peak visitor viewing hours. However, the State Party notes that this measure will not be implemented until the power station is connected to the national power grid, and that there will be no reduction in power generation if the water flows in the Zambezi drop below 200 m³/s.

The State Party further notes that poaching has been reduced by 65%, 107 arrests have been made, and 3,662 snares and other items have been confiscated from poachers. In addition, the States Parties have run combined security meetings and patrols, acquired necessary equipment and trained 44 field rangers.

The report further notes that pollution arising from effluent discharge from urban areas on either side of the border is being addressed. Sewerage ponds on the Zimbabwe side have been rehabilitated, but those on the Zambia side are still reported to be leaking. Mitigation measures have been put in place to address pollution from boat sewage, such as the installation of chemical toilets on all boats operating on the Zambezi river.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress made since the introduction of the Joint Integrated Management Plan in developing a unified management approach by the States Parties through regular meetings of the Joint Technical and Site Management Committees. They commend the introduction of joint annual action plans and note that their implementation has been constrained by staffing and budgetary issues that are largely beyond the control of the site management authorities. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the committee encourages the States Parties to develop a sustainable financing strategy and business plan for the property, through which, *inter alia*, increased revenues generated from park entry fees and other sources are available to the property and can be re-invested in addressing management needs.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note the States Parties' stated intention to develop a comprehensive monitoring plan for the property by December 2012 and encourage the JSMC to make this a priority. There is a need to identify specific quantifiable indicators and collect data in a systematic and replicable manner so as to monitor the status of the property's Outstanding Universal Value and indicators of the property's ecological integrity.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that despite some improvements, helicopter use and noise remains a significant concern that impacts on the quality of experience of visitors to the property and requires continued regulation and management. Furthermore, after reviewing the project brief, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the new location of the tethered balloon does not mitigate the visual impacts of the balloon on the view from the Zimbabwean side or from river cruises above the falls. They recommend that the Committee recall its Decision **34 COM 7B.6**, which re-iterated that any tethered balloon projects close to the property would adversely impact its integrity because, when raised, the balloon is likely to appear within the viewing corridor of the Falls.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the measures taken to halt any further development of hotels and other tourist facilities on the river banks and islands; to reduce noise and river pollution and to maintain the site's visual integrity and natural unspoilt beauty. They also note that the State Party of Zambia has submitted three environmental project briefs for a five passenger tethered balloon, an amphicoach, and a tent sanctuary and spa lodge facility before taking a decision on these projects, as required by the *Operational Guidelines*.

However, with regards to the amphicoach project, the environmental project brief submitted does not currently adequately address mitigation of visual and physical impacts. Considering the spa project, the brief should include a limit to the height of the tents and other infrastructure associated to the spa lodge, and specify measures to avoid impacts of the spa on the view from the Zimbabwe side of the river. Furthermore, regarding the spa site, adequate measures should be taken to avoid erosion of top soil within and around the spa lodge site, as well as silt run-off into the river or associated streams as a result of surface drainage of rainwater. While it is possible to assess the impacts of individual development projects on the property, the cumulative effects of a range of tourism related developments

will together impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note historical concerns regarding the visual impact of high structures and recommend that the Committee request the State Party that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of development within the property and in its vicinity be conducted, in order to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, including its aesthetic value and the related conditions of integrity.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the loss of revenue (estimated at USD 218,160 annually) that would be involved in reducing the amount of water diverted from the falls to generate electricity. They however note that the ZESCO plant, as reported by the State Party, requires 175 m³/s to operate at full capacity, which involves abstraction of 44-87% of typical dry-season flows over the September-January period. This level of water abstraction is clearly affecting the visual impact and aesthetic value of the property (the basis of its inscription on the World Heritage List under criterion (vii)), and may be having other long-term impacts such as degradation of the adjacent rainforest as a result of reduced spray at critical times. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee urge the State Party of Zambia to consider further voluntary reductions in dry-season water abstraction so as to fully maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.7

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.6** adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Welcomes the further progress of the two States Parties in strengthening the joint management of the trans-boundary property through the work of the Joint Technical and Site Management Committees, and the measures taken to promote sustainable tourism by halting construction of hotels and lodges on the river banks and islands, reducing noise and water pollution, and upgrading visitor facilities at the property;*
4. *Encourages the two States Parties to develop a sustainable financing strategy and business plan for the property, recognising that implementation of the Joint Integrated Management Plan may be largely financed from park entry fees and other internally-generated sources;*
5. *Also welcomes the voluntary agreement of the State Party of Zambia to introduce a limit on the dry-season diversion of water from the falls for hydro-electric power generation, which would significantly restore a major attribute of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and requests the State Party of Zambia to implement this new water abstraction regime as soon as possible, and consider further reductions in water abstraction by the power station;*
6. *Notes that the State Party of Zambia submitted three environmental project briefs, including for a tethered balloon project adjacent to the property, reiterates its previous conclusion at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) that any tethered balloons close to the property will adversely impact its visual integrity, and urges the States Parties not to authorize any tethered balloon or other tall structures within the vicinity of the falls;*
7. *Also requests that the State Party of Zambia to address IUCN's comments regarding the proposed amphicoach and spa lodge projects, before considering whether to proceed with the two proposed projects;*

8. Recommends the States Parties to conduct a joint Strategic Environmental Assessment of developments within the property and in its vicinity, in order to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, including its aesthetic value and the related conditions of integrity;
9. Also recognizes the progress made in developing benchmarks and indicators to monitor the State of Conservation of the property and also requests the States Parties to develop a comprehensive monitoring plan for the property and submit a copy to the World Heritage Centre by **1 December 2012**;
10. Reiterates its request to the two States Parties to continue their on-going efforts to control invasive species;
11. Further requests the two States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2014** a jointly prepared report on the state of conservation of the property, including details of progress made in the implementation of measures to address the recommendations of the 2006 mission and the issues mentioned above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

ASIA-PACIFIC

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

9. 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

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1083/documents/>

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
- e) Management planning.

Illustrative material

see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1083>

Current conservation issues

A report on the state of conservation of the property was received from the State Party on 13 January 2012. The report responds to issues raised by the Committee in decision **35 COM 7B.12** and provides additional information on conservation actions undertaken at the property. Extracts relating to Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) for three hydroelectric power projects (A'hai, Longkaikou and Ludila) are annexed to the report.

a) Issues related to planned dam building

The State Party states that reports of unapproved dam construction having begun on the Liuku Dam on the Nujiang River are incorrect and cite photographic evidence to illustrate that, as of December 2011, no construction has begun. The State Party points out that the prerequisite watershed planning and EIA have not been completed. The report further states that *"In accordance with the regulatory protocols of Chinese government for constructing hydroelectric power plants, it will not be possible for Liuku dam project and its EIA to pass*

the state approval'. Similarly, the State Party confirms that no Lisu people have been displaced in connection with the proposed Liuku Dam, however, 100 households living near Xiaoshaba village were relocated to improved housing, an issue unrelated to dam construction.

The State Party also reports that no unauthorised construction is taking place with respect to the Majia, Yabilluo, Liuku and Saige sites. Geological drilling is being undertaken to inform a report on "Hydroelectric Power Planning on the Middle and Low Reaches of Nu River" which is yet to be approved. The State Party indicates that any road works being undertaken are a part of normal rerouting and maintenance operations.

The State Party reports on three proposed hydroelectric projects (A'hai, Longkaikou and Ludila) on the middle reaches of the Jinsha River which have been approved and are in various stages of implementation. They state that these proposed projects are distant from the Haba Snow Mountain sub unit of the property and that EIAs conclude they will not create negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). Based on this judgement EIAs were not submitted to the World Heritage Centre, however, extracts of the EIAs have been provided within the current report.

The State Party affirms its view that the values of the property are related to higher elevation areas (above 2,000m asl) and that proposed hydroelectric projects and dams within the lower elevation disturbed valleys will not have impacts on the property's OUV.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome confirmation that construction has not begun at the proposed Liuku Dam site and the State Party's advice that this proposal will not be approved at the state level. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also appreciate the clarifications provided by the State Party on the three above-mentioned hydroelectric projects. The distance of these projects downstream from the Haba Snow Mountain sub unit of the property may mitigate against significant impact on the property's OUV, however, IUCN is not in a position to assess impacts having not had the opportunity to consider the EIAs. It is also noted that no lists or maps were provided showing the overall extent of hydroelectric dams proposed for areas adjacent to the property and its buffer zone.

IUCN has also received specific reports asserting that site preparations have taken place for the proposed Li Yuan dam on the Jinsha River and the Songta and Maji dams on the Nujiang River. Physical site preparation works may also have impacts and should not proceed ahead of an approved EIA. The Environmental Impact Evaluation Division of the Ministry of Environmental Protection (MEP) issued a notice on 6 January 2012 on further strengthening environmental protection during hydroelectric power construction. This notice directs that site preparation should be included in the EIA of any hydroelectric power project. Furthermore, MEP reinforces that basin-wide hydroelectric power development plans are required by law. On 5 April 2012, the World Heritage Centre requested clarifications by the State Party on reported preparatory construction work at the property.

b) Details of mining and dam proposals which may affect the property

The State Party reports that there are no longer any legal mining activities within the property. The State Party further affirms its commitment that no new mining operations will be approved within the property and its buffer zones. In addition, it indicates that plans to specify areas of no-mining outside of the property and buffer zones have been developed. They also detail a range of measures directed at reducing the impacts of those mines most recently excluded from the property through boundary modifications. Measures include improved standard setting, environmental planning, and environmental compliance monitoring.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the commitment of the State Party to ensure no new mining approvals within the property and buffer zone and to additionally delineate no-mining zones outside of the property. Initiatives to reduce the potential adverse impacts of mining operations in areas adjacent to the property are also welcomed. However, the World

Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that in its evaluation of the minor boundary modification approved by the Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), IUCN was concerned about some mineral processing taking place in the watercourses, with no separation between the water used for mining and the natural water flow, and noted that this represented a permanent impact on the natural system, while also potentially posing a risk to downstream communities.

c) Issues related to management and planning

The State Party reports that relevant Management Plans have been adjusted for consistency with the boundary changes approved by the 34th session of the Committee. A revised Master Plan for the property has been submitted to the State Council and is anticipated to be approved for implementation in 2012. The State Party furthermore reports a range of activities to better protect the property's values including proposals to conduct a range of thematic studies, undertake boundary marking, enhance zoning systems, and expand staffing levels and capacity building. Among future management challenges, the State Party notes tourism development and the need to mitigate conflicts between local community development and the protection of natural heritage.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN commend efforts to enhance coordination between the eight sub units of the serial property and encourage on-going harmonization of planning and management especially between the two types of protected areas (Scenic and Historic Interest Areas and Nature Reserves) which comprise the property. They note the State Party did not report on overall progress regarding its intention to put in place adequate staffing and budget for the management of the property, but welcome a report that 85 staff have been hired among 3 components of the property. They recall this was a key element that led the Committee to approve the minor boundary modification at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010).

IUCN received reports of local disputes in relation to existing mining activities close to the property on the western slopes of the sacred Mount Kawagebo, of which the eastern slopes are included in the property. In response, on 23 January 2012, the local Prefecture announced that a gold mine that had been operating in the area for nearly a year would be closed. The reports provided to IUCN also note that the communities on the western slopes of Mount Kawagebo could also be affected by proposed dam development on the Nu River.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall the statement made by the State Party in its report to the 35th session of the Committee in Paris that planning and approval of dams and hydroelectric power plants on the Nujiang, Jinsha and Lancang river basins had been suspended in 2008. Given the evidence of ongoing planning of dams, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain deeply concerned regarding the extent of possible dam construction in this region and the cumulative impacts of overall development. Concerns have been expressed to IUCN regarding potential impacts that could result from hydroelectric dam construction, such as those from resettled human populations moving out of the valleys into higher elevations thereby increasing pressure on the property, disruptions to freshwater fish ecology and migration, river sedimentation from road development, water quality and other forms of potential pollution. These concerns together with the overall scale of planned development reinforce the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to review the overall proposals and impacts rather than assessing proposals dam by dam.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* emphasizes that notice be given as soon as possible and before drafting basic documents for specific projects. Paragraph 172 is in the spirit of supporting a process to find solutions that ensure the OUV of the property is fully preserved. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are willing to assist the State Party with advice on the preparation of Strategic Environmental Assessments.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to continue the positive efforts to improve management and complete the reviews of Management Plans to better harmonize and coordinate management across all sub units within the property.

Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property, to review the potential impacts of the proposed dams to be constructed on the major rivers in the region, including the Jinsha, Nujiang and Lacang Rivers which are in close proximity to the property and its buffer zone, on the property's Outstanding Universal Value. They stress that it will be essential to receive the requested planning documents related to the extent of proposed dam construction prior to a mission to ensure it is informed and productive. They further consider that the mission should also review the mining areas adjacent to the property, including those that were excluded from the property through the minor boundary changes approved by the Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), to ensure that these are not having a negative impact on the OUV of the property. Furthermore, the mission should evaluate the overall management effectiveness of the property.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.9

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.12** adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the on-going actions to address conservation issues at the property and urges the State Party to continue these efforts;*
4. *Welcomes the efforts made by the State Party to ensure those mining areas which were excluded through the boundary modification and are now adjacent to the property and its buffer zone comply with international environmental and health standards;*
5. *Regrets that comprehensive lists and accompanying maps of proposed dams in areas near to the property and its buffer zone have not yet been provided, and requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 December 2012** a detailed list and maps of all proposed dams that could affect the property, and to submit to the World Heritage Centre the Environmental Impact Assessments for any such dam proposals, prior to their approval, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Also urges the State Party to ensure that active site preparation works for proposed hydroelectric projects do not proceed ahead of an approved Environmental Impact Assessment;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to invite an IUCN reactive monitoring mission to review the potential impacts of the proposed dams, and of mining in the areas adjacent to the property, on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, and to assess the overall management effectiveness of the property, and further requests the State Party to make available prior to the mission the English documents necessary to this review, including pertinent Environmental Impact Assessments, reports on hydroelectric power planning, and the terms of reference for a possible Strategic Environmental Assessment of all the dam proposals in the region;*

8. Requests furthermore 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 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 37th session in 2013.

10. Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India) (N 338)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Minor boundary modification also submitted by the State Party – see Document WHC-12/36.COM/8B.Add)

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1985

Criteria
(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/340/documents/>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount provided to the property: USD 80,000 (Enhancing Our Heritage project on management effectiveness assessment). The property has benefited from the UNF funded World Heritage India programme from 2008 (enhance management effectiveness and build staff capacity; increase the involvement of local communities in the management of the property and promote their sustainable development; and raise awareness through communications and advocacy).

Previous monitoring missions
March 2005: World Heritage Centre site visit; March 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Inadequate water supply and competition for water with neighbouring communities;
b) Poor water (quality and quantity) management;
c) Invasive species (*Prosopis*, *Eichhornia*, *Paspalum*)

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/340>

Current conservation problems

A report on the state of conservation of the property was received from the State Party on 27 January 2012. The report responds to issues raised by the Committee in decision **35 COM 7B.14** and provides additional information on conservation actions undertaken at the property. Several press articles reporting on the inflow of water to the property are annexed

to the report. Copies of the Management Plan for Keoladeo National Park 2010 - 2014 are also annexed to the report.

a) *Issues related to adequate water supply*

The State Party reports on three measures to provide adequate water flows to the property which are necessary to sustain Keoladeo's wetland values. These include the release of 15 million cubic feet (mcft) of water from the Ajan Bandh reservoir in September 2011 which the State Party reports as having stimulated a successful heron nesting season with 538 pairs from 12 species of herons.

In addition the State Party advises on the completion of the Dholpur – Bharatpur Drinking Water Project and the commencement of water flows to the property in October 2011. Water is being released to the property at the rate of 4 mcft per day and as of January 2012 250 mcft has replenished the property's wetland systems. The State Party reports that water monitoring from the Chambal river shows an "adequate supply of fishes and crustaceans" to provide forage for the property's bird populations. The report notes that the marshes of the property and associated birdlife have responded positively to the water replenishment. Furthermore, it is noted that enhanced water flows have re-catalysed the local tourism industry.

The State Party notes that the Govardhan Drain project which is expected to provide 350 mcft of water to the property is still under construction with a revised completion date expected in March 2012. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the 2011 State Party report had indicated that construction began in April 2011 and would take six months to complete.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN emphasize the importance of consistent and sustainable water replenishment as a foundation for the natural seasonal ecological functioning of the property's wetland systems. Equally, it is emphasized that water quality is as important as quantity for the functioning of the wetlands. The ecosystem health of the property also underpins tourism and local livelihoods. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall the recommendations of the 2008 Mission that environmental water flows of 550 mcft per annum are considered a minimum to sustain the property's wetland values. The completion of the Govardhan Drain project, and the 350 mcft which it will provide, should therefore be expedited as soon as possible to augment the improved water flows which have been re-established to date. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party does not provide information on the release of water from Panchana Dam, as urged by the Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011). They consider that the release of water from Panchana Dam should remain an option to top-up the water supply to the property, particularly when the supply of water from the Dholpur-Bharatpur Drinking Water Project is reduced after four years, as planned. The wetland systems should not be placed under abnormal duress through a water regime of critical dryness and extremes of wetness.

b) *Ecological monitoring and Management Plan*

The State Party reports the implementation of an ecological monitoring programme across a range of 8 indicators for selected birds, mammals, reptiles, vegetation and water levels. Thresholds have been set to ensure the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained. The monitoring programme sits within the framework of the property's Management Plan 2010-2014, a copy of which has been included in the State Party report.

The State Party also report on monitoring of a number of satellite wetlands which act as an essential part of the overall wetland ecosystem providing habitat to birdlife in the region. The monitoring programme was initiated under a UNESCO-IUCN project in 2005 and it is continuing under a follow up project through to 2014.

The State Party report details bird counts for 15 heron species from 1991 to 2011. These show fluctuations and a number of failed breeding seasons particularly from 1997 onwards which are attributed to a lack of water.

The existence of a science based Management Plan in operation for the property is a welcome confirmation. The implementation of ecological monitoring programmes for the property and surrounding satellite wetlands is also welcomed. Given the importance of the satellite wetlands for maintaining the values of the property it is critical that monitoring and management continues beyond the life of specific projects.

Furthermore the World Heritage Centre and IUCN appreciate the time-series data on heron bird counts. This data illustrates the serious decline in total heron numbers since 1997. Numbers of birds average 5,777 p.a. in the 6 years between 1991 and 1997, however, only 850 p.a. in the 15 years since then, a decline of over 85%. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the dramatic decline in bird populations demonstrates that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been seriously compromised. They emphasize that it is imperative that water flows are restored and maintained at adequate levels, and they consider that the continued implementation of the ecological monitoring programme should demonstrate the clear and sustained recovery of bird populations in the property by 2014.

c) *Other conservation issues – inappropriate developments near the park boundary and participatory management*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have also received reports on threats from inappropriate residential and industrial development close to the park boundary and the need to further strengthen participatory management. In response to these reports, the World Heritage Centre requested further information from the State Party, which was received on 11 March 2012. The State Party notes that a 500 meters eco-sensitive area is defined around the property, which cannot be widened due to the proximity of Bharatpur town. The State Party also notes that no illegal conversion of agricultural land to other uses has so far taken place, nor are any factory developments proposed within the eco-sensitive zone.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that at the Committee's 35th session, the State Party had noted that in addition to removal of Prosopis, local communities were involved in prevention of offences, education, and grassland management. They consider that the participatory approach to management of the property should be continued and further intensified.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the progress achieved in restoring the water supply to the property's wetland systems. However, more water is needed to sustain the system along with a commitment, wherever possible, of ongoing water allocations even during times of general water shortage, including through release from the Panchana Dam. Adequate and sustained water allocations estimated at 550 mcft will be necessary to ensure the recovery of the bird populations which are central to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Systematic monitoring of the bird numbers and other environmental indicators will be vital to monitor long term recovery. The completion of the delayed Govardhan Drain project is essential to augment water flows to levels which can sustain the ecology of the wetlands in the longer term. As this project is anticipated to be completed in March 2012, the Committee may wish to request confirmation of completion at its 36th session.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.11

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.14**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),

3. Welcomes the efforts and the progress made by the State Party to replenish the water regime within the property's wetland systems through the decisions to release environmental water flows from reservoirs and completed water related projects and urges the State Party to continue to provide adequate water flows on a sustainable basis;
4. Regrets the delays in completion of the Govardhan Drain project and reiterates its request to the State Party to expedite completion of this project and initiate the planned water flows from this project to the property;
5. Encourages the State Party to continue ecological monitoring programmes, which are independent of specific projects, in order to assess long-term ecosystem changes and particularly the recovery of bird populations;
6. Also urges the State Party to further intensify the involvement of local communities in the management of the property, building on its existing achievements, including in the control of invasive species and other aspects of management, as appropriate;
7. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a report on the state of conservation of the property including confirmation of the completion of the Govardhan Drain, the progress made in providing adequate water flows to the property, updated statistics on bird populations and the management of the threats of alien invasive species and development on the edge of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

12. Shiretoko (Japan) (N 1193)

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
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1193/documents/>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
February 2008: joint UNESCO / IUCN mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Completion of the revision of the overall Management Plan;
b) Implementation of the recommendations of the joint UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission.

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1193>

Current conservation issues

A comprehensive report on the state of conservation of the property was received from the State Party on 27 January 2012. The report responds to issues raised by the Committee in Decision **32 COM 7B.16** and reports progress against the recommendations of the 2008 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission. A copy of the 2009 Management Plan and sub-plans for the property is provided in an annex to the report.

a) *Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA) designation for marine areas to improve protection*

The State Party reports that the impacts of international shipping on the property's values are currently minimal. The Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism is investigating enhanced navigation systems for shipping which will be evaluated by the State Party before considering the need for PSSA designation of the marine areas of the property.

b) *Management planning*

The State Party notes that the overall Management Plan for Shiretoko has been revised in December 2009 to become the "Management Plan for the Shiretoko World Natural Heritage Site" (World Heritage Management Plan). The revision has updated the former 2004 plan and results are reported upon annually. The new World Heritage Management Plan integrates terrestrial and marine management at a general level with details provided in sub plans such as for Sika Deer and Multiple Use Marine Areas which are annexed to the main plan. These sub plans are currently being reviewed. The Scientific Council is developing a mid- and long-term monitoring plan to ensure that values of the property are being maintained. Future revisions of the World Heritage Management Plan will consider the identification of objectively verifiable indicators and adjusted timeframes.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the revision of the plan and consider the establishment of a relatively simple overarching Management Plan for the property within which more detailed sub plans are developed to be an effective planning framework. The State Party is encouraged to progressively review all thematic sub plans and update these consistent with the World Heritage Management Plan. Strengthened priority setting, objectively verifiable indicators and implementation timeframes should be incorporated into revised plans.

c) *Management of marine resources*

In response to the need for improved local marine zoning the State Party notes that fishers and fishing associations self-manage no-take zones and no-take periods to ensure sustainable use of marine resources. Kushiro Nature Conservation Office and the Hokkaido Government monitor fishing activities in accordance with the marine Management Plan.

The State Party also reports on enhanced cooperation with the Russian Federation to promote exchange of scientific information and to address issues of unsustainable harvesting of Walleye Pollock. A Cooperation Program on sustainable use of ecosystems was signed between the two countries in May 2009. Several joint workshops and symposiums have been held. In addition, a joint statement among researchers from Japan, China, and Russia was adopted and a researchers' network, the "Amur Okhotsk Consortium", has been established. The State Party reports that Walleye Pollock levels have not returned to pre-1989 levels however they have stabilised. Monitoring, legal regulation and voluntary management by fishing cooperatives continue.

The State Party further notes a number of measures which have been adopted to limit the culling of Steller Sea Lions which threaten local fishing (economic damage estimated at 12 m USD p.a.). Measures include regulation of reinforced nets, use of deterrents and monitoring of catch limits, however, none are completely effective in achieving co-existence between fishing and Sea Lions. Overall Asian populations of Steller Sea Lions are reported as slowly recovering (1.2% increase p.a. since the early 1990s). Sea Lions in the region are culled in

accordance with quotas and guidelines set by the Hokkaido Fishing Coordination Commission. A new system for quarterly management introduced in October 2010 is expected to allow for flexible management based on migration and damage conditions in the Hokkaido fishery grounds.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the enhanced efforts at collaboration between Japan, Russia and China. This has focused to date on research and information exchange. The 2008 mission noted impressive levels of community stewardship which appear to have continued. IUCN notes that it will be important to continue collaboration through the development of joint planning and sustainable fishing agreements which can be monitored to ensure on-going conservation of marine stocks. Concerns remain over the culling of Steller Sea Lions through a quota system in operation since 1994. Statistics in the Multiple Use Marine Areas Plan show the number of Sea Lions caught averaging 106 p.a. since 1997 however, there is no data provided post 2006 nor are population trends shown for Steller Sea Lions within the property. The adoption of a quarterly management method is welcomed. This method should be supported by additional data to assess the impact of annual cullings on local Steller Sea Lion populations.

d) *Management of salmonids and river constructions*

The State Party records that the River Construction Working Group of the Shiretoko World Natural Heritage Site Scientific Council identified 13 river structures on five rivers within the property. Modifications of these began in 2006 and further structural modifications are planned to facilitate natural salmonid movement. Monitoring shows the positive increase in levels of spawning and escapement resulting from installation of fishways.

The IUCN Species Survival Commission Salmonid Specialist Group, whilst acknowledging efforts to modify river constructions, has expressed concerns regarding three dams which remain on the Rusha River, noting that this is one of the largest and most important salmon rivers at the site. To the extent possible, dam removal should also continue in some of the other river systems at the site.

IUCN notes that measures to enhance spawning fish densities will also benefit a variety of other taxa at the site, particularly the iconic higuma (Hokkaido brown bear) that rely on salmon as an important food source in the fall.

e) *Management of Sika Deer grazing impacts*

The State Party reports that the Kushiro Nature Conservation Office is developing indicators for monitoring Sika Deer grazing impacts. The Sika Deer and Terrestrial Ecosystem Working Group are also managing deer populations in accordance with the 2006 Sika Deer Management sub plan to manipulate population size through humane control programmes.

f) *Ecotourism Strategy linked to regional tourism development*

The State Party notes provisions within the updated 2009 Management Plan which specify the importance of avoiding negative tourism impacts on the natural environment through the establishment and implementation of Guidelines for Shiretoko Ecotourism. A Shiretoko Ecotourism Strategy was prepared in 2010 to protect natural values, stimulate local development and promote high-quality nature-based visitor experiences.

g) *Climate Change Strategy to monitor impacts and implement adaptive management strategies*

The State Party reports on a series of initial discussions through the Scientific Council to better understand climate change impacts on the property as part of broader natural resource monitoring programmes.

Efforts to understand climate change impacts and assess vulnerability and adaptive responses should be accelerated given the particular sensitivity of the property to terrestrial-marine interplay. The property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) related to being the

southernmost occurrence of sea ice in the Northern Hemisphere could be at significant risk from climate change impacts.

Conclusion

The State Party is to be commended for sustained efforts to improve the management and protection of the property. Interagency coordination has been improved through a number of mechanisms and continues to be effective. The governance framework provided through the Regional Liaison Committee and Scientific Council has been enhanced as a workable collaborative vehicle for management. The 2009 update of the overall Management Plan has strengthened integration of marine and terrestrial components and provides for an appropriate Management Planning framework.

Concern remains over the status of Steller Sea Lion populations and the unresolved conflicts with fishers. A range of measures has been deployed to alleviate conflicts; however, none has been particularly effective. Additional data is needed to assess the annual numbers of Steller Sea Lions caught since 2006 and trends within the population at the property and in surrounding seas.

It is encouraging to see the direct improvement in salmonid fish stocks resulting from river structure interventions, however, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to continue to remove impediments to natural salmonid spawning including the complete removal of dams on the Rusha River.

Continued efforts are supported to address the issues of climate change impact on the property's OUV. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the initial discussions on adaptive management strategies for minimizing impacts of climate change which have been conducted through the Scientific Council and stress that these should be accelerated given the susceptibility of the property's OUV to climate change.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.12

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.16**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Acknowledges the efforts made by the State Party and information on the on-going actions to address conservation issues at the property and urges the State Party to continue these efforts;*
4. *Requests the State Party to update statistics on annual Steller Sea Lion quotas and numbers caught and to report on population trends within the property;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to consider more significant river construction modifications including the complete removal of dams and their foundations on the Rusha River in order to facilitate natural salmonid migration and spawning, and further dam removal in other river systems within the property;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Center by **1 February 2015**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including on progress achieved in the further removal of river structures in the property and in addressing the conflict between fishers and Steller Sea Lion, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.*

13. Phoenix Islands Protected Area (Kiribati) (N 1325)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2010

Criteria

(vii)(ix)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1325/documents/>

International Assistance

Global amount granted to the property: USD 20,000 for a workshop on the preparation of World Heritage nomination of the property

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

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 13,864 in 2008 through the Stakeholder Workshop for the Phoenix Islands nomination organized by Apia Office with the funding from France FIT and Italy FIT. USD 20,943 in 2008 to support the finalization of the nomination document.

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal fishing and overfishing by licensed and unlicensed vessels;
- b) Degradation of seamounts;

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1325>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted its report on the state of conservation of the property, as well as a copy of the 2010-2014 Phoenix Islands Protected Area (PIPA) Management Plan on 12 February 2012. The report provides a summary of progress made on the three recommendations in Committee decision **34 COM 8B.2** taken at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010).

- a) *Strengthen the management framework for fisheries, including the extension of no-take areas, measures to prevent degradation of seamounts and concrete timelines for the phasing out of tuna fishing*

The State Party reports that the PIPA Management Plan 2010-2014 suggests a two-phased approach to zoning in relation to increasing the protection of the property. Phase One is currently implemented and 3.12% of the total surface of the property is designated as “no-take” areas. The State Party notes that, while small in relation to the total area of the property, the proposition of “no-take” areas amounts to more than 83% of priority threatened habitats of atoll reef islands, lagoons and coral reefs. During the second zoning phase, the State Party intends to designate an additional 25% of the property as “no-take” zone, which will also contribute to reducing the PIPA Offshore (tuna) Fishing effort. The implementation of the second zoning phase is subject to the establishment of the PIPA Trust Fund and will become operational only when the Trust Fund capital has reached a sufficient level to compensate the State Party for any losses in Distant Water Fishing Nation (DWFN) license fees associated with such limitations. Apart from the planned extension of “no-take” zones in Zoning Phase Two, the State Party provides no concrete timelines for the phasing out of tuna fishing.

The State Party indicates that because of the property's remoteness, seamounts have escaped deep sea trawling to date. It also indicates that the property's seamounts have great importance for pelagic and commercially important fisheries such as tuna and skipjack. The PIPA Management Plan 2010-2014 includes provisions for increasing the protection of seamounts, including by incorporating Winslow and Carondelet Reef Seamount systems into "no-take" areas during Zoning Phase Two, and by adjusting the PIPA zoning plan of the open ocean/buffer zone to specify protection levels for seamounts. The State Party notes that the implementation of these measures is subject to the availability of resources, which emphasizes the importance of the capitalisation of the Trust Fund.

- b) *Ensure an appropriate and sustainable budget towards management of Phoenix Islands Protected Area through a funded and functional trust fund or through other appropriate mechanisms*

The State Party notes that a GEF/UNEP project for a total amount of USD 2,663,100 to support the implementation of the Management Plan is under implementation since November 2011 and is expected to cover core funding for PIPA management needs until 2014, in anticipation of the operationalization of the PIPA Conservation Trust Fund. The Trust funding members made a commitment to capitalize the Trust Fund with an initial endowment of USD 13.5 million before the end of 2014. It is anticipated that this endowment will support core PIPA management costs at approximately USD 300,000 per year. The PIPA Trust Executive Director has developed a fundraising framework for review and endorsement by the Trust's Board in March 2012. The framework targets private foundations, individual donors, institutional and government donors. Conservation International has committed USD 2.5 million to the Trust, subject to matching funds.

- c) *Ensure capacities and resources for refined and systematic monitoring, surveillance and law enforcement*

The State Party recognizes the need for effective surveillance and enforcement of the property and indicates the significant challenges in terms of technology, capacity and resources due to its remoteness and large size. Currently the property is surveyed through aerial surveillance from domestic planes, including support from Australia and New Zealand, sea surveillance by patrol boat (1-2 patrol runs a year to PIPA), and land-based surveillance. The State Party notes that it has developed a surveillance and enforcement programme for its entire Exclusive Economic Zone that is targeted at preventing illegal fishing and monitoring of licenced vessels. An enforcement plan has been designed including licences, permits, and associated penalties for non-compliance. The properties' Management Plan lists a number of initiatives that are currently assisting with the surveillance programme design and increased patrolling exercises, including the 2009 sister agreement with the World Heritage property Papahānaumokuākea. Initial funding for increased surveillance is provided through the GEF/UNEP project. The State Party notes its plans to increase human resources and infrastructure on Kanton Atoll, including an atoll-based boat.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the property's Management Plan 2010-2014 is currently being implemented and seeks to establish a management system that can adequately protect the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. They underscore that the State Party has also successfully attracted initial project funding to cover basic management operational needs and is undertaking efforts for the operationalization and capitalisation of the Trust Fund to allow coverage of core management costs up to approximately USD 300,000 annually. They note that until the Trust Fund is capitalised and income from the Trust Fund is disbursed that the proposed "long term" coverage of "no-take" areas, including their adequate monitoring and surveillance, and level of protection proposed for the property will not be realised. No contributions to the Trust Fund were reported officially by the State Party and the funds promised by partners need to materialise.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that a phased zoning scheme is the cornerstone of the management system used for the conservation of the property, and note the importance that the zones are designed to allow sustainable, long-term conservation of the OUV of the property. They note that future refining of the zonation should consider the ecological significance of all no-take zones (existing and anticipated) in relation to the OUV of the property, and the most effective configuration of zones in relation to threats from current or predicted extraction.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note the challenges for law enforcement in this large and remote area. Currently, it is unclear to what extent the currently existing no-take areas are monitored (or plan to be monitored) adequately and continuously. Considering the large size of the area and associated high costs for surveillance, they recommend it is essential that priority areas are defined for surveillance. As in other large marine World Heritage sites, surveillance costs have been reduced efficiently by targeting patrolling activities to the areas ecologically most significant to the OUV of the property and with the highest risks of resource extraction.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.13

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 8B.2**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Welcomes the State Party's effort in attracting a preliminary financial contribution for the implementation of the 2010-2014 Management Plan from the Global Environment Facility, and for the design of a fundraising framework for the envisaged Trust Fund for the property;*
4. *Notes the essential importance of the establishment and full capitalisation of the Trust Fund to the long term conservation of the property, and requests the State Party, with the support of its partners, to:*
 - a) *Ensure the Trust Fund is fully capitalised, operational, and disbursing funds,*
 - b) *Provide a clear financial plan outlining funds to be allocated for core management needs, including the proportion to compensate the State Party for the loss in tuna fishing licences fees ,*
 - c) *Enable the extension of no-take zones for the property no later than 2014;*
5. *Considers that the envisaged future extension of the zonation, as requested by the Committee at the time of inscription as an essential requirement, should consider the Outstanding Universal Value of the property by establishing no-take zones in the areas of greatest ecological significance, and consider the level of threat posed to each zone from both legal and illegal resource extraction;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2015** a report on the progress made with the management of the property, in particular measures addressing illegal and overfishing of inshore and offshore fisheries, prevention of the degradation of seamounts, extension, surveillance and enforcement of no-take zones and establishment of long-term sustainable financing of the property's management system, including the full capitalisation of the initial endowment of the*

Trust Fund for the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.

14. Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1979

Criteria
(vii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/120/documents/>

International Assistance
Global amount granted to the property: USD 232,097
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/120/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
December 2002: IUCN monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Pressure and degradation from increasing tourism and mountaineering;
- b) Development of tourism resort in core area;
- c) Climate change;
- d) Aircraft use;
- e) Mining;
- f) Deforestation for firewood.

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/120>

Current conservation issues

A brief report updating the state of conservation of the property was received from the State Party on 1 February 2012. The report responds to issues raised by the Committee in Decision **34 COM 7B.16**.

a) *Development of tourism resort in core area*

The State Party reconfirms earlier advice that an illegal foot trail constructed between Thame and Kongde was halted and that no tourists are using this trail. The State Party further informs that the issue of the Kongde View Resort has not yet been decided by the Supreme Court of Nepal and that the Committee will be promptly informed once a decision is reached by the court.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN wish to underscore the protracted nature of the legal process for the Kongde View Resort, coupled with the fact that this resort is reported to have been operating since 2007 and legal proceedings have been unresolved since then. IUCN recalls previous advice from the State Party that the Sagarmatha National Park (SNP) Management and Tourism Plan (2007-2012) identifies the Kongde region as a special protection zone because of its unique and best habitat for musk deer in SNP, amplifying

concerns that this resort development may be impacting on an area of high conservation value.

b) *Strengthening management and tourism planning*

The State Party reports that tourism is being managed in accordance with the SNP Management and Tourism Plan and in collaboration with local communities and stakeholders. Furthermore, though without providing any quantitative details, it reports on a number of training and capacity building initiatives, as well as a significant increase in annual park budgets. The State Party conclude that there is no observed significant negative impact from tourism.

The State Party also reports on plans to review the SNP Tourism and Management Plan for the period 2013-2017. In line with the Committee's Decision **34COM 7B.16**, the State Party requests international technical assistance to review the management of a range of tourism issues including setting carrying capacities and appropriate levels of tourism infrastructure development.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall previous state of conservation reports, the previous IUCN mission (2002) and information from local stakeholders which assert that tourism is having significant impact. IUCN has received reports which suggest that tourism related waste management is still a major concern, and that well publicised garbage removal initiatives by mountaineering groups and the clean-up of high use trails may be giving a false impression and masking underlying problems with waste in other less visited areas.

These reports suggest that tourism impacts remain a significant threat to the property's values. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN therefore welcome the commitment to seek international assistance and look forward to working with the Nepali Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation to develop a constructive package of support.

c) *Declaration of a Buffer Zone to the World Heritage property*

The State Party confirms briefly its intention to submit documentation related to the inclusion of the existing Buffer Zone of Sagarmatha National Park, as a recognised buffer zone to the property and informs that this process is underway. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are willing to provide advice to further assist the State Party to consider this proposal, and determine the most effective means to propose it. They note that the proposal to create a buffer zone would be considered normally through the minor boundary modification process. They recommend that the proposal indicate clearly how the buffer zone would be managed to enhance protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

d) *Other conservation issues of concern*

The State Party reports on a range of positive initiatives with respect to management of endangered species; sustainable use of natural resources, pollution control, alternative energy schemes and wildlife poaching. These include collaboration with the Nepal Army and awareness raising programmes with local porters to overcome impacts from poaching and threats to endangered flora and fauna. Furthermore the State Party notes that the collection of non-timber forest products is not a significant concern as most locals are deriving their income from tourism. The report notes the implementation of various alternative energy schemes in the Buffer Zone which aim to reduce pressure on firewood collection. Finally the report speaks to a range of activities to control pollution in collaboration with the Sagarmatha Pollution Control Committee, however, no details are provided.

The initiatives noted are welcomed by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN as positive contributions to addressing long-term threats to the values of the property. However, the lack of detail within the State Party report does not allow a more in-depth assessment of the effectiveness of these measures. Moreover previous state of conservation monitoring has highlighted a range of other issues such as the threat of glacial lake outburst floods (GLOFs), social impacts on Sherpa communities and other ethnic groups, localised quarrying for

building materials, and aircraft access and management, none of which are discussed in the report submitted by the State Party.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Committee may take particular note with concern of the continued operation of the Kongde View Resort within the property and the protracted process of the legal case concerning its future. Legal proceedings have been on-going for more than 5 years and the tourist resort is reportedly continuing to operate. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee express its increased concern about the range of conservation issues and threats which are impacting the property; past state of conservation reports together with information received by IUCN indicating complex environmental, social and economic factors which affect the property; and invite the State Party to consult IUCN, including the Mountains Biome Specialist Group of the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) for technical advice on the overall state of conservation of the property with particular attention to the impacts of the Kongde View Resort and tourism on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.,

They recall that the most recent monitoring mission to the property was over 10 years ago, and consider the Government of Nepal might wish to invite the WCPA Mountains Biome to undertake an advisory mission to assess these issues and to provide a more complete picture of the state of conservation of the property. Such a mission could also facilitate the recommended designation of a buffer zone to the property, in line with the reflection of providing upstream support to States Parties on nomination of sites.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.14

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.16**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the on-going actions to address conservation issues at the property, and urges the State Party to continue these efforts;*
4. *Reiterates its concern that the legal process has not been completed with respect to the Kongde View Resort which is within the property's core area and is reportedly still operating, and also urges the State Party to submit the verdict to the World Heritage Centre as soon as it is issued by the Supreme court;*
5. *Recommends the State Party to consult the Mountains Biome Specialist Group of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas for technical advice on the overall state of conservation of the property with particular attention to the impacts of the Kongde View Resort and tourism on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and the proposed buffer zone, and also to consider the possibility of inviting an advisory mission by the Mountains Biome Specialist Group to the property to provide advice on these matters;*
6. *Welcomes the commitment of the State Party to:*
 - a) *Revise the Sagarmatha National Park Tourism and Management Plan for 2013-2017,*

- b) *Request international assistance in support of enhanced tourism planning, development and management, and*
 - c) *Submit documentation to incorporate the Sagarmatha National Park buffer zone as a buffer zone to the World Heritage property, and to seek further advice on this proposal from IUCN;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress with respect to legal proceedings related to the Kongde View Resort, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

15. East Rennell (Solomon Island) (N 854)

Year of Inscription on the World Heritage List
1998

Criteria
(ix)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/854/documents/>

International Assistance
Global amount granted to the property: USD 26,350
For more details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/854/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
March – April 2005: UNESCO/IUCN monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Mining;
- b) Logging;
- c) Over-exploitation of coconut crab and marine resources;
- d) Invasive species.

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/854>

Current conservation issues

A report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party on 2 February 2012. This report addresses all previous Committee decisions since 2005. Copies of the Protected Areas Act (2010), the draft Lake Tegano Natural Heritage Park Ordinance (2009), the East Rennell World Heritage Site Management Plan (2007), the Constitution of the Lake Tegano World Heritage Site Association (2009), and the Environmental Assessment and Audit Report for logging operations on Tehakamagoku Customary Land in West Rennell (2012) are annexed to the report.

a) *Logging*

The State Party report notes that a logging licence was granted to a logging company, Amos Company (SI) Limited, by the Commissioner of Forests in July 2008, for the 6,900 hectares

Tehakamagoku concession area in West Rennell. Infrastructure such as roads, a logging pond, wharf and campsite were constructed and logging operations commenced. This licence had not been subject to the required environmental impact assessment and this led to the Ministry of Environment declaring a stop on logging, which was ignored by the logging company and not enforced. In January 2012 an assessment of the logging operation was conducted under environmental monitoring and auditing procedures of the Environment Act 1998, the report of which is annexed to the State Party report. This assessment acknowledges that flora and fauna habitat destruction is a major environmental impact of the logging. The World Heritage property was not considered to be directly affected by the logging operations because it is located well away (approximately 12km) from the concession area, but it was accepted that indirectly the property would suffer from loss of the island's biodiversity and from visual impacts for visitors. Nevertheless, the assessment recommended that a development consent be granted under the Act.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are mindful of the likely impact of logging operations on the integrity and Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They note that the Management Plan for the property recognises that communities in East Rennell are trying to attract logging in areas outside the property, and includes policies preventing large-scale timber extraction in the property. Reports received by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN indicate that at least six shipments of logs have removed some 60,000 cubic metres of timber from the Tehakamagoku concession, and that another licence was granted in 2008 for logging the Magaone & Aga'eha forests in West Rennell. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also received a copy of an application for timber rights over the Agapogabu forest within the property, and advice from the Provincial Secretary that a hearing on these timber rights is scheduled to be held in April 2012. On 29 February 2012 the IUCN Oceania office wrote to the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of the Environment requesting information on the application, offering its assistance, noting that the proposal to establish palm oil plantations in the logged areas would directly affect the values for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List and compromise the integrity of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN would also like to highlight that the construction of wharves, establishment of staging and loading areas, and the increase in activity by logging vessels could all threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of the substantial marine component of the property. IUCN notes that the Regional Director of its Oceania office had a meeting with senior leaders in the Solomon Islands in April 2012 to discuss these issues. On 21 March 2012, the Director of the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party requesting clarification of the reports regarding the proposed logging within the property, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. No response has been received to date.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have also received reports that a national NGO and representatives from the Ministry of the Environment and the Provincial Government conducted forestry awareness activities with villagers, warning of the threats from logging, explaining the Code of Logging Practice, outlining the financial disadvantages of logging (e.g land owners receive only 5% of logging export earnings) and the disruptive social impacts for the community. The delegation report notes that the majority of the residents are opposed to logging, favour the development of sustainable livelihood enterprises, such as ecotourism, support World Heritage and are concerned about possible de-listing of the property. The report further notes that the Provincial Government wishes to ban logging for the sake of World Heritage and its deleterious impacts on the lives of residents, and will endeavour to have the property adequately recognised in the Provincial Ordinance being drafted at present.

b) Invasive species associated with illegal logging

IUCN has received reports that rats and the invasive African snail have been introduced to the island with the onset of logging operations. This could have extremely serious consequences for the biota of the property. The IUCN evaluation report at the time of

inscription of the property highlighted the absence from Rennell Island of invasive predators such as rats and alien land snails, which have decimated the fauna of many other oceanic islands in the Pacific. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that at the time of inscription of the property questions arose about confining the property to only a portion of the island where the extent of forest is insufficient to ensure long-term survival of the endemic bird population, in particular. Any disturbance of the forest ecosystem through logging in West Rennell could, therefore, severely impact the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property. They consider that the situation should be assessed promptly and appropriate control or eradication measures implemented.

c) Legislation, Management Planning and administration of the property

The State Party notes that a national Protected Areas Act 2010, which applies only to conservation of biological diversity, includes provision for gazettal and management of protected areas over areas that merit protection under the World Heritage Convention. National legislation for cultural protection, including heritage sites and cultural landscapes, is at draft stage, and the Rennell-Bellona Province Lake Tegano Natural Heritage Park Ordinance will move forward in 2012 with assistance from the Australian Government and WWF. The State Party reports that a Management Plan for the property was produced in January 2007 with support from the World Heritage Fund. The report also notes that the Solomon Islands National Commission for UNESCO established a World Heritage Sub-Commission in 2011 with focal points in key Government agencies. A representative East Rennell World Heritage Site Association was established in 2008, and replaced in 2009 by the Lake Tegano World Heritage Site Association with financial support from the Australian Government. This support continues in partnership with the NGO Live and Learn Environmental Education to strengthen the governance of the property and enhance the livelihood of the customary owners.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome these developments. However, they note the need to strengthen provisions in the Management Plan to address threats from logging and from over-exploitation of coconut crab and marine resources, in particular, and welcome the intention of the State Party to prepare a proposal for international assistance under the World Heritage Fund in 2012.

d) Over-exploitation of coconut crab and marine resources

The Management Plan notes that coconut crab are harvested for subsistence use and are important for income generation, and that the potential for localised extinction of the species is growing. The plan also notes that overharvesting of crayfish, trochus, beche-de-mer and clamshells is the most serious threat to marine resources at present. Localised declines in trochus and beche-de-mer stocks are noted.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that an immediate assessment of coconut crab and commercially exploited marine resources should be conducted to determine the impacts of current harvesting practices and establish appropriate conservation measures.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the scale of commercial resource extraction taking place both within the property (coconut crabs, other marine species) and outside (large scale commercial logging), particularly in the context of a small island ecosystem is likely not sustainable and may have significant negative impacts on the OUV and on the longer term subsistence prospects for residents. They wish to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that an application for commercial logging within the property is reported to be under consideration by the State Party. If permitted, such a licence inside the property would constitute a clear basis for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. They therefore recommend that the Committee request the State Party to immediately refrain from considering any further logging operations on Rennell Island.

They further recommend that the Committee request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property, in order to assess its current state of conservation, particularly in relation to the threat of logging operations on Rennell Island, the associated threat of invasive species, and the over-exploitation of Coconut Crab and marine resources, as well as other relevant conservation issues.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.15

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.17**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Commends the State Party for its work to rectify deficiencies in the protection legislation, Management Planning and administration of the property, that have been the subject of Committee concerns since 2003;*
4. *Expresses its serious concern that applications for commercial logging rights within the property are being considered by the State Party, which if granted would represent an ascertained danger to the property in line with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines, and also over the impacts of large scale commercial logging operations in West Rennell on the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to immediately ban all commercial logging from Rennell Island to avoid loss of integrity and the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and to assess the possible associated introduction of rats and invasive land snails, and institute the necessary control measures, and also calls upon companies applying for licences which could impact the property to not proceed further with those applications;*
6. *Urges the State Party to make an immediate assessment of the over-exploitation of Coconut Crab and other marine resources;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to invite an IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property, to assess its current state of conservation, particularly in relation to the threat of logging operations on Rennell Island, the associated threat of invasive species, and the over-exploitation of Coconut Crab and marine resources, as well as other relevant conservation issues;*
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, including a report on the outcome of an assessment of over-exploitation of resources and the possible introduction of invasive species, and on the imposition of a ban on logging operations on Rennell Island that might impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, for examination by the Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2010

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1203/documents/>

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

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1203>

Current conservation issues

On 10 February 2012, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, providing information on the property's management, the status of threats previously identified, and actions taken to address these threats. In response to the Committee's request in its decisions **34 COM 8B.9** and **35 COM 7B.18**, the State Party also provided copies of the management framework for the serial property, as well as the management plans for each of its three components: Horton Plains National Park (HPNP), Peak Wilderness Protected Area (PWPA), and Knuckles Conservation Forest (KCF).

- a) *Management framework, including a management and monitoring framework for tourism*

The State Party notes that an overall management framework for the serial property and three different management plans for its components were prepared in collaboration with key stakeholders. The component management plans contain a set of prescriptions for each of the management objectives, including for ecotourism. The high number of annual visitors to the property, and particularly HPNP and PWPA, is noted as the cause of the main environmental problems in these component parts of the property, including improper garbage disposal, pollution and disturbance from vehicles. The State Party notes that new visitor management plans are being prepared for each component, on the basis of the prescriptions included in their current management plans. The State Party also notes that each year a committee consisting of government and non-government members prepares an action plan to prevent and mitigate the environmental impact of the pilgrimage season in PWPA.

The overall management framework for the serial property includes provisions for coordination between the two government institutions that manage the property (the Forest Department and the Department of Wildlife Conservation), as well as for stakeholder involvement. In relation to community engagement as an essential requirement of the

approach to management identified by the Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), the State Party provides details of the cooperation between the Forest Department and 32 Community Based Organizations (CBOs) operating in buffer zone villages of KCF, and the implementation of community forestry and awareness raising programmes in PWPA.

IUCN has received reports that inadequate staff capacity and funding are limiting the effective implementation of the new management plans.

b) *Boundaries and buffer zones*

The State Party notes that the status of buffer zones is different for the three components of the property. It reports that every national park, including HPNP, has a legally defined buffer zone with a width of 1.6 kilometers where all development activities are regulated according to provisions of the Flora and Fauna Protection Ordinance. In case of PWPA, the buffer zone is protected through the Soil Conservation Act, and partially overlaps with tea estates and reserve forests. The buffer zone of KCF is protected, in its entirety, through the Soil Conservation Act and partly through the National Environmental Act. The State Party provides maps of the buffer zones of all three components of the property, included in the respective management plans.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that in its evaluation of the property, IUCN had identified the need for better delineation in the field of the entire boundary of the three components of the property. The State Party does not provide any details on progress achieved in that respect. However, IUCN has received reports that the boundaries are well defined for HPNP and KCF, but that inadequate boundary demarcation of PWPA is hampering protection and conservation. Reports received by IUCN indicate that, although buffer zones are established for all components of the property, law enforcement is not fully effective in stopping illegal activities within the buffer zones, including poaching, small scale illegal logging, and land clearing. They consider that clear boundary demarcation to identify the private lands that fall within the boundaries would be an important step towards stopping illegal expansion of these lands and new land clearing.

c) *Other conservation issues – invasive species, forest dieback, illegal gemming, cardamom cultivation, and infrastructure development*

The State Party provides information on the current status of threats identified at the time of the property's inscription, as well as new threats identified since. It notes that these threats are addressed in the new management plans and that they will be monitored over the next five years.

The State Party reports that a number of invasive plant and animal species have been identified in the property, which could have a significant impact on its Outstanding Universal Value. The State Party lists nine invasive plant species, of which *Ulex europaeus* (in HPNP) and *Lantana camara* (in KCF) are noted as the most problematic. Removal of *Ulex europaeus* has been completed in 22 of 30 hectares of HPNP identified for clearing. Removal of invasive species in KCF is ongoing and planned for 80 hectares in 2012, and stated to continue until all identified areas have been cleared.

The State Party notes that the phenomenon of forest dieback, which was first observed in HPNP in 1946, is believed to be caused by a fungus, and 22 plant species are reported to be affected. A number of factors have been identified as contributing to plant vulnerability to fungal attacks, including water deficit and strong winds. A solution to the problem has not yet been identified and further research is needed.

The State Party reports that the Forest Department and the Department of Wildlife Conservation have adopted strict measures against the illegal gemming that has been reported to take place in parts of PWPA, and that this illegal activity is now being effectively controlled.

The State Party also reports that 400 hectares of KCF have been affected by illegal cardamom cultivation underneath the forest canopy. Legal cardamom cultivation had taken place in the area since the 1960s, but since the area's declaration as a Conservation Forest in 2000, resident cultivators were moved out and no new cultivation has occurred. The current illegal cardamom cultivation is limited to the maintenance of abandoned crops. Legal action has been taken against 57 people, of which 11 have been ejected from the property on court orders in 2011. Court cases against the remaining 46 are ongoing. The State Party notes that law enforcement officers are permanently stationed in the area to prevent illegal maintenance of abandoned crops, and the area is left to natural regeneration.

The State Party states that recent media articles about hotel construction and the establishment of mini-hydropower stations within KCF are not correct. It notes that there is one mini-hydropower station just 1.5 kilometers outside KCF boundaries, but that this station does not affect the property as the water source is found outside its boundaries, and the water does not flow back into the property after power generation. It adds that a payment for environmental services arrangement with a large irrigation project downstream helps cover management costs.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that there is a need to strengthen invasive species control measures to effectively address this problem. These reports also note that climate change may be a factor contributing to forest dieback.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee welcome the reported progress in developing an overall management framework for the serial property and request the State Party to expedite the development of a management and monitoring framework for ecotourism, in order to effectively address the environmental impact of the high number of visitors, including pilgrims, that the property receives each year. They also recommend that the Committee should invite the State Party to expedite the demarcation of the property boundaries, and increase the effectiveness of law enforcement to address illegal activities in the property's buffer zones, including poaching, small scale illegal logging and land clearing; and also urge the State Party to ensure the availability of adequate staffing and funding for the effective implementation of the management plans.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that the Committee should welcome the efforts made in addressing threats identified at the time of inscription of the property but should also note that the new management framework for the property and the component management plans include provisions to further address these threats, and they consider that the planned monitoring of threats should include a regular evaluation of the effectiveness of management provisions to ensure that existing and new threats are effectively controlled.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.16

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.18**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Welcomes the progress achieved in the development of an overall management framework for the serial property, as required by the Operational Guidelines, as well as management plans for each of the component parts of the property;*

4. *Urges the State Party to expedite the development of an effective management and monitoring framework for tourism, and requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the tourism management plans for review by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN when these will have been finalized;*
5. *Also urges the State Party to ensure that adequate staffing and funding are available for the effective implementation of the new management plans, and to expedite the field demarcation of property boundaries;*
6. *Encourages the State Party to include as part of the planned regular monitoring of threats the regular evaluation of the effectiveness of management provisions, in order to ensure that existing and new threats are effectively controlled;*
7. *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 a report on the current status of threats to the property and its buffer zones.*

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1983, extension in 2010

Criteria

(vii) (viii) (ix)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/225/documents/>

International Assistance

Global amount granted to the property: USD 15,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/225/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: 2010: financial support from the Participation Programme of UNESCO for development of a strategy for sustainable tourism

Previous monitoring missions

2002, 2004: Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Developments in the Bansko ski zone,
- b) Lack of effective management mechanisms,
- c) Boundary issues,
- d) Illegal logging.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/225>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2012, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides a response to Decision **35 COM 7B.21**, adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session.

From 10 to 14 October 2011, a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the property, in accordance with Decision **34 COM 7B.5**. The mission's objective was to review the recent capacity upgrades of ski facilities in the property's buffer zone, in order to determine their likely impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and make a recommendation on the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as requested by the Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011). The mission also assessed the overall state of conservation of the property and other factors affecting its OUV.

a) *Developments in the Bansko tourism zone*

The State Party notes that the recent capacity upgrades of ski facilities, approved in 2010, has not resulted in increased tourism pressure, nor has it affected the OUV of the property. It states that higher capacity has not increased the number of skiers, but only improved their security and the quality of service. The State Party reports that in 2011, it has not approved the construction of any new ski runs and ski facilities within the property or its buffer zone. In

line with Committee Decision **35 COM 7B.21**, the State Party provides a list of 6 approved and 2 proposed developments, which relate to ensuring the functioning of existing facilities, enhancing the safety of tourists, restoration of habitats and improving components of the environment.

The mission noted that, although the replacements and capacity upgrades within the buffer zone of the property were not foreseen in the Territorial Arrangement Plan (TAP) for Bansko tourism zone, they have been undertaken in an appropriate manner and cannot be viewed as adversely affecting the OUV of the property. The mission is of the view that attention should be focussed on monitoring the impact of the buffer zone activities on the OUV of the property, including the requirements for integrity and protection and management, and considers that the State Party should be specifically requested to notify the World Heritage Centre of any development taking place in the buffer zone that it considers might have impacts on the OUV of the property. However, it should not need to notify amendments within the buffer zone that are assessed as not having impacts outside the buffer zone.

However, the mission found that the municipalities of Bansko and Razlog have explicit and concrete plans to expand new ski zones within the property, as reflected in the TAPs of Dobrinishte (2010) and Kulinoto (2008). Furthermore, the concessionaire conveyed to the mission his request and plans to re-open and develop the Tzarna Mogila ski lift and ski run, which would extend developments outside the present buffer zone boundaries. The mission considers that if those developments were to proceed, they would clearly impact on the property's OUV. It emphasized that any further developments of ski or other such facilities within the World Heritage Site would seriously compromise the integrity and the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN support the mission's view that the World Heritage Committee needs to continue to take a very firm position that no further areas within the property, outside the already excluded areas, should be permitted for ski or other similarly high-impact developments. They emphasize that the 2010 exclusion of the Bansko and Dobrinishte buffer zones cannot be used as a precedent to consider further boundary modifications to facilitate additional ski development. They consider that the new Management Plan of the property should give this particular assurance. Worrying reports have been received about an unofficial proposal which envisages a new nomination of the property to reduce its size by 12% and to triple the skiing facilities within its current boundaries. The World Heritage Centre has sent a request to the State Party to provide clarification on this matter on 17 April 2012. At the time of writing the present report, no response had yet been received from the State Party.

b) *Ecologically sustainable tourism*

The State Party reports that the 2014-2024 Management Plan of the property will pay special attention to not allowing further ski development or construction of other facilities within the property and its buffer zone, nor extension of the tourism zone into the property. It notes that as part of the preparation of the new Management Plan, an assessment of the capacity of the ski zone will be made. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the Committee had encouraged the State Party to commission an independent assessment of the capacity of the property and the buffer zone, rather than only the ski zone, in order to set clear usage limits for the ski zone. They also recall that the Committee's recommendation was made in view of the apparent high capacity of tourism accommodation in Bansko town, which far exceeded the capacity of ski facilities.

The mission noted that there is an obvious imbalance between the capacities of facilities in Bansko town and those in the ski zone, which drives the pressure to expand ski tourism at the expense of other more sustainable and less seasonally dependent forms of economic development. The mission considered that in promoting a sustainable and more balanced development of livelihoods in communities surrounding the property, emphasis should be on a diversification of tourism in terms of products, services and season, in line with the new

strategy for sustainable nature tourism, developed in 2010 by the Pirin National Park Directorate, with financial support from the UNESCO Participation Programme.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN support the mission's recommendation that the tourism strategy, which emphasizes summer tourism and includes interesting proposals for each of the seven municipalities, taking into account their natural and cultural resources, needs to be promoted and implemented as a viable alternative to ski-based tourism development. They also support the mission's recommendation that detailed "Tourism Implementation Plans" be prepared for the Bansko ski zone, based on the TAP, and for the Dobrinishte buffer zone, where no detailed plans currently exist.

c) *Other conservation issues: boundary demarcation and monitoring the impact of activities*

The mission noted that there is a need to clearly mark, communicate and maintain the boundary of the property, and especially the boundaries of the buffer zones, as defined in Committee Decision **34 COM 8B.5**. The boundaries should be properly measured using ascertained GPS measurements, marked on the ground, and communicated to the municipalities and the ski zone concessionaire. They should be regularly monitored and enforced by the Pirin National Park Directorate to ensure that they are being respected, and violation of the boundaries should constitute a serious offence and breach of concession agreement, and be treated with the strictest measures by the Directorate and the Ministry of Environment and Water.

The mission also noted the importance of putting in place processes to monitor the impacts of the ski and other activities within the buffer zone on the surrounding property. It stressed that the impact of past and potentially future increases of visitor numbers and new activities within the buffer zone or the municipalities of Bansko and Razlog should be monitored and managed, and should not be permitted to lead to impacts on the OUV of the property. Also, the implementation of restoration measures should be strictly supervised and monitored by the Pirin National Park Directorate in accordance with conditions in the TAP, Environmental Impact Assessments, or any other subsequent administrative decisions.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the mission's conclusion that the replacements and capacity upgrades of facilities in the buffer zone have been undertaken in an appropriate manner and cannot be viewed as adversely affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. On that basis, they consider that there is currently no ascertained or potential danger to the OUV of the property as defined in Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and they recommend that the Committee not inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 36th session.

However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the mission's observation that there are plans and aspirations to expand new ski zones within the property. They recommend that the Committee request the State Party to ensure, including through provisions in the new Management Plan, that no further areas within the property, outside the already excluded areas, should be permitted for ski or other similarly high-impact developments, emphasizing that the 2010 exclusion of the Bansko and Dobrinishte buffer zones cannot be used as a precedent to consider further boundary modifications to facilitate additional ski development. They also recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to promote and implement the 2010 strategy for sustainable nature tourism as a viable alternative to ski-based tourism development, and to prepare "Tourism Implementation Plans" for the Bansko and Dobrinishte buffer zones, for inclusion in the new Management Plan. They further recommend that the Committee request the State Party to clearly demarcate, communicate and maintain the boundaries of the property as defined in Decision **34 COM 8B.5**, and ensure that they are being respected.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.18

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.21** adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Takes note of conclusion of the World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission that the recent capacity upgrades of ski facilities undertaken in the buffer zone of the property do not appear to have negatively impacted the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and requests the State Party to ensure developments in the buffer zone are assessed to ensure that they do not create impacts on the property;
4. Notes with concern the reported plans to expand new ski zones into the property, including the proposed reopening of the Tzarna Mogila ski lift and ski run, and reiterates its position that if any additional development of ski facilities, ski runs, or associated infrastructure within the property are undertaken, the conditions for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger will be fulfilled;
5. Urges the State Party to ensure, including through provisions in the new Management Plan, that no further areas within the property, outside the already excluded areas, are permitted for ski or other similar high-impact developments;
6. Requests the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 2011 joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property, in particular:
 - a) ensure effective wider regional planning for economic development, and ensure that no developments that exceed the capacity of the area are permitted,
 - b) promote and implement the 2010 strategy for sustainable nature tourism as a viable alternative to ski-based tourism development,
 - c) clearly demarcate, communicate and maintain the boundaries of the property as defined in Decision **34 COM 8B.5**, using ascertained Global Positioning System (GPS) measurements, and ensure that these boundaries are respected,
 - d) put in place processes to monitor the impacts of the ski and other activities within the buffer zone on the surrounding property, in order to ensure that they do not negatively impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and put in place sufficient legal, contractual or other administrative arrangements to ensure that the Pirin National Park Directorate can influence the use and environmental impact of the chalets owned by the Bulgarian Tourism Union,
 - e) ensure that the implementation of restoration measures are strictly supervised and monitored by the Pirin National Park Directorate in accordance with conditions in the Territorial Arrangement Plan (TAP), Environmental Impact Assessments or any other subsequent administrative decisions,
 - f) expedite the process and make available sufficient resources to ensure that the new Management Plan of the property is completed and approved on time for its implementation immediately after the current Management Plan ceases being in effect in 2013,
 - g) prepare detailed "Tourism Implementation Plans" for the Bansko and Dobrinishte buffer zones, consolidating existing, approved and envisaged plans in a transparent manner, and ensure that these buffer zone areas are explicit parts of the new Management Plan;

7. Also requests the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre, as soon as it is available, three printed and electronic copies of the new Management Plan for review;
8. Further requests that the State Party submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including confirmation that no further ski development has been or will be permitted within the property, and a report on progress achieved in the implementation of the mission's recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

19. Gulf of Porto: Calanche of Piana, Gulf of Girolata, Scandola Reserve (France) (N 258)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of information from the State Party)

20. Natural System of "Wrangel Island" Reserve (Russian Federation) (N 1023)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2004

Criteria
(ix) (x)

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

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

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
Lack of Management Plan

Illustrative material
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1023> and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/arctic/>

Current conservation issues

On 10 February 2012, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report describes monitoring activities at the property and gives a general overview of zoological surveys and research during 2010/2011. General observations on vegetation cover and watercourses, a list of historical objects within the reserve territory that are being monitored and an update on waste removal activities and infrastructure renewal/development during this period are also included in the report.

a) *Monitoring*

The State Party reports a 20% increase in the inspectorate staff and lists various monitoring activities on the island, but no monitoring results. The State Party notes that 15 animal species were surveyed during 2010-2011, and that scientific research on 11 species of animals was conducted. The State Party further reports that no damage of tundra vegetation as a result of thawing of permafrost soils was observed in 2011, and notes that monitoring of watercourses in relation to climate change impacts has commenced. The State Party concludes that the ecosystems and biota of the property have maintained their state of preservation since inscription and that no negative impacts of climate change on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property are currently apparent.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that it is not entirely clear from which indicators, monitoring schedules and methodologies the conclusion of the State Party has been derived, particularly as no monitoring results have been provided. It is also not clear whether the monitoring and research activities reported by the State Party are carried out within an effective monitoring framework, including for potential climate change impacts on the property. Further monitoring of the conservation state of the ecosystems and biota of the property should be based on a systematically planned, broad monitoring system that considers the potential climate change impacts on the property.

b) *Management Plan*

The State Party mentions that a 2008-2012 Management Plan for the property has been developed, but it is not clear if this is referring to the same Management Plan which was submitted as part of the 2009 State Party report (Wrangel Island Nature Reserve Mid Term Management Plan 2009 – 2013). The report also does not provide further information about its endorsement, implementation and financing.

c) *Waste removal*

The State Party reports that an unspecified amount of additional funding was allocated to the property, to support the removal of waste accumulated on the island. Empty fuel barrels have been warehoused, pressed, and shipped from the island. Residuals of fuels and lubricants have also been removed, and three old buildings have been dismantled. The State Party plans to continue these activities in 2012-2013.

d) *Infrastructure renewal and development*

The State Party reports that guest houses for educational and scientific tourism are being installed on the property. According to its website, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation plans to develop further tourism infrastructure (including trails) and increase visitation to the island.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that while the development of scientific and educational tourism at the property offers considerable potential benefits, the particular sensitivity of the tundra ecosystem and the location of the property near the margin of the distribution range of many of its biota require a cautious approach to tourism development. They consider that any proposals for major up scaling of tourism facilities within the property should be preceded by the completion and approval of a comprehensive environmental impact assessment (EIA), which pays particular attention to the potential impact of tourism on the property's OUV. They recall that the Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) encouraged the State Party to further develop and implement an effective plan for public use within the property, and they consider that such a plan should provide a clear management framework for tourism development at the property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the increase in inspectorate staff, the monitoring and research activities, and the on-going waste removal at the property. The

observations of the State Party in 2010/2011 suggest that there are currently no major negative impacts of climate change or other factors on the property. However, no information about the ministerial endorsement and financing of the property's Management Plan or about the establishment of a monitoring system that pays particular attention to potential climate change impacts, as requested by the Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) has been provided. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that a systematically planned and well-resourced monitoring system, which pays particular attention to potential climate change impacts, remains an important prerequisite for the long-term protection of the OUV of the property, and would also be of considerable general scientific interest.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the potential environmental impact of the planned up scaling of tourism facilities on the island requires careful study and recommend that the Committee request the State Party to carry out an environmental impact assessment for the upgrading of tourism infrastructure and activities within the property, as well as urge the State Party to develop a tourism Management Plan for the property.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.20

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.30**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Welcomes the efforts of the State Party to increase inspection, monitoring and waste removal from the property;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to ensure that ministerial approval and adequate finance are in place for the implementation of the Management Plan and to establish an effective monitoring system that considers potential climate change impacts on the property;*
5. *Notes the plans to develop further tourism infrastructure and increase visitation to the island and urges the State Party to develop and implement an effective plan for tourism use within the property and, taking into account the particular sensitivity of the tundra ecosystem, to conduct an environmental impact assessment for the planned upgrading of tourism facilities, and submit it to the World Heritage Centre;*
6. *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 the ministerial approval and provision of adequate and increased financing of the Management Plan, the establishment of an effective monitoring system that pays attention to possible climate change impacts on the property, copies of the tourism Management Plan and the environmental impact assessment for the upgrading of tourism facilities within the property.*

21. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765bis)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

23. 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

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

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
- d) Road construction
- e) Deforestation

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

On 17 February 2012, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides some information on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property and responds to specific issues raised in previous decisions of the World Heritage Committee.

a) *Amendments to the legislative framework*

As requested by the World Heritage Committee at its previous session, the State Party report provides information on changes to the Russian protected area legislation: it notes that through Federal Law No. 365-FZ dated 30 November 2011 a number of amendments and additions to the Federal Law No.33-FZ "On specially protected natural territories" dated 14 March 1995 have been made, making it possible to allow capital construction facilities and related infrastructure on specifically designated plots of Strict State Nature Reserves, following a list to be established for each site by the Government of the Russian Federation.

The new legislation also provides for the possibility to lease out land plots for the above development activities to citizens and legal entities and establishes a federal executive body, which will be tasked with the development of a procedure for such leases.

b) Legal certificate and conservation regime of natural monuments that form part of the property

The State Party report recalls the three 2008 Orders of the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Adygea, which legally approved the certificates of “Buinyi Ridge”, “Headwaters of the Tsitsa River” and “Headwaters of the Pshékha and Pshékhashka Rivers” and states that the certificates approved by these Orders established a strict regime, which excludes “capital construction facilities” on their territories. However no further details are provided on the protection regime, or on the activities allowed.

The available information is insufficient to judge whether the conservation regime of the three Natural Monuments that form part of the property is effective in preserving the Outstanding Universal Value.

c) Infrastructure development for tourism facilities

The State Party reports that no infrastructure development is currently being carried out on the property’s territory but notes that in accordance with the Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 833 dated 14 October 2010 “On creation of tourism cluster in the North Caucasian Federal District, Krasnodar Region and the Republic of Adygea”, the Russian Ministry of Economic Development and Trade and the Republic of Adygea have decided to establish a special economic zone including touristic and mountain skiing facilities. It is planned that this special economic zone will include development of touristic and skiing infrastructure on parts of Lagonaki plateau inside the Caucasus Strict State Nature Reserve (CSSNR) and inside the property. The State Party notes that these planned projects will only be implemented subject to obtaining a positive conclusion of the State Environmental Expertise, which would take into account EIA documents and the results of public hearings.

IUCN has received maps indicating that the proposed ski development overlaps considerably with the CSSNR and also with the “Headwaters of the Tsitsa River” Natural Monument, both of which form part of the property. At the time of inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, the legislation on Strict State Nature Reserves did not allow for such developments but that the establishment of the special economic zone has been made possible by Federal Law No. 365-FZ mentioned above. IUCN has further received reports about a draft Order of the Government of the Russian Federation, due to be signed in 2012, which lists types of infrastructure the development of which would be allowed on Lagonaki plateau within CSSNR, as required by Federal Law No. 365-FZ. This list comprises guesthouses, skilifts, cable cars, ski pistes, service buildings and information centres, as well as infrastructure necessary to operate the above facilities. The legal basis for development of the parts of the area on the territory of the “Headwaters of the Tsitsa River” Natural Monument is unclear, and appears to contradict the State Party’s information on the protection regime of the Nature Monument as reported under (b) above.

According to recent media reports, the French public investment group Caisse des Dépôts is the main partner of “North Caucasus Resorts”, which plans to develop the five projects envisaged under Resolution No. 833.

d) Implementation of the other recommendations of the 2010 monitoring mission

The State Party reports that at the time of preparation of their report (beginning 2012), there was no on-going or approved development of infrastructure and tourism facilities, and therefore no Environmental Impact Assessments can be submitted. No further information is provided on the status of developments reported earlier such as the Lunnaya Polyana road and “Biosphere Centre”. The report also notes that there is no on going logging within the property.

Russian media reported in October 2011 that two tenders for the projecting of two separate sections of a road from a southerly direction to a planned meteorological station within the Babuk-Aul section of the CSSNR, and in the immediate vicinity of the “Biosphere Centre” on Lunnaya Polyana, were published on a Government procurement site. One of these sections is reportedly located entirely inside the CSSNR. Since no maps or detailed information on these plans have been provided by the State Party, it is impossible to verify these reports. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that previous monitoring missions have clearly stated that the development of recreational facilities at Lunnaya Polyana and the development of road infrastructure are incompatible with the World Heritage status of the property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that Federal Law No. 365-FZ dated 30 November 2011 is weakening the protection status of Strict State Nature Reserves and therefore could affect the Universal Value of several World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation; the protection status being one of the three pillars of the Outstanding Universal Value. They reiterate the request of the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session to the State Party to take appropriate legal measures to maintain a high level of protection of the property or other Natural World Heritage properties on its territory, in accordance with Paragraph 15(f) of the *Operational Guidelines* when establishing the list of allowed infrastructure in the Strict Nature Reserves that are part of a World Heritage property. They recall that the World Heritage Committee in the past has recommended developing a national law for all natural World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation to ensure that they meet the State Party's obligations to the *Convention* and consider that this issue could also be addressed through such a law.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the World Heritage Committee has repeatedly requested the State Party to immediately abandon any plans for recreational use and development of the Lagonaki plateau, including at its 32nd, 34th and (through reference to the recommendations of the 2010 monitoring mission) 35th session. They note that the nearby developments of facilities for the Sochi 2014 Olympic Games adjacent to the property may be a contributing factor to driving the demand for such facilities in the area, including within the property. They draw the attention of the International Olympic Committee to the need to consider this issue as part of avoiding impacts of the Sochi 2014 Olympic Games on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They further reiterate the conclusions of previous monitoring missions to the property that the development of tourism and mountain skiing infrastructure at Lagonaki Plateau and Lunnaya Polyana, as well as road construction within the property would threaten the Outstanding Universal Value and in particular the integrity of the property. They stress the high ecological value of the Lagonaki plateau and Lunnaya Polyana and recall that the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its 23rd session to inscribe the property under both World Heritage criteria (ix) and (x) was largely based on its undisturbed character and inaccessibility. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee expresses serious concern about the plans to construct tourist and mountain ski facilities at Lagonaki and consider that a decision to proceed with plans to develop these facilities would affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and constitute a case for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in line with paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*. They recommend that the Committee reiterates its request to the State Party to immediately abandon all plans to develop tourism and/or mountain skiing infrastructure on Lagonaki plateau and Lunnaya Polyana as well as any plans for road construction.

Regarding the project of two separate sections of a road from a southerly direction to a planned meteorological station within the Babuk-Aul section of the CSSNR, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the request by the World Heritage Committee to submit copies of Environmental Impact Assessments to the World Heritage Centre conducted for all

proposed developments inside or adjacent to the property which could affect the Outstanding Universal Value, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party did not provide an updated map of the boundaries of the property and the areas proposed for future inclusion in the Caucasus Strict State Nature Reserve, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session. They also note that the Party Report does not provide any information on progress in implementing the other recommendations of the 2010 monitoring mission: (a) the establishment of a comprehensive programme to monitor the impacts of all Olympic facilities and tourism facilities on wildlife populations, (b) the establishment a coordination body for the entire property, to ensure the implementation of the overall Management Plan, and develop and implement operational plans for its implementation and (c) the development of an overall sustainable tourism strategy and comprehensive plan for the property and adjacent protected areas.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee requests the State Party to invite a mission to the property to review the state of conservation of the property, progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2010 monitoring mission and to determine the status of the proposed tourism and ski development on the Lagonaki Plateau, to evaluate the possible impacts of the proposed development on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and to evaluate if the property meets the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.23

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **32 COM 7B.25**, **34 COM 7B.24**, and **35 COM 7B.24**, adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008), 34th (Brasilia, 2010) and 35th (UNESCO, 2011) sessions respectively,*
3. *Expresses its utmost concern about Federal Law No. 365-FZ dated 30 November 2011, which is weakening the protection status of Strict State Nature Reserves and therefore could affect the Outstanding Universal Value of several World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation and reiterates its request to the State Party to take appropriate legal measures to maintain a high level of protection of the property or other Natural World Heritage properties on its territory, in accordance with Paragraph 15(f) of the Operational Guidelines when establishing the list of allowed infrastructure in the Strict Nature Reserves that are part of a World Heritage property;*
4. *Also expresses its serious concern about the plans to construct tourist and mountain ski facilities at Lagonaki and considers that a decision to proceed with plans to develop these facilities would affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and constitute a case for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in line with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines;*
5. *Reiterates its request to urgently implement all recommendations of the 2010 monitoring mission in order to protect the property's Outstanding Universal Value, and in particular urges the State Party to immediately abandon any plans for recreational use of the Lagonaki plateau, Mt Fisht and Mt Oshten areas and to halt all road developments in the property;*

6. *Encourages financial institutions not to invest in any developments on the Lagonaki Plateau or other parts of the property, which might impact its Outstanding Universal Value;*
7. *Regrets that the State Party has not submitted the updated map of the boundaries of the property and detailed information on the activities allowed in the Natural Monuments which are part of the property, and urges the State Party to submit the updated map, showing the exact location of all proposed or planned infrastructure and the special economic zone, as well as documentation of all EIAs conducted for projects inside or adjacent to the property that might affect its Outstanding Universal Value for review by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN;*
8. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission to the property to review the state of conservation of the property, progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2010 monitoring mission and to determine the status of the proposed tourism and ski development on the Lagonaki and to evaluate the possible impacts of the proposed development on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
9. *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, **with a view to considering the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

24. Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

26. Henderson Island (United Kingdom) (N 487)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1988

Criteria
(vii) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/487/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Invasive species

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/487>

Current conservation issues

On 26 January 2012, a concise report on the state of conservation of Henderson Island was submitted by the State Party. The report describes the initiation of the rat eradication programme on the island during the second half of 2011, comments on the possibility of deploying a ranger on the island, as requested by Decision **34 COM 7B.27**, and gives a brief update about other measures taken by the State Party to protect the integrity of the natural values of the property.

a) *Rat eradication*

The State Party reports that a rat eradication programme, which is coordinated by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) and partly funded by the Government of the United Kingdom, was initiated on Henderson Island in the second half of 2011. The State Party notes that the potential impact on non-target species was carefully assessed, and does not expect significant impacts on other species. According to the Henderson Island newsletter, published by the RSPB and the Government of Pitcairn Islands, the Henderson Crake had been identified as being potentially at risk from non-target poisoning, but the establishment of a captive population of this species during the rat eradication operation has minimized the impacts on its wild population. The State Party notes that no signs of rats were observed on the island during 11 weeks following the bait drops but that confirmation of the success of the eradication programme will be ensured through a monitoring expedition, which is scheduled for 2013. According to the RSPB, a two-year monitoring period is required because surviving residual populations of the Polynesian Rat would only be detectable after a recovery period. The State Party expects that, if the rat eradication programme has been successful, populations of the ground-nesting Henderson Petrel on the island will increase by up to a factor of 100 over the coming 70 to 100 years.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN emphasize the crucial importance of the successful finalization of the rat eradication programme for safeguarding the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of Henderson Island as predation by the Polynesian Rat on chicks of ground nesting *Pterodroma* petrels, including the globally endangered Henderson Petrel *P. atrata*, is the single most serious threat to the OUV of the property. It is therefore important to confirm the success of the eradication programme.

b) *Ranger Post*

The State Party notes that a full-time ranger will not be deployed at Henderson Island until biosecurity issues have been fully assessed and the necessary biosecurity measures have been taken, particularly in relation to the risk of a re-introduction of rats. The State Party also notes that it is in the process of strengthening biosecurity measures, but does not provide any information on what these efforts entail.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that, while the deployment of a permanent ranger on the island requires an assessment of biosecurity issues and corresponding measures, the presence of the Ranger Post itself is a crucial measure to prevent new introduction of

invasive species through uncontrolled visitation. Therefore, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider the finalization of the biosecurity assessment/measures and the establishment of the Ranger Post an urgent priority for the conservation of the property's values.

c) *Other measures*

The State Party has provided a copy of the updated Henderson Island World Heritage Site Management Plan to the World Heritage Centre. No other conservation issues affecting Henderson Island have been reported by the State Party. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the submission of the updated Management Plan.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress achieved in the implementation of the rat eradication programme on Henderson Island and highlight the crucial importance of its successful finalization for safeguarding the property's OUV. They consider that the establishment of a permanent Ranger Post on the island remains urgent, in order to prevent future re-introductions of Polynesian Rat or new introductions of other invasive species through uncontrolled visitation. They recommend that the Committee urges the State Party to finalize the necessary preparatory biosecurity assessments and precautions as a matter of priority, and to appoint a permanent Ranger on Henderson Island as soon as possible.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.26

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.27**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Welcomes the progress made by the State Party in the implementation of the rat eradication programme, and the reported preliminary results indicating the success of the eradication operation with minimal negative impacts on non-target species;
4. Urges the State Party, in close cooperation with the Pitcairn authorities and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, to rapidly finalize biosecurity assessments and the strengthening of biosecurity measures, and to establish a permanent Ranger Post at the property as soon as possible, in order to prevent the (re-)introduction of rats or other invasive species through uncontrolled visitation;
5. 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, the final result of the rat eradication programme, and the progress achieved in the establishment of a permanent Ranger Post.

27. Yellowstone National Park (United States of America) (N 28)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1978

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

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
1995 - 2003

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/28/documents/>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
1995: joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission
September 2011: joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Mining;
- b) Wildlife management: bison and cut-throat trout;
- c) Invasive alien species;
- d) Water quality;
- e) Road construction;
- f) Snow mobile noise and impact on air quality;
- g) High visitor use.

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/28>

Current conservation issues

On 17 February 2012, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, which provides information on progress achieved in the implementation of the Committee's recommendations, as well as other conservation issues. From 19 to 22 September 2011, a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the property, in accordance with Decision **34 COM 7B.28** adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). The State Party report and the mission report provide information on the following key conservation issues:

- a) *Securing bison migration on ranch lands surrounding the park*

The State Party report notes that a coalition of federal, state, and tribal managers recently agreed to management practices that would increase tolerance for bison migrating to habitat outside the park's northern and western boundaries, in the state of Montana. One such agreement has allowed an extension of the northern migratory route for bison an additional seven miles beyond the park boundary. Nevertheless, the State Party notes that some stakeholders continue to be opposed to bison migration due to concerns about public safety and property damage.

The mission concluded that management agencies should: continue to allow bison migration to essential winter ranges in areas adjacent to the park; actively prevent the dispersal and range expansion of bison to outlying private lands until there is tolerance for bison in these areas; make more efforts to identify additional habitat and conservation areas for bison in Montana; develop fencing strategies with private landowners; discourage bison movement on to private land with cattle; and consider shipping surplus Yellowstone bison to quarantine sites operated by Indian tribes, to help preserve Indian culture and promote the further establishment of wild bison herds.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that several positive steps have been taken to provide more winter grazing habitat for bison on state and private land outside the park, and that good progress is being made to secure the principal traditional bison migration routes within the Greater Yellowstone Area surrounding the park.

b) *Ensuring adequate funding to intensify lake trout suppression efforts over the next six years*

The State Party reports that under a Native Fish Conservation Plan the National Parks Service has initiated a significant increase in lake trout removal efforts that will continue for at least the next 6 years. Funding in the amount of USD 2 million per year over the next 6 years (2012-2017) is recommended to outsource an immediate surge in lake trout suppression efforts to private-sector contractors. Of that total, approximately USD 1 million per year has been acquired to date. The State Party is confident that the remaining funds will be secured through private donor sources, such as The Yellowstone Park Foundation, Yellowstone National Park's primary fundraising partner, which is expected to make a decision on a grant request in the near future.

The mission noted that catch per unit during the removal operations of lake trout has been rising since 2002, indicating that the population of the invasive lake trout is increasing faster than fish have been removed. However, the mission concluded that under the Native Fish Conservation Plan, which aims to reduce the lake trout population by 25% annually until it collapses to an insignificant level, the park authorities have responded quickly and positively to implement recommendations of a scientific and management review of the lake trout suppression programme.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that results from implementing the Native Fish Conservation Plan in suppressing the lake trout population are encouraging, and the commitment to increased effort is strong. They consider that the medium-term budget is sufficient to give some real confidence of a successful outcome. However, they note that it will be important to continue to monitor the success of the programme and to report results to the World Heritage Committee.

c) *Increasing the Yellowstone grizzly bear population's connectivity with bears in the region, and further mitigating human-bear conflict*

The State Party reports that, while connectivity issues are not considered an immediate threat to the Yellowstone grizzly bear population, comprehensive plans and implementation strategies are in place to address the issue should the need arise. The State Party also notes that currently the grizzly bear population in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem is not at risk from inbreeding and the need for gene flow is not urgent. Achieving natural connectivity will require a co-operative effort on the part of management agencies, private landowners, industry, political leaders, and the public. Connectivity can be enhanced by allowing grizzly populations to increase their current sizes and/or by facilitating range expansion through natural dispersal and/or reintroduction into suitable intermediate habitat.

Regarding human-bear conflict, the State Party reports that preventing bears from obtaining anthropogenic foods and garbage is the underlying foundation of the park's bear management programme. Experience demonstrates that bear populations can be maintained in a manner that provides for the safety of bears, park visitors and their property, while still providing opportunities to view bears. Reducing human-bear conflicts has also significantly reduced the number of bears killed in management actions. Currently, the overall risk of bear attack is low and public support remains high for the grizzly bear programme.

The mission noted the need for park authorities to work co-operatively with private landowners and regulatory agencies to keep areas open for bears, and recommends that the park should intensify its public education programme to increase human tolerance of bears.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN observe that grizzly bears are well managed and protected in Yellowstone National Park and generally the species continues to recover, with good long-term prospects. There are also encouraging signs that the park's bear management programme is contributing effectively to mitigation of human-bear conflicts.

d) *Assessing the impact of hunting of wolves on the Yellowstone wolf population*

The State Party reports that wolves will likely be delisted as a protected species in Wyoming by the next hunting season (fall 2012), and legal wolf harvest will then occur in all three states surrounding the park. Currently, there are about 100 wolves in nine packs in the park, so it is unlikely that mortality rates to date (2 to 4 wolves per year) will have a significant impact on the park's wolf population. A lowered quota of wolves in Montana's hunting districts will reduce the potential for significant mortality of the park's wolves. Although Idaho has no quota reductions, only one Yellowstone pack shares the park/State boundary. The State Party notes that studies using radio-collars indicate that wolf movement is primarily from areas within to areas outside the property (i.e. from areas with high wolf densities to areas with low wolf densities), and that hunting of wolves outside the property may increase such movements by creating vacant wolf territories.

The mission noted that Yellowstone wolves need more land and habitat than is available in the park for their survival, and are reliant on connection to populations in central Idaho and north-west Montana. Private landowners, especially ranchers, in lands surrounding the park are opposed to wolf conservation, but are critical partners for the park in keeping land open for wolves. Housing and road construction also destroy natural habitat and act as barriers to wolf dispersal.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that delisting of wolves as an endangered species in 2011 has ushered in a new era of hunting on lands outside the park, and that hunting and its impacts pose a significant on-going problem for the park authorities. While ecological solutions may be straightforward, the political and social issues remain difficult, and the park authorities will need to make great effort in establishing partnerships with key stakeholders on lands surrounding the park.

e) *Developing a long-term vision and action plan for integrated management of the property and its surrounding areas*

The State Party reports that the widely representative Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee has the role of ensuring co-ordinated planning, monitoring and management practices on a series of priority issues including: ecosystem health; air quality; climate change; disease; invasive species; species on the brink of extinction and healthy water quality and flow.

The mission noted that the recent collaborative development of a climate action plan is an excellent example of integrated management of resources between the park and surrounding lands.

The World Heritage Committee and IUCN recommend that the park should continue to play a full and effective role in all available collaborative mechanisms for integrating management of the park and surrounding lands.

f) *Reducing visitor impacts and improving winter use management*

The State Party report notes winter use in the property, and in particular the use of snow mobiles, continues to be controversial. It reports that a new long term plan for regulating winter use is being completed and that the on-going winter use plan includes management regulations to ensure air quality and limit noise pollution. The State Party considers that the winter use programme has improved the conditions that existed in the nineties, with scientific research indicating good resource conditions (air quality, noise, impacts on bison and elk populations, visitor experience). The mission notes that, while the current winter use plan is satisfactory for current management needs, impacts arising from motorized winter use remain a challenge for the park. The mission concludes that there has been marked improvement over the unsatisfactory situation that existed earlier.

The State Party also reports that the Yellowstone Environmental Stewardship (YES!) initiative has set achievable environmental management goals to achieve by 2016. Other

measures to reduce pressure on park resources from high visitor numbers include measurement of visitors' attitudes, perceptions, and experiences, and consideration of studies of impacts from roadside parking, development of social trails, and overcrowding of sensitive natural areas. Recurring visitor surveys help the National Parks Service understand who the visitors are, their activities, and their values. Sub-plans within the Park Master Plan address issues associated with developed areas in the park.

The mission noted that the park's 2008 YES! initiative, along with other sustainable resource use programmes, are proving successful in meeting their ambitious targets.

g) *Other conservation issues*

The mission further noted that restoration of mine tailings is proceeding well and there are no adverse impacts on aquatic life from discharge flows, and road construction is kept within prescribed corridors and conducted in harmony with wildlife needs.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that there are no outstanding problems or serious impacts on natural park resources from mining restoration and associated water pollution, or from road construction and use.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the State Party has taken the necessary measures to address the main conservation issues currently affecting the property and concludes that progress in finding effective solutions for many of the problems confronted by the park is satisfactory, in particular in relation to securing traditional bison migration routes beyond the park boundaries; suppression of the lake trout population; mitigation of human-bear conflict, improving winter visitor use management, and restoring and reducing the impacts of mining and road construction. Accordingly, they recommend that the Committee should commend the State Party for its successes in addressing conservation issues to date.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note, however, that sustained effort and considerable input of resources will be needed to ensure these and other programmes achieve long-term success. They further note the importance of forging of close co-operative relationships between the park and private landowners and State agencies responsible for land and wildlife management in lands surrounding the park, in particular concerning the management of wolf and grizzly bear populations.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.27

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.28**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Commends the State Party for the substantial progress made to find effective solutions to conservation issues affecting the property, particularly relating to bison migration, suppression of the lake trout population, mitigation of human-grizzly bear conflict, improvement in winter visitor use, and mining and road impacts;*
4. *Notes that the conservation programmes will require sustained effort and considerable input of resources if they are to be successful in the long term;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to establish effective co-operative relations between the park and private landowners and State land and wildlife regulatory agencies in lands*

surrounding the park, in the interest of achieving long-term conservation goals for the park's bison, grizzly and wolf populations;

6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, including on progress in addressing the key conservation issues, including mobilizing the necessary financial support for the implementation of the conservation programmes to address them as well as the establishment of co-operative relations between the park and other stakeholders.*

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

28. Iguazu National Park (Argentina) (N 303)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party of Brazil's report on Iguazu National Park – both properties need to be reported on simultaneously)

29. Iguazu National Park (Brazil) (N 355)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

32. Galápagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1978, extension in 2001

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

Year (s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
2007-2010

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1/documents>

International Assistance
Global amount granted to the property: USD 557,850
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 3.5 million for the capitalization of an introduced species Trust Fund, management of introduced species, tourism management studies and other technical support.

Previous monitoring missions

June 1996, Joint UNESCO / IUCN mission (including World Heritage Committee Chairperson) ; June 2003, UNESCO mission ; April 2005 : UNESCO informal visit; February/March 2006, Joint UNESCO/IUCN mission ; April 2007, Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission (including World Heritage Committee Chairperson) ; April 2009 , UNESCO informal visit; April/May 2010, Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Inadequate implementation of the Special Law on Galápagos;
- b) Inadequate and ineffective quarantine measures;
- c) Illegal fishing;
- d) High immigration rate;
- e) Unsustainable and uncontrolled tourism development.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 24 February 2012 and reports on the 2010 reactive monitoring mission recommendations as well as requests made under Decision **35 COM 7B.30**.

a) *Biosecurity*

Preventing the arrival and dispersal of non-native species remains a critical component of conserving the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). The State Party reports that though a single cargo loading facility on the continent is now being used, there are long term plans to acquire property that will allow adequate inspection and quarantine operations to be carried out. Similarly, a single offloading facility in Galapagos is currently being considered and the State Party reports that one of three potential areas will be selected, however no time frame is indicated. The Committee had expressed concerns over reported infrastructure development at the town docks in the islands, but the State Party reports that these consisted only of minor re-design to better accommodate activities there, such as luggage inspection, the siting of biosecurity check points, and separating tourism from commercial uses. New, strict biosecurity standards for ships transporting goods to Galapagos have been in place since January 2012. However, as the current ships are mostly too old to be retrofitted to meet these standards, the State Party appears to be willing to give the transport companies time to find financing for new ships. No timeframe is indicated for this process.

The State Party further reports that the agency in charge of managing biosecurity in Galapagos (Agrocalidad) has been strengthened with the addition of 6 technicians and the installation of animal pathology and molecular biology investigation facilities. Reports are provided on successful campaigns for the control of several invasive species mentioned in previous reports. The final elements of biosecure cargo transportation remains to be put in place.

The dockyards in Guayaquil and the single offloading facility in Galapagos remain to be completed, and the cargo ships still do not meet strict biosecurity standards. Until these issues are finalized, the property continues to be subjected to a higher level of biosecurity risk than is necessary.

b) *Tourism*

Notwithstanding a small decline in 2009, tourist arrivals have increased year after year since 1992 (nearly 117,000 in the first 7 months of 2011). As the number of available berths on cruise ships has not increased for approximately 10 years, the increase in numbers is largely

taken up by land based visits. Efforts at regulating land based tourism are on the rise, with the State Party reporting a campaign for the inventorying of all tourism establishments and ensuring they have the necessary permits and meet quality standards. Press releases from the Galapagos National Park Service indicate that the Park, with the backing of the Minister of the Environment, was successful in stopping the construction of a 26 room hotel that had begun without the necessary permits, and in having a large fine imposed on the owner.

The State Party reports that it does not consider the imposition of temporary maximum number of visitors as practical for the case of Galapagos but rather considers improved tourism management as a preferred approach. There is a concerted effort on the part of the authorities to encourage smaller scale, lower impact land based tourism. The governing council of Galapagos has formally requested that the law governing tourism in protected areas be amended to recognize ecotourism as a modality, though most effort so far appears to be focused on gathering information, establishing ecotourism principles adapted to Galapagos, defining action points and informing Galapagos residents on such objectives. Some initiatives have been undertaken to work with local communities in an effort to focus on ecotourism, notably on Floreana Island. An inter-institutional technical advisory committee on tourism for Galapagos has been implemented and provides inputs to public policy on the management of Galapagos as a destination.

Information from Park press releases indicate that it has established new 15 day itineraries for cruise ships, starting in February 2012, which are designed to reduce the visitor impact on specific visitor sites and distribute visitors more uniformly among the 70 designated visitor sites.

The State Party reported in its 2011 report to the Committee that the “artisanal fishing” tourism activity would be evaluated in the course of that year, to ensure that it was not marketed and practiced as outright sport fishing, but rather as an authentic “fishing with the locals” activity. However, no mention is made in the current State Party report on any progress on this matter.

c) *Galapagos National Park Service (GNPS)*

The State Party notes that a management effectiveness assessment of the GNPS took place in 2011, and was accompanied by a major restructuring of the service, which is near completion. The restructuring is expected to give the GNPS greater capacity to deal with biosecurity issues

d) *Fisheries and marine reserve management*

The State Party reports that fisheries are being adequately managed. The sea cucumber fishery was opened for 60 days in 2011 after a 2 year ban, based on results from the sea cucumber population monitoring programme. Strict monitoring took place and buyers participated in ensuring the respect for minimum sizes. New regulations have been put in place in 2011 to ensure the sustainability of lobster fisheries.

The State Party also reports many marine control activities with the support of the Navy, with the capture of 18 ships caught fishing illegally, along with the confiscation of 20 longlines, which are illegal within the reserve. A significant increase in activity of the GNPS’s patrol fleet is reported, in contrast to previous years when ships were often out of service. In an effort to control costs, the Park is experimenting with non-piloted “drone” aircrafts and also with electronic monitoring of all ship movements within the reserve. The State Party identifies the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, World Wildlife Fund and WildAid as contributing significantly to its efforts.

e) *Immigration*

A national population census conducted in 2010 shows a decrease in migratory flows to the islands over previous years. The rate was the lowest since 1962 and it shows the results achieved on the implementation of migratory control measures. Credit can largely be

attributed to the effective use of the Transit Control Card system which allows authorities to identify and notify people that do not respect the terms of their visitation permit. Over 750 people were requested to leave the islands in the first 10 months of 2011 (many of whom complied) and another nearly 200 people were forcefully returned. This clear policy is helping change the previous attitudes amongst would-be migrants that immigration policies could be easily disregarded.

f) *Education*

During 2011, technological and didactical equipment was installed in 8 public schools to enhance knowledge on sustainable development and natural resources. This programme will be extended in the next few years to other public schools on the islands

g) *Governance*

The State Party's report notes that the Sustainable Development and Territorial Planning Plan for Galápagos was under preparation and should have been finished by the end of 2011. However no information is provided on the finalization of this Plan. The report also clarifies that, as a result of a broad social consultative process, a number of changes have been proposed to the Organic Special Law for Galapagos and that the legal reforms to address those changes will be discussed by the National Assembly at the beginning of 2012.

The World Heritage Centre has learned of the efforts taking place to strengthen the capacity of the judicial system of the islands so that environmental crimes can be effectively tried in Galapagos, particularly in cases involving illegal fishing vessels. Galapagos judges have been refusing to hear environmental cases brought forth by the Galapagos National Park Service, instead sending them to be heard on the continent. Typically, for administrative reasons, this is leading to many cases being abandoned after enormous investment of resources on the part of the Park and its partners in detaining illegal fishing vessels and charging their crew. In response to this situation, the Attorney General of Ecuador filed a petition requesting the Supreme Court of the country to analyse the issue.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the further progress made by the State Party in addressing the decisions of the World Heritage Committee, particularly in regards to improving governance, controlling immigration and further strengthening biosecurity measures.

They note that the State Party is making concerted efforts at developing a suitable ecotourism policy and regulatory framework for the property, and that it has shown determination in dealing with developments that disregard established procedures. The issue of artisanal versus sport fishing needs to be clarified.

They note from Park press releases that there has been some stability in the Park directorship position, with the current director having been in his position since June 2010. They also take note of the progress achieved in establishing greater robustness of the GNPS as an institution, and recommend that the Committee encourage the State Party to further strengthen the GNPS.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are also of the view that the ability to impose a ban on selective fisheries is a positive indicator that the fishing community and the State Party are working cooperatively. The marine reserve is benefitting from the reasonably effective monitoring capacity of the Park service.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that the State Party has established better control over immigration pressures, and that this improvement in the situation needs to be sustained. They also wish to highlight to the Committee that progress in revising the Special Law for Galapagos indicates a degree of cooperation amongst different Galapagos stakeholders, but that lack of judicial capacity is a clear limiting factor. The involvement of

the Attorney General in efforts to resolve this problem is an indication of the commitment on the part of the State Party to strengthening governance in the islands, and it is essential that there is a rapid improvement in enforcement capacity. They finally recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to resolve the problem regarding the capacity of Galapagos based judges to hear environmental crime cases as a matter of urgency.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.32

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.30**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Welcomes the further progress achieved by the State Party in implementing the recommendations of the 2010 World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission;*
4. *Requests the State Party to sustain its efforts to implement all of the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission, in particular those where activities are at the planning stage and require finalization and implementation as soon as possible, including:*
 - a) *Putting in place the biosecurity infrastructure for the islands, with a particular focus on the requirements for international biosecurity standards both for cargo ships, and for loading and offloading facilities,*
 - b) *Implementing a sustainable tourism strategy through appropriate regulatory, legal and policy instruments,*
 - c) *Resolving the issue over the capacity of judges in Galapagos to hear environmental crime cases as a matter of urgency,*
 - d) *Resolving the sport fishing / artisanal fishing issue;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, with particular emphasis on the implementation of the points noted above, as well as on further progress made in the implementation of the 2010 mission recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (State of conservation report by the State Party not received)

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of complementary information from the State Party)

MIXED PROPERTIES

AFRICA

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

ASIA-PACIFIC

36. Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Minor boundary modification also submitted by the State Party – see Document WHC-12/36.COM/8B.Add)

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

37. Pyrénées – Mont Perdu (France / Spain) (C/N 773 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1997; extension in 1999

Criteria
(iii) (iv) (v) (vii) (viii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/773/documents/>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
February 1999: UNESCO visit; July 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Impacts of the Gavarnie Festival (France);
b) Insufficient support for agropastoralism;
c) Inefficient transboundary cooperation.

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/773>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2012, the States Parties (France and Spain) provided a joint report that contains information on transboundary management and pastoral activities. The report indicates efforts to minimize the impacts of the Gavarnie Festival, but does not suggest any solution for its relocation and provides no decisive element concerning the closure of the Troumouse Road.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that on 3 April 2012, the State Party of France transmitted to the World Heritage Centre a joint letter from the Prefect of the Hautes-Pyrénées and the President of the General Council of the Hautes-Pyrénées concerning the status of requests made by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **34 COM 7B.39**, including the relocation of the Gavarnie Festival and improvement in transboundary management.

a) *Transboundary management arrangements*

The State Parties informed that in 2011, the Transboundary Monitoring and Management Committee became the Joint Steering Committee comprising representatives of the two States concerned as well as the local authorities and, from the Spanish side, the breeders. A Charter of Cooperation (2010-2020) was signed between the two Parks in December 2010, to supervise transboundary management and cooperation. It will promote the enhancement of the site inscribed as World Heritage, and the implementation of a network of natural areas. The Charter of Cooperation indicates that a joint annual meeting shall be devoted to the

training of field staff. A transboundary conservation and enhancement programme of the site was established (2012-2014) and is provided in annex to the joint report of the States Parties. Moreover, in this report, the States Parties inform that the members of the two parks preside in their respective jurisdictions.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies favourably welcome the representation of the Spanish breeders within the Joint Steering Committee but given the importance of the pastoral issue, are surprised by their absence from the French side. They consider that agro-pastoralism should be part of the main subjects treated by the transboundary conservation and enhancement programme of the site (2012-2014). The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the actions concerning the scientific knowledge and the conservation of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value of the property are not sufficiently dealt with in the Charter of Cooperation. Furthermore, they note that the associative levels of the members of the two parks sitting in their respective jurisdictions are not equal: in one case it is the scientific council, in another the Patronat.

b) Agro-pastoral activities

The State Parties indicate that significant financial support has been allocated for agro-pastoral activities. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies however note that the elements provided by the State Party of Spain on built heritage and landscapes remains too general. They note that the 2012-2014 Action Plan does not place sufficient emphasis on pastoralism in its sustainable development action.

c) Impacts of the Gavarnie Festival

The State Party of France recalls that no acceptable solution for relocation has been found to date. It underlines the efforts undertaken to diminish the impacts, considering that the environmental impact is almost nil. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that this affirmation is not accompanied by any valid element to support this assertion. The Fébus Theatre Association for the Gavarnie Festival informs of a cultural project but provides no details. As regard the 2012-2014 Action Plan, it mentions the preparation of a methodological best practice guide. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that that this is not a cultural project but a practical guide. Finally, the Association, as the State Party, mentions the creation of specifications to supervise all the technical and logistical actions of the Festival, without however, providing any details.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the letter transmitted on 3 April 2012 by the State party of France indicates that all attempts to relocate the Gavarnie Festival have failed, highlights the actions undertaken to mitigate the negative impacts of the Festival and indicates that, according to local authorities, the impact of the Festival on the property is nil. Further, this letter recalls the strong opposition of the Prefect of the Hautes-Pyrénées and the President of the General Council of the Hautes-Pyrénées, as well as the Member of Parliament and Mayor of Gavarnie, with regard to the relocation of the Festival.

However, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the letter does not provide any clear details concerning the measures taken to diminish the negative impacts of the Festival. They consider that the major threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property persists. Furthermore, they confirm that the location of the Festival in the most scenic area of the World Heritage property remains incompatible with the aesthetic values of its natural landscape for which the property was explicitly inscribed.

d) Closure of the Troumouse Road

The State Party of France indicates that the study on possible solutions for the Troumouse Road, which should have begun in 2010, is almost completed and should be examined by the Pilot Committee during the winter 2011-2012. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned with the delay in this study and emphasize that due to this fact, the World Heritage Committee cannot discuss this issue in 2012.

e) *Other conservation issues*

The report of the States Parties on the state of conservation of the property deals at length with the requests of the Committee, but no information is provided on the evolution of the heritage values for which the property was inscribed. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the report should also mention the observations and analyses on the general state of conservation of the property and trends.

Moreover, a common draft Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value concerning the property was submitted on 1 February 2011, as requested by the Committee, and is being revised by the Advisory Bodies.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that some progress has been accomplished: preparation of joint management and action plans, the joint preparation of a common report on the state of conservation of the property by the two State Parties, and the strengthening of transboundary cooperation.

However, they consider that further consolidation of transboundary collaboration is required, as well as management of the property by means of far more detailed work on agro-pastoralism that has shaped the landscape inscribed on the World Heritage List, and that this work must be integrated into a perspective of sustainable development. It is essential that the representatives of French breeders be represented in the Joint Steering Committee.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the World Heritage Committee regrets that no concrete progress has been achieved concerning the relocation of the Gavarnie Festival and the closure of the Troumouse Road. They consider that the main threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property still remains.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.37

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.40** and **34 COM 7B 39** adopted at its 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions respectively,
3. Welcomes with interest the elements of information concerning the joint governance of the property, whilst encouraging the State Parties to finalize the participation of representatives of the two national parks in the jurisdictions of these institutions;
4. Regrets that no concrete progress has been accomplished concerning the relocation of the Gavarnie Festival and, given its location in the most scenic place of the property explicitly inscribed for the aesthetic values of its natural landscape, strongly reiterates its request for the relocation of the Festival due to its incompatibility with the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
5. Strongly urges the State Party of France to prepare a study on potential relocation sites for the Festival, integrating the advantages and inconveniences of these sites, property rights and usage, as well as the costs of the operation;
6. Also regrets that the study on the closure of the Troumouse Road that should have been completed in 2010, is still not finalized, and also strongly urges the State Party of France to submit this study to the World Heritage Centre by **31 December 2012**;

7. *Further regrets that the 2012-2014 Action Plans do not place sufficient emphasis on agro-pastoralism activities and the restoration of pastoral built heritage, and encourages the State Parties to improve support to these activities in the next action plan;*
8. *Requests the State Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated joint report on the state of conservation of the property, notably on the issues relating to the relocation of the Festival and the closure of the Troumouse Road, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

38. Mount Athos (Greece) (C/N 454)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

40. Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

1985 - 2007

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/323/documents/>

International Assistance

Global amount granted to the property: USD 113,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/323/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted to the property: USD 400,000 by the Government of Japan in 1998; USD 50,000 in 2005 by the Riksantikvaren (Norwegian Cultural Heritage Directorate).

Previous monitoring missions

2004 and 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS missions; 2006: World Heritage Centre / CRAterre-ENSAG / Getty Conservation Institute monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Absence of a national legislative mechanism for the protection of cultural heritage;
- b) Major deterioration of almost 50% of the earthen structural components;
- c) Lack of presentation and interpretation at the site.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/323>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation on 17 February 2012. The report provides an overview of the current situation at the property. In addition, several media reports were received by the World Heritage Centre regarding the fire at the Houégbadja Palace that occurred on 19 January 2012.

a) *Management of the property*

The State Party indicates that although there is a clear policy for the safeguarding and conservation of the property, the required considerable investments are not necessarily the best solutions to achieve efficient conservation. Therefore, new discussions have started to define a policy to align conservation goals with the functionality of the property and the important contribution to the development of the Abomey village. Work has started on improving the productivity of the artisan village within the site to enhance promotion and dissemination of derived products with the aim of increasing its central role as an important area for economic activities, cultural industries and tourism. As for the financial strategy, revenues from the site are used for minor maintenance works and interpretation. The Ministry of Culture has allocated additional material resources and equipment for

maintenance and conservation. It is expected that sales from souvenirs will also contribute to financing conservation work.

With regard to the management council for the property, the report indicates that it continues to operate as the decision-making entity in terms of defining the activities programme, budget and reporting. To strengthen awareness raising, a communication plan has been developed and is pending finalization for approval by the council. Notwithstanding, efforts have already been implemented to increase promotion of the property at different levels. Local communities have continued to be involved both in conservation endeavors, to enhance transmission of know-how regarding earthen architecture, as well as commemorative events.

b) *Current state of conservation*

The report indicates that the reconstruction of the remaining walls, in accordance with the Management Plan, will ensure the integrity of the site and avoid further water damage. As for preventive conservation, daily inspections are carried out for the 184 components of the property, including inspections at the buffer zone to ensure its protection. Additional work has continued in the implementation of the general priority objectives set out in the Management Plan. This has entailed interventions and increased capacity building to ensure that maintenance needs are duly covered in the long term.

The report highlights interventions at the Houégbadja Palace, with funds from the German Embassy in Benin, as well as at Adjalala, the Honnuwa d'Agadja, and the Roi Akaba Palace.

An increase in visitation is reported although no further information was provided on whether this will entail additional measures for visitor management.

Additional information was also received at the end of March 2012 indicating that the State Party has started digging trenches to bury an electrical system, which will provide new illumination for the Singbodji Square. This project is conducted in partnership with the City of Albi, France.

c) *Fire incidents*

On 19 January 2012, a fire occurred at the Houégbadja Palace. It appears that the straw roofs on seven of the ten structures were completely burnt and the bas-reliefs were reported to have sustained slight damage, particularly at the base. On 28 February 2012, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party requesting a detailed report on the incident including its impact on the property and measures on fire prevention taken. At the time of the drafting of this report, the requested information has not been received from the State Party.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the fire is the second one to occur in three years. They further note that although no reconstruction policy document has been prepared, as requested at the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010), reconstruction work has been carried out on the areas affected by the fire of 2009. They also note that no progress has been made with regards to a fire prevention strategy and that the current Management Plan expired at the end of 2011.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that incidents such as the fire in early 2012 put in question the efficiency of the maintenance and monitoring practices and hence recommend that the Committee expresses its concern. They also wish to highlight that reconstruction work has been undertaken in the past in the absence of an overall reconstruction policy being approved by the Committee. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that before any new work is undertaken to mitigate the impacts of the most recent fire, an overall reconstruction policy needs to be approved, as well as a detailed reconstruction project plan for the fire damaged buildings and a disaster risk preparedness strategy for the property. They further consider that this should be undertaken within the framework of a revised Management Plan.

Draft Decision : 36 COM 7B.40

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.43**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party in regard to the state of conservation of the property and urges it to continue its efforts in the sustained implementation of conservation and management measures;
4. Expresses its concern at the damage caused to the Houégbadja Palace by the fire in January 2012 and the lack of any mention of the fire and its impact in the State Party report;
5. Considers that the lack of adequate prevention and maintenance measures and response plans appears to have contributed to the fires in 2009 and 2012;
6. Requests the State Party to develop a comprehensive disaster risk Management Plan and submit it to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review by **1 February 2013**;
7. Also urges the State Party to develop a reconstruction policy document as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session and to halt all reconstruction work until such a policy and a detailed reconstruction project plan for the fire damaged buildings have been approved by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
8. Further urges the State Party to update the Management Plan as a framework for the reconstruction policy and disaster risk Management Plan;
9. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property and to assist in defining ways to address the development of a reconstruction policy, a detailed reconstruction project plan for the fire damaged buildings, a disaster risk Management Plan and an updated Management Plan;
10. 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. Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(i) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/15/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 5.07 million by the Italian Funds in Trust for the "Aksum Archaeological Site Improvement Project: Preparatory studies for the reinstallation of the Obelisk and capacity building for archaeological conservation - Phase 1", "Reinstallation of the Obelisk - Phase 2" and "Consolidation of Stele 3".

Previous monitoring missions

2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009: missions of the World Heritage Centre and experts for the implementation of the Obelisk project; 2010: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Insufficient delimitation of this serial property;
- b) Lack of conservation and Management Plans;
- c) Lack of appropriate urban planning and building regulations;
- d) Urban encroachment and inappropriate new developments;
- e) Rising water level / seepage;
- f) Structural instability of Stele 3.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/15>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2012, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. The report gives a brief overview on the current status of site management, including the development of a local master plan and the beginning of construction of the Church Museum. With the report, the State Party also submitted a draft Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. It further submitted two maps, aimed at indicating the property's and buffer zone's boundaries. Unfortunately, the maps lack the required format and level of detail to be fully indicative. On 23 March 2012, the State Party submitted the architectural drawings of the four-storey museum building designed by an Italian architect following a request for information by the World Heritage Centre.

a) Construction of the Orthodox Church Museum

The State Party report states that the construction of the Orthodox Church Museum has commenced and has reached first floor level. The museum is next to both the old and new St Mary of Aksum church buildings within the boundaries of the property, as described in the Nomination file.

Although the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that a museum at Aksum would be an asset for the property, they note that despite the monitoring mission in 2010, which concluded that a museum building in this location could have an adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, work has progressed without detailed plans being submitted for review, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at the 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have now reviewed the details submitted by the State Party on 23 March 2012, and consider that the size, scale and design of the building are incompatible with the sensitive surrounding where previous excavations showed foundations of ancient structures, and would have a negative impact on the OUV of the property. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that it is essential that the construction is halted immediately and a comprehensive assessment undertaken by means of a high level reactive monitoring mission before any further construction activity takes place.

b) Urban regulations and tourism master plan

The State Party provided information that a master plan for Aksum, which included a future land use and development plan besides aspects related to tourism, had been developed in 2010 by the regional government of Tigray, under the lead of the Culture and Tourism Agency. Following the State Party's perception, this plan helped in placing all development activities within a larger sustainable framework. The master plan also includes references to standardized site interpretation, such as touring routes and visitor facilities.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the development of a master plan and consider that this first strategic tool may provide a possible framework to establish the required formal cooperation with all governance agencies concerned. It is essential however, that a land use and development plan also becomes a legal reference for planning permissions.

c) Site management

The State Party reports that the establishment of the site office for management, expected in 2010, had been delayed but would be established shortly. The first task of the new office will then be the development of a site Management Plan.

d) Legal protection

Preparations to gain additional legal protection for the property have been continued and following the initial presentation to parliament, the State Party now foresees a protective regulation to be endorsed by the Council of Ministers. The State Party notes, however, that the general legal protection granted by the Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage Proclamation No 209/2000 is sufficient to ensure the long-term protection of the property.

e) Rising water / seepage in the Tomb of Brick Arches

The State Party considers that the rising water level in the Tomb of the Brick Arches still requires a permanent solution and envisages further technical studies to be conducted with support of national universities. To finance such investigation it seeks technical assistance. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that further studies are essential and recommend that the Committee may wish to once again reiterate its invitation to submit an International Assistance request.

f) Consolidation of Stele 3

According to the State Party, the Stele 3 was destabilized during the reinstallation of Stele 2, and it therefore considers it part of the responsibility of the reinstallation project to ensure the stabilization of Stele 3. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that a consolidation project has been developed, and funding will need to be raised for its implementation. Until the necessary funding is in place, the temporary consolidation structure needs to remain in place.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee regret that the construction of the Orthodox Church Museum has started without prior submission of the plans to the World Heritage Centre as requested by the Committee at its 34th session and in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. They note that the location and scale of the museum under construction will have a negative impact on the OUV of the property. The construction should be halted immediately to allow for a comprehensive assessment by a high level reactive monitoring mission before any further construction activity takes place, and seek appropriate solutions to ensure the OUV of the property is fully preserved. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further recommend that the Committee encourage the State Party to finalize their efforts in establishing a site management office, developing a Management Plan and integrating a sustainable land-use plan and protection status in all local planning procedures. They further recommend to the

Committee to reiterate its invitation to the State Party to submit an International Assistance request for investigation of causes and potential solutions for the rising water / seepage in the Tomb of the Brick Arches.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.41

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision 34 COM 7B.45 adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party, in particular the efforts made towards the delimitation of boundaries of the property and of a suggested buffer zone, as well as the submission of a draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value;
4. Expresses its concern that the construction of the Orthodox Church Museum has started on the property without prior submission of information on this construction to the World Heritage Centre in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010);
5. Also expresses its strong concern that this Orthodox Church Museum construction will have a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
6. Reiterates its request to the State Party to establish more structured management arrangements at the property, including a Management Plan, and to provide the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, with maps showing the precise boundaries of the property and the buffer zone;
7. Also reiterates its request to the State Party to undertake investigations on the causes of the rising water table and renews its invitation to the State Party to submit a request for International Assistance to :
 - a) conduct the study on the causes of the rising water,
 - b) support the Stele 3 consolidation project;
8. Requests the State Party to invite a World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS high level reactive monitoring mission to assess the Orthodox Church Museum project before any further construction activity takes place;
9. Also requests the State Party to halt the Orthodox Church Museum construction until the World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission and the assessment are completed;
10. Further 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 and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013, with a view to considering, if the Orthodox Church Museum construction is not halted until the project is comprehensively assessed by a high level reactive monitoring mission, and until appropriate solutions to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is fully preserved have been identified and agreed upon, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

42. Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia) (C 18)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1978

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/18/documents/>

International Assistance

Global amount granted to the property: USD 112,300

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/18/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 800,000 for the « Conservation Action Plan for Lalibela » -Phase 1 and Phase 2 (Norwegian Funds-in-Trust).

Previous monitoring missions

2004, 2005, 2008, 2009: World Heritage Centre follow-up missions; 2006.: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission; 2007, 2008: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission;

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of clearly defined boundaries for the property and the buffer zone;
- b) Impact of the four temporary shelters constructed in 2008;
- c) Absence of a Management Plan for the property;
- d) Insufficient urban and architectural regulations;
- e) Urban development and encroachment around the property;
- f) Impact of rainwater and humidity;
- g) Impact of earthquakes;
- h) Geological and architectural characteristics of the property.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/18>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2012, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the Rock-Hewn Churches of Lalibela. The report addresses most requests made by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **34 COM 7B.44**, but fails to provide details of the type and frequency of the monitoring arrangements for the temporary shelters or the development plan of Lalibela area. The report submitted contains detailed maps of the property boundaries and suggested buffer zone.

a) Monitoring arrangements for the temporary shelters

The State Party reports that following the completion of the temporary shelters in 2008, experts of the Authority for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage (ARCCH) have established regular inspection procedures. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note with concern that details with regard to the type and frequency of these monitoring arrangements were not provided, and reiterate the importance of well-defined processes and indicators for the monitoring. These are particularly important for Aba Libanos Church, where the shelter was constructed against the advice of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in a location at risk of landslides, potentially aggravated by the shelter's weight.

b) Urban encroachment and site management

Following the State Party's report, urban encroachment was identified as the key problem in the management of the property. The Management Plan drafted is the product of successive stakeholder workshops and is described as currently in its consultation phase. Within this framework a resettlement action plan was developed, according to which some households were relocated from the property to a newly designated settlement zone. The emptied traditional Tukuls (vernacular round houses) are now being refurbished to develop them as additional tourist attractions.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee regrets that neither the completed development plan for Lalibela area nor the draft Management Plan have been submitted. They further note the reported resettlement of inhabitants of traditional Tukul structures in the property, and consider that the development of the emptied historic Tukuls as tourism attractions has the potential to impact on the association between the churches and the traditional community. Resettlement should therefore be preceded by a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidelines on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties.

c) Pilot project at Gabriel Rufael Church

Following the completion of technical studies funded by UNESCO/ Norway funds-in-trust of the Gabriel Rufael Church and based on archival research, photogrammetric surveys, GIS, and laser scanning of all the churches, the State Party reports that a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) has been drawn up with the World Monuments Fund, which will allow them to undertake training activities. In addition, the Norway-funded project has started preparations of the technical documents for the conservation and consolidation works. Information has been received by the World Heritage Centre that these works could be funded jointly through the US Ambassador's fund and the World Monuments Fund.

d) World Bank Tourism Development Project

The State Party reports that the World Bank's tourism development project is implemented at Lalibela in four components: destination development, capacity building, site promotion, and community involvement. At present the components destination development and site promotion are undertaken with a focus on training in handicraft, waste management, and access roads.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge the submission of detailed maps for the property boundaries and suggested buffer zone. However, they note that the development plan, draft site Management Plan, resettlement action plan as well as further details on the World Bank Tourism Project and the monitoring type and frequency for the temporary shelters were not submitted. All these documents should be made available for review.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further recommend that well-defined processes and indicators need to be developed for the monitoring of the temporary shelters, including their micro-climate effects. Furthermore, any planned demographic or other changes meant to strengthen tourist-targeted services in the property or its immediate surroundings should be preceded by a HIA.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.42

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.44**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party, notably the development of maps of the property's boundaries and suggested buffer zone, and requests the State Party to submit the finalized maps in the context of the retrospective inventory and plans of the suggested buffer zone as a minor modification;
4. Encourages the State Party to finalize the consultation process for the draft Management Plan for the property, and also requests the State Party to submit the draft Management Plan, including the resettlement action plan and the development plan for Lalibela area for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
5. Reiterates its request to the State Party to:
 - a) Submit details of the type and frequency of monitoring arrangements for all temporary shelters,
 - b) Regularly provide information about the World Bank Tourism Development Project that is being implemented at the property,
 - c) Pursue its efforts to implement the pilot preservation project at Gabriel Rufael Church in cooperation with the World Monuments Fund;
6. Further requests the State Party to conduct a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidelines on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties, to evaluate the potential impact of any planned demographic or other changes to strengthen tourist-targeted services in the property or immediate surroundings on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
7. Requests furthermore 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 and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

43. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2001

Criteria
(ii) (iv) (vi),

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

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

International Assistance

Total amount granted to property: USD 31,776

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

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2004: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission; February 2005 World Heritage Centre advisory mission on water and sanitation assessments, 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

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

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2012, a report on the state of conservation for Lamu Old Town was submitted by the State Party. The report addresses some issues requested by the World Heritage Committee in decision **35 COM 7B.39**, including a feasibility study for the Lamu-Southern Sudan-Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) corridor and Lamu port development at Manda Bay, the table of contents for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the first three berth of Lamu Harbour, encroachment in the Shela sand dunes and uncontrolled development. However, it does not contain any information on the exact routing of the LAPSSET corridor, scope and infrastructure of the port, its associated city, airport, and tourism resorts, its likely impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), the precise boundaries of the property and buffer zones, or the Management Plan.

a) *Lamu-Southern Sudan-Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) corridor and new Lamu Port*

The State Party reports that no infrastructure developments were earmarked for Lamu Island itself, neither in the property nor in the gazetted buffer zones. The National Museums of Kenya (NMK) have engaged in close cooperation with the government agencies concerned and their request for a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) /Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was acknowledged and agreed to by the responsible Ministry, the Ministry of Transport.

In information published by the Kenyan Ministry of Transport, LAPSSET project is outlined as a major development, perhaps the largest present infrastructure investment on the African continent. It comprises three corridors of 200meters width connecting Lamu to Nakodok in South Sudan (1,250km), Moyale in Ethiopia (460km) and Nairobi (270km), each combining a 4-6 lanes highway, railway tracks and pipe corridors for oil pipelines and fibre optic cables. The 32 berth cargo port at Lamu Manda Bay is proposed to be developed along with the new Lamu Metropolis development, a new Lamu International airport, an oil refinery and a resort city and leisure environment, including a convention centre, amusement centre, cultural and technology centre, a cruise terminal facility and a fisherman's wharf, all located along a new ring road around Manda Bay.

A feasibility study prepared by a Japanese port development consultancy firm, in executive summary available in the public domain, anticipates a significantly enlarged urban community in Lamu District with considerable environmental and social impacts. Rough

estimates assume a population growth from presently 101,000 inhabitants to 1.25 million by 2050, with increased fresh water requirements from presently 3,000 m³ per day (estimate) to anticipated 296,750 m³. It seems that these estimations would by far outstretch any available resources and endanger the ecology of this fragile ecosystem. The project is likely to further lead to a decline of the local biodiversity and indigenous economies, to changes in the morphology of the coastline and tidal flows, and will have considerable socio-economic impacts on Lamu and its surrounding landscape.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that LAPSSET has been approved by H.E. the Hon. Mwai Kibaki, President of the Republic of Kenya on 26 July 2011, and that all concerned government agencies were instructed to expedite the implementation of this project, before the EIA/HIA requested by the National Museums of Kenya was commissioned. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would like to recall in this context in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, that detailed information on new constructions, which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of a property, should be made available before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse, so that the Committee may assist in seeking appropriate solutions to ensure that the OUV of the property is fully preserved.

On 2 March 2012, an official ceremony took place at Lamu in presence of the Kenyan President, the Ethiopian Prime Minister and the President of South Sudan to launch the construction of the first three berth facilities at Lamu and the beginning of the transport corridor construction.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to particularly highlight that the amount of development foreseen in the project, while outside the boundaries of the property, could cause enormous urban development pressures on Lamu Old Town, and would also have an effect on the traditional Swahili cultural and religious functions for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (vi).

b) *Encroachment in the Shela sand dunes and water catchment area*

A special inter-departmental team, spearheaded by the National Environment Authority (NEMA), the National Museums of Kenya (NMK) and the Water Resource Management Authority (WRMA) has been formed to register the Shela sand dunes as an area of special bio-diversity (SOB). This status is expected to raise the area's profile and further enforce development restrictions and protection efforts. The WRMA, in cooperation with water user associations, is developing a catchment Management Plan and has in 2011 received funding for a number of catchment protection initiatives. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the risks of encroachment in the Shela sand dunes and of loss of the ecological balance of the water catchment area are increasing with the planned Lamu Port and Metropolis development as part of the LAPSSET project. In this context the need for effective anticipatory planning and management as well as enforcement of By-laws have become more urgent and important than ever before.

c) *Boundaries, buffer zones and finalized Management Plan*

Despite repeated requests, the State Part has not provided maps with the exact boundaries of the property and gazetted buffer zones. It has equally not provided a copy of the Management Plan, the finalization of which was supported by the World Heritage Fund in 2010.

Conclusion

Despite the continuing lack of officially provided information on the LAPSSET project, based on information of Kenyan government agencies available in the public domain, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the Lamu Port and Metropolis development, including the transport corridor, international airport and other infrastructure, along with the massive influx of population to Lamu District that will accompany the project,

will have a significant impact on the environment and the property. The development is further likely to negatively affect the OUV of the property, in particular its social and cultural unity and cohesion, its relationship with the surrounding landscape and setting extending to the surrounding islands, as well as its fresh water supplies of the Shela sand dunes water catchment area. There is also a strong potential to create massive urban development pressures on the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee urges the State Party to halt and prevent any construction on the LAPSSET project or new Lamu Port and Metropolis until a comprehensive EIA and HIA (following the "ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties", covering not merely the first three berths of Lamu Port, but for the full scope of the project) have been carried out and have been submitted for consideration by the World Heritage Committee. This assessment should focus, not only on the possible impacts on the built heritage and natural environment of the World Heritage property, but also on the social, cultural, and religious impacts, which are important attributes of the OUV of the property. In advance of this HIA, support needs to be given to the property to allow the development of precise definitions and delineations of the attributes of OUV, both tangible and intangible, to use as a firm basis for the impact assessment.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies wish to draw the attention of the Committee on the continuing lack of information, apparent scope and ambitious implementation schedule of the LAPSSET project. Whilst there could clearly be considerable economic benefits for the greater Lamu area from the project, the pace of development could overwhelm the property unless its governance, management and planning controls are strengthened to allow a more symbiotic relationship to develop.

They also indicate that, in case of on-going construction works without prior consideration of the EIA/ HIA by the World Heritage Committee, or a continuing lack of commitment to provide essential information on the scope, location, implementation schedule as well as projected secondary developments of the LAPSSET project and Lamu Port and Metropolis, the World Heritage Committee may wish to consider the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 37th session in 2013. The Committee could also express its concern at the continuing lack of precise documentary material on the property boundaries and buffer zones as well as the delay in submission of the finalized Management Plan, and request that these be provided at the earliest possible opportunity.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.43

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.39**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Notes the general information provided by the State Party on the Lamu-Southern Sudan-Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) corridor, Lamu Port development, encroachment and uncontrolled development in the Shela sand dunes and Lamu Old Town;*
4. *Expresses its strong concern that detailed information on the LAPSSET corridor and Lamu Port project, such as its scope, projected kinds of primary and secondary developments foreseen, projected economic and population data, has not been submitted by the State Party as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) and 35th session (UNESCO, 2011);*

5. *Notes with concern, that information made available by Kenyan government authorities to the public domain suggests a project of major scale, which may impact the social and cultural unity of Lamu Old Town, its environment and setting, in particular the coastline, tidal flows and the ecological balance of the water catchment area at the Shela sand dunes;*
6. *Also expresses its concern about the likely negative impact of the LAPSSET corridor and the new Lamu Port and Metropolis, including secondary developments foreseen, on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
7. *Requests the State Party to halt and prevent any further construction of the new Lamu Port and LAPSSET facilities at Lamu until :*
 - a) *a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidelines on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage Cultural Properties, to assess the project's potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value including its social, cultural and religious impacts, have been carried out by independent experts in collaboration with the National Museums of Kenya (NMK),*
 - b) *these EIA and HIA have been submitted to the World Heritage Centre for examination by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies,*
 - c) *appropriate solutions to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is fully preserved, have been identified and agreed upon;*
8. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to provide detailed information on the development of the LAPSSET corridor and new Lamu Port and Metropolis, and planned secondary developments, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, including but not limited to its scope, exact location of all developments, anticipated construction schedule as well as compensation procedures for traditional and legal land owners, before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse;*
9. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies:*
 - a) *the requested maps showing the precise boundaries of the property and the buffer zones areas, indicating those gazetted at present as well as those planned to be gazetted in the near future,*
 - b) *three printed and electronic copies of the finalized draft Management Plan;*
10. *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 and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013, **with a view to considering, if the Lamu Port construction is not halted until an EIA and HIA are available, and until appropriate solutions to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is fully preserved have been identified and agreed upon, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

44. Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/116/documents/>

International Assistance

Global amount granted to the property: USD 37,977

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

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 110,000 (Italy Funds-in-Trust); USD 23,100 (Croisi Europe); USD 86,900 (European Commission)

Previous monitoring missions

2002, 2005: World Heritage Centre missions; 2006: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) No management and conservation plan;
- b) Pressure from urban development;
- c) Deterioration of dwellings;
- d) Waste disposal problems;
- e) Encroachment of the archaeological sites.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/116>

Current conservation issues

A state of conservation report was submitted by the State Party on 8 February 2012. It includes a description of current conservation conditions and challenges faced for the property. The report notes that gradual changes have occurred both in the urban fabric and in the buildings, which could modify the character of the place if provisions are not implemented to alleviate development pressures and other factors such as impoverishment of the local population, which is unable to meet maintenance needs, leading to a serious state of disrepair in some buildings. In addition, new construction, introduction of new equipment for urban development, a tendency to cover earthen facades with baked brick or modern materials, illegal occupation and land speculation pose a challenge to maintaining the conditions of integrity and authenticity of the inscribed property.

a) State of conservation of archaeological heritage

The archaeological components of the property are also being affected by natural and man-made factors. For the latter, interventions were undertaken to mitigate decay derived from erosion. However, no updated information was provided regarding the current status of development projects in areas adjacent to the archaeological components.

b) Waste disposal problems

The historic city continues to face severe sanitation and environmental problems arising from poor solid and liquid waste management practices. The report notes that these problems

have been partially addressed in some neighbourhoods by the Local Sanitation and Pollution Control Services but this, nevertheless, remains a serious concern.

The UNESCO Niger-Loire project, funded by the European Union, developed a transitional waste disposal area, provided sanitation material to the community, and trained 100 women in waste recycling. Further, a feasibility study was conducted for the final waste disposal area, envisioned 5 km outside Djenné, funding for which still needs to be raised.

c) Rehabilitation of architectural heritage

The report includes information on interventions that were completed in 2011 at the Mosque, supported by the Aga Khan Trust for Culture, and at the Djenné Museum, funded by the European Union. The third phase of the rehabilitation and conservation project is currently in place, and it is expected that six houses will be restored in Djenné. In addition, the rehabilitation of the Youth House including the development of technical guidelines for earth conservation was successfully completed with support of UNESCO/ Italy funds-in-trust in the framework of the World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme (WHEAP).

d) Demolition of Old Courthouse

The report also states that the Old Courthouse building had fallen into disrepair and had been demolished, in order to allow for a large new construction. Given that the demolition did not have the approval of the Cultural Mission, new building works were stopped and participatory discussions have started on the new project which is foreseen to house the craft market. The current proposal is to construct a new building in modern materials that would follow the Sudan-Sahelian architectural style and be integrated with the physical and urban setting.

e) Urban regulations and management and conservation plan

The report includes a recommendation to implement the urban regulations developed in the framework of the WHEAP project and the management and conservation plan but does not provide any information on how this is to be accomplished nor where the required resources could be obtained for systematic and sustainable implementation.

f) Boundaries and buffer zone

No information was provided on the clarification of boundaries and buffer zone or on the prepared town planning and construction regulations.

The proposal for the property's zoning has been developed with the technical assistance provided in the framework of the UNESCO Niger-Loire and the WHEAP-Conservation project for Africa funded by Italy.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party has made efforts in addressing the conservation of the property in spite of the limited resources available. However, they wish to particularly draw the Committee's attention on the lack of implementation of developed planning tools to better manage conditions that threaten the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

They consider that the demolition of the Old Courthouse appears to be a symptom of the lack of adequate protection and planning controls. The building was a large and significant example of the traditional architecture of Djenne and occupied a prominent place on the market square near the Grand Mosque. The building had been restored as part of a project funded by the Netherlands funds-in-trust which renovated 100 buildings between 1996 and 2003. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the demolition of the Old Courthouse has impacted adversely on the integrity of the property. Many smaller buildings

have been demolished or re-built since the inscription, and the World Heritage Committee has encouraged the development of planning tools to halt this trend. The Old Courthouse is, however, a case of one of the most prominent buildings in Djenné being demolished, not because it was in a bad state of repair but because its plot was seen to have high value. The replacement building suggested in drawings that have been submitted bear little resemblance to what was there before and, with their elaborate pseudo-Sahelian style, will present an uncomfortable intrusion into the urban landscape. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee request the State Party to provide revised plans and drawings that are sympathetic to the urban surroundings; and that the urban regulations should include clear presumption against demolition.

A reactive monitoring mission would be appropriate to better assess the current state of conservation, to work jointly with the State Party in identifying an action plan to address pressing concerns and to verify whether the existing lack of planning controls and the lack of protection for individual buildings might warrant the Committee giving consideration to including the property in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.44

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.47**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided on the state of conservation of the property and the measures implemented in regard to its conservation;*
4. *Notes with concern the conservation conditions at the property and the lack of significant progress made in implementing the management and conservation plans;*
5. *Expresses its regret at the demolition of the Old Courthouse, a significant and prominent example of the Djenné architectural style, that had been renovated as part of an urban restoration project and considers that its destruction impacts adversely on the integrity of the property and that it is symptomatic of the lack of adoption of developed planning tools;*
6. *Urges the State Party to cooperate with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, as well as any other relevant international bodies, to put in place measures to address pressing concerns regarding implementation of regulatory measures to control development pressures, conservation conditions of the built heritage and sanitation;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2012**, a boundary clarification in the framework of the Retrospective Inventory process;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property, in particular the vulnerability of its distinctive architecture, the conditions of the archaeological components of the property and development proposals for different sectors, and to develop an action plan for the implementation of priority conservation and protection measures;*
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 on the steps taken to implement the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th*

session in 2013, with a view to considering, in the case of confirmation of ascertained or potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

45. Aapravasi Ghat (Mauritius) (C 1227)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

46. Island of Mozambique (Mozambique)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

47. Saloum Delta (Senegal) (C 1359)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2011

Criteria
(iii) (iv) (v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1359/documents/>

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
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1359>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted its report on 1 February 2012. It essentially provides an update on the implementation of the recommendations that the Committee had made in 2011, following the inscription of the property.

a) Management Plan

In the framework of the implementation of the Management Plan, several eco-guard training sessions were held in 2011 and were to be extended to the conservation of cultural elements. However, the subjects covered, the reports on which were appended to the State Party's report, relate exclusively to the natural heritage, despite the Committee's recommendation to ensure that cultural values be duly taken into consideration in the management and development programme. The Management Plan was formally circulated to all those involved in the management of the property. The establishment of the Toubacouta Interpretation Centre should be completed in 2012. The Order establishing the Saloum Delta Management and Safeguarding Committee has been issued and its enactment is in progress.

b) Implementation of other recommendations of the Committee

According to the State Party, the recent improvement in the condition of the mangrove contributes to better natural protection of the shell mounds, however preventive natural management of erosion must be studied. As for human waste management, the State Party notes that this issue remains a recurrent problem in the Delta, but experiments are underway.

The report of the State Party also refers to the preparation of an urban regulation for classified perimeters for which the future Management Committee will be responsible once it is finalized. On the issue of major development projects, the report notes that these are subject to environmental impact studies for the protection and conservation of the cultural elements of the property.

Regarding the provision of an annual monitoring report on the property, the State Party's report indicates that it will be the responsibility of the Management Committee and its secretariat, once they are established.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies consider that recent decisions by the State Party are in the right direction, and should be implemented without delay. However, they recommend that the Committee reiterate the urgency of giving special attention to protection of the shell mounds against erosion, good anthropogenic waste management, and the training of eco-guards in the cultural values of the property.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.47

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 8B.14**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Notes with satisfaction that the decisions taken by the State Party are steps in the right direction towards greater attention to the management of the cultural heritage of the property and encourages it to continue its efforts;
4. Requests the State Party to:
 - a) *Continue to give priority attention to the simultaneous protection and conservation of cultural elements of the property and the natural elements associated with them,*

- b) *Ensure that this joint protection and conservation is carried out at the same level on the entire property, in particular through the deployment of eco-guards over the entire site,*
 - c) *Establish a training programme for eco-guards in the cultural values of the property,*
 - d) *Continue studies and research on protection of the shell mounds against erosion by currents, as well as projects and technical research for better management of human waste and domestic waste within the property,*
 - e) *Develop a policy for monitoring the conservation of the property with clearly defined indicators and a regular programme of observation of these indicators;*
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a report on the state of conservation of the property.

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

49. 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

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

International Assistance

Total amount granted to the property: USD 15,000

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

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: 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;

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 1 February 2012 that responds to the request made by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011).

a) Management system

The report notes the challenges faced to secure the resources for the operation of the Stone Town Conservation and Development Authority (STCDA) and for the implementation of the Heritage Management Plan. However, with the new Act No. 4/2010, additional funding can be obtained from other sources to increase possibilities of implementing the Management Plan. Capacity building has also been partially addressed by training staff and hiring professional staff. Awareness building activities among different stakeholders have been carried out in relation to the conservation and development at the property.

b) State of conservation of the property

The State Party reports that a comprehensive condition assessment was undertaken; 18 buildings were found to be in poor condition while 108 are deteriorated. Based on results obtained, proposals have been developed to address conditions and raise funds for emergency cases. The assessment or proposal for intervention was not submitted nor was the expected timeframe for when emergency projects are expected to be implemented. Open spaces were also assessed, and a proposal was made to address the problems faced. This was also not submitted. As for street vendors, the State Party indicates that actions will be taken to enforce rules and regulations for the removal of street vendors. As for the use of inappropriate building materials, which poses a threat to the attributes of the property, a programme has been developed to enforce regulations for the use of traditional materials.

As for new construction, monitoring has been carried out to enforce sanctions on illegal or unauthorised construction. With the new Urban Development Control Authority, the situation of issuing permits is expected to improve permit mechanisms and enhance capabilities to better exercise control at the property and at the buffer zone. In regard to the tourism plan, the report notes previous planning efforts made that were not implemented. No further information is provided on how these prior initiatives will be updated to develop, adopt and implement a tourism policy for the property as requested by the World Heritage Committee.

c) Mambo Msiige building

Heritage Impact and Environmental Impact assessments were carried out by independent consultants to assess the potential impact of the proposed project. The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was submitted to the State Party at the end of January 2012. The State Party indicates that the results of the HIA will be provided to the World Heritage Centre before any design work starts. Meanwhile, it is reported that no development work is being undertaken on site.

d) Other interventions at the property

The reorganisation of the North part of the Port pertains to the rehabilitation of the old Clove Oil distillery within the Zanzibar Port by Blue Horizon Investments. STCDA has requested that the proposal be revised to reduce the height of cello tanks, also an Environmental and Social Impact assessment is being carried out. As for the Sea Wall project, under preparation since early 2008, it is noted that the Aga Khan Trust for Culture has withdrawn its funding but drawings are still being prepared. As for the House of Wonders project, implemented under the Marine and Coastal Environmental Management Project (MACEMP) funded by the World Bank, STCDA has stopped interventions at the House of Wonders because of the poor quality of the works and because of the inappropriateness of the materials. Pending submission of new material samples, permits will be issued. As for the Tip Tippu House, a

proposal is to be developed for the renovation. No timeframe for implementation for these projects has been provided.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the information provided by the State Party regarding efforts made to improve the management of the property. They wish, however, to highlight the persistent conservation issues of the property, since, although some work has been undertaken on condition assessments, no overall priority measures for interventions have been developed, nor has an effective monitoring system for illegal and new construction been established as requested by the Committee at its 34th session. They therefore recommend that the Committee expresses its concern. They also wish to highlight that no tourism plan has been developed as further requested by the Committee at its 34th session.

With regards to development proposals, they note that planned projects relating to the reorganization of the northern part of the port, the Seafront project part II interventions in the House of Wonders and at the Tippu Tip House, are currently not progressing. For the Mambo Msiige project, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, in the absence of details of the HIA, have not been able to assess whether the proposed plans for the hotel might impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.49

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.45**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Notes the information provided by the State Party on the efforts made to improve the conservation and management of the property;*
4. *Also notes that the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has been undertaken on the proposed hotel complex development at Mambo Msiige and the adjacent designated public open space, and urges the State Party to submit this HIA to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies as soon as possible;*
5. *Expresses its deep concern about the state of conservation of the property and the lack of significant progress in addressing the requests of the Committee;*
6. *Reiterates its requests to the State Party to:*
 - a) *Complete and submit 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;*
7. *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 and the implementation*

of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

ARAB STATES

50. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (State of conservation report by the State Party not received)

51. Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (State of conservation report by the State Party not received)

52. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (State of conservation report by the State Party not received)

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (State of conservation report by the State Party not received)

56. Ancient *Ksour* of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (State of conservation report by the State Party not received)

57. Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

58. Ancient Villages of Northern Syria (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 1348)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2011

Criteria

(iii) (iv) (v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4294>

International Assistance

Global amount granted to the property: USD 30,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1348/assistance>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 202,917 (2001-2010: Technical and Financial Assistance from the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Culture in the framework of France-UNESCO Cooperation.

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Protection Policy does not adequately integrate cultural landscapes;
- b) Lack of human and financial resources;
- c) Development or infrastructure projects that may affect the integrity of the property;
- d) Management Plan still incomplete and lack of an Action Plan.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1348>

Current conservation issues

Decision **35 COM 8B.23** adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011) requested the State Party to give consideration to the following:

- a) Pursuing and extending the policy of protection and conservation of the cultural landscapes, notably through the revision of the Antiquities Law,
- b) Increase the number of guards for those parks with the least number or which are most exposed to illegal activity,

- c) Confirm that Park No 1 (Saint Simeon Sanctuary) is not affected by a project for high voltage power lines,
- d) Confirm the complete rejection of the large property development project in Park No 3 (Sinkhar site),
- e) Confirm that the visual integrity of Park No 5 (Jebel Zawiye) is not compromised by large quarry and/or industrial projects,
- f) Complete as soon as possible the land surveys for each of the parks, under the supervision of the General Directorate for Antiquities and Museums (DGAM),
- g) Maintain throughout the management transition period, DGAM's prerogatives for the supervision of the preservation and conservation of the property,
- h) Provide the 'Maison du patrimoine' and parks management centres with the human and material resources commensurate with their new missions for the protection, conservation, and economic and tourism development of the property as stipulated in the Management Plan,
- i) Finalise the Management Plan and the Action Plan with a schedule of actions considered suitable for the property's conservation and its expression of Outstanding Universal Value, together with their implementation timeframes,
- j) Detail the monitoring indicators for the property's conservation as a function of the particularities of each site and as a function of more extensive landscape data.

On 30 January, 2012, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, in which it evokes the present difficulties in the country and indicates the following progress made: 1. The Committee established within the Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums (DGAM) has made progress on amendments to the Antiquities Law of 1963 to take better account of protection of cultural heritage, notably that of cultural landscapes; 2. The implementation of the protection, management, and action plan for the property has been undertaken with the Regional Development Authority, to include them in the regional land-use plans and involve the different authorities responsible for their implementation and monitoring. Notably, the following elements are being undertaken:

- a) Monitoring of the appropriation measures on the Roueihia site is funded as a priority;
- b) The Sinkhar site is designated as fully protected against potential real estate projects unsuitable for its preservation;
- c) A budget has been earmarked for the protection and rehabilitation of the Ancient Villages in the year 2012, which will enable the preparation of the Management Plan and the contractual implementation of a study conducted by the DGAM on the long-term management and conservation of the property;
- d) A documentary project in the form of a database and Geographic Information System is announced for the sites of Saint Simeon and Jebel Zawiye.

Recruitment of qualified personnel, notably in archeology, has been announced statewide, in particular for the two regional offices of the DGAM responsible for the property, but without further explanation; likewise for the guards of the sites.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies consider that the report of the State Party only partially meets the recommendations of Decision **35 COM 8B.23**, while noting the present circumstances experienced by the State Party. Recommendation d) is met; Recommendations a), h), and g) are partially met or are announced as close to being met; the other recommendations are not. It is therefore necessary to closely monitor the implementation of these recommendations. Moreover, the World Heritage Centre and the

Advisory Bodies were informed by various sources, unverifiable at this time, of damage to the village of Barra and risks to the property as a whole because of the situation in the country.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.58

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 8B.23**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Expresses its utmost concern for the country's current situation, the loss of life and potential risks to the property;
4. Notes the report sent by the State Party and the circumstances that hinder the implementation of responses to recommendations of the World Heritage Committee;
5. Maintains most of its previous recommendations and requests the State Party to:
 - a) Continue and extend the policy of protection and conservation of the cultural landscapes, notably through the revision of the Antiquities Law,
 - b) Increase the number of guards for the parks with the least number or those most exposed to illegal activity,
 - c) Confirm that Park No.1 (Saint Simeon Sanctuary) is not affected by a project for high voltage power lines,
 - d) Confirm that the visual integrity of Park No. 5 (Jebel Zawiye) is not compromised by large quarry and / or industrial projects,
 - e) Promptly complete the land surveys for each of the parks, under the General Directorate for Antiquities and Museums (DGAM)'s supervision,
 - f) Maintain throughout the management transition period, DGAM's prerogatives for the supervision of the preservation and conservation of the property,
 - g) Provide the 'Maison du patrimoine' and park management centres with the human and material resources commensurate with their new missions for the protection, conservation, and economic and tourism development of the property as stipulated in the Management Plan,
 - h) Finalize the Management Plan and the Action Plan with a schedule of actions considered suitable for the property's conservation and its expression of Outstanding Universal Value, together with their implementation timeframes,
 - i) Detail the monitoring indicators for the property's conservation as a function of the particularities of each site and as a function of more extensive landscape data;
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 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

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

International Assistance

Global amount granted to the property: USD 213,315

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/37/assistance>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

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

Previous monitoring missions

January 2012: Joint World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

As a follow up to Decision **35 COM 7B.59**, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre a report on the state of conservation of the property dated January 2012. It contains the decree cancelling inappropriate declassifications made from 1992 to 2008 (Decree No. 2011-11 of 10 March 2011 related to the National Archaeological Park of Carthage-Sidi Bou Saïd). This land management policy is continuing with the acquisition of land with funding from the 2012 budget of the National Heritage Institute (INP).

The State Party has embarked upon a major programme of restoration and enhancement at several sites including three important sectors: the amphitheater, the Antonin baths and the Maalga cisterns. This policy includes an increase in staff of the two teams working jointly for the conservation and enhancement of the property. Thus the number of heritage conservators has increased from two to ten, and the head architects from two to four, while the property and the museum each have their own responsible curator.

The report of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission that went to Carthage from 24 to 28 January 2012 emphasizes two types of damage affecting the property: aggression for financial profit and the development of infrastructures on the one hand, and negligence of the responsible authorities, on the other. The mission issued four recommendations, in addition to the revision of the property's boundaries. It stressed, as an absolute priority, the revision and implementation of the Management Plan (PPMV: Protection and Enhancement Plan); the development of a presentation plan and of a tourism Management Plan; the adoption of an archaeological and conservation strategy; the coordination of the tools and stakeholders involved in the management and preservation of the property. The mission report is available online at the following Internet address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/36COM>

a) Protection and Enhancement Plan (PPMV)

Produced between 1996 and 2003, the Protection and Enhancement Plan (PPMV) was never approved or submitted to the World Heritage Centre, nor applied. Following the 14 declassifications of land belonging to the Archaeological Park between 1992 and 2008, including two large-scale ones in 2006 and 2007, the Decree of 10 March 2011 allowed the return of the parcels within the protected area and the fixing of boundaries of the property to the perimeter of the site classified at the national level in 1985. To help resolve disputes arising from these previous situations, the joint reactive monitoring mission recommended a regrouping of the components of the PPMV of 1998 and 2003 and a synchronization of their procedures with that of the Urban Development Plan of Carthage. It stressed the urgency of accomplishing this rapidly and efficiently.

b) Presentation Plan and Tourism Management Plan

In order to give coherence to a scattered ensemble difficult to comprehend for non-specialists, the mission recommends the elaboration of a general presentation plan for the property, and of a tourism Management Plan. An efficient guidance of visitors would enable greater economic benefits and an interesting cultural appeal.

c) Archaeological and Conservation Strategy

In view of the lack of a comprehensive global strategy document on conservation and archaeological excavations, the mission members recommend its preparation be undertaken. Despite numerous restoration and enhancement interventions conducted in recent years and highlighted in both reports of the INP of 2011 and 2012, the mission recommends that priority improvements be made in areas of the circus, the Borj Boukhris, the park of Roman villas and the Maalga cisterns.

d) Coordination of tools and stakeholders involved in the management and preservation of the property

Currently, two separate bodies are responsible for the management and preservation of the property. As this situation causes misunderstandings and overlapping, the mission recommends the establishment of a coordination mechanism between the INP and the Heritage Enhancement and Cultural Promotion Agency (AMVPPC), to achieve a clear designation of functions and powers to be integrated into the Protection and Enhancement Plan (PPMV).

e) Retrospective Inventory and property boundaries

In response to previous requests and to the World Heritage Committee's Decision **35 COM 7B.59**, the State Party submitted on 31 January 2012 a map of "clarification of boundaries at the time of inscription", indicating a return to the boundaries classified at national level in 1985, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at this session (see document *WHC-12/36 COM/8D*). Previously, on 30 March 2011, the State Party had submitted a request for "minor boundary modifications" with regard to the creation of a buffer zone which will also be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document *WHC-12/36.COM/8B.Add*).

The joint mission recommends a revision of this perimeter and the components of the property to better correspond to the reality of the archaeological site today. Similarly, the creation of a buffer zone is expected to provide additional protection to the property.

Conclusion

Given the present circumstances, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies recognize the efforts of the State Party to respond to the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee. The cancellation of the decrees of declassification within the archaeological site of Carthage should be followed up with a land management policy emphasizing heritage as

opposed to private interests. The State Party should continue in this way to preserve the integrity of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies consider that the revision and adoption of the PPMV must be fulfilled through effective implementation. The four main recommendations of the joint reactive monitoring mission and the creation of the buffer zone, should enable the State Party to pursue the action it has undertaken.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.59

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.59**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Notes the report presented by the State Party and the information provided on the property's boundaries;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to continue its policy of land management of the areas in the archaeological zone to avoid alteration to the integrity of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to implement the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission of January 2012, including:*
 - a) *the revision, adoption and implementation of the Protection and Enhancement Plan for the property,*
 - b) *the elaboration of a Presentation Plan and a Tourism Management Plan,*
 - c) *the development of an archaeological and conservation strategy,*
 - d) *the coordination of preservation and management tools of the property, and coordination of the roles of the different stakeholders concerned;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014** a report on progress made in implementing the above recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (State of conservation report by the State Party not received)

ASIA-PACIFIC

61. Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodh Gaya (India) (C1056 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2002

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1056/documents>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
April 2005: Joint ICOMOS-World Heritage Centre mission; February 2011 Joint ICOMOS-ICCROM-World Heritage Centre mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Lack of co-ordinated and integrated management system;
b) Loss of character of the cultural landscape directly associated with the property and its outstanding universal value;
c) Lack of protection under national legislation.

Illustrative material
see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1056>

Current conservation issues

From 21 to 27 February 2011 a joint World Heritage Centre/ICCROM/ICOMOS monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). The mission report and its recommendations are available online: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/36COM/>.

A report on the state of conservation was provided by the State Party on 1 February 2012. This report addresses the continuing efforts towards the definition of a buffer zone, and improvement of management cooperation, in particular with regard to pilgrim management and protection of the landscape setting. It further discusses the Committee's requests to re-nominate the property as a cultural landscape and to increase its legal protection by listing it as a national monument.

a) *State of Conservation of the property, in particular the Bodhi Tree*

The State Party reports that the overall state of conservation of the property is satisfactory and that the Bodhi Tree had been attested as sound and healthy, following the latest report of the Forest Research Institute, Dehradun, India, in January 2012. The joint World Heritage Centre/ICCROM/ICOMOS monitoring mission equally confirmed the satisfactory overall state of conservation and commended the State Party for its efforts, but at the same time also noted that the landscape setting remains vulnerable.

b) *Buffer zone, setting and re-nomination of the property as a cultural landscape*

Following the report of the State Party, the potential re-nomination of the property as a cultural landscape caused difficulties, predominantly as a result of the immense development pressure in the broader urban and rural setting. The State Party therefore proposes to further study the possibility of extending the property as a serial site, to include several other sites associated to the life of the Lord Buddha.

The joint World Heritage Centre/ICCROM/ICOMOS mission shared the concerns of the State Party with regard to a potential re-nomination as a cultural landscape and recommended adopting a two step approach. As the first step, the State Party would, on the basis of the present boundaries of the property, define an appropriate buffer zone and establish regulations for its protection as a matter of priority. Following this, further investigations concerning the feasibility of a serial extension to the property would be conducted, aimed at conceptualizing this serial approach as an additional means of wider landscape protection.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the World Heritage Committee consider this approach, but note that once the boundaries for the new buffer zone are established, strict development regulations would need to be established and regional development plans would need to be revisited. They further recommend conducting capacity-building activities for all local stakeholders aimed at raising awareness for World Heritage management requirements and reversing the apparent misconception that World Heritage status is an obstacle to local development.

c) *Site and visitor management*

The Bodhgaya Temple Management Committee (BTMC) is the responsible authority for the site management, and it works in close cooperation with the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) whenever necessary. The State Party report outlines that the central management concern is visitor pressures from the steadily growing number of pilgrims. In a recent peak, the property was visited by more than 300,000 pilgrims within a mere 15 days on the occasion of the Kalachakra Initiation held at the beginning of 2012.

The February 2011 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM monitoring mission recommended that the State Party conduct a one-year study of pilgrimage patterns and visitor behavior to better understand the pressures and develop possible mitigation strategies. From this study, a comprehensive pilgrim management strategy should be developed.

d) *Improving legal protection at the national level*

As discussed with the State Party during the February 2011 mission and following a careful analysis of the pros and cons of a legal protection as a national monument, the State Party requested to retain the property's special legal status, which is protected under the Bodhgaya Temple Act of 1949. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the current management coordination by the BTMC and its cooperation with the ASI and the State Government of Bihar on the basis of this Act are indeed successful. They further accept the position that the status of a national monument would cause legal and financial obstacles to the use and function of the temple as a living pilgrimage site. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies therefore support the pragmatic approach currently applied and suggest to strengthen and build up existing mechanisms and work within the legal framework already put into place through the State Government of Bihar so as to provide BTMC formalized status within the strategic management framework and Management Plan of the property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies commend the State Party for the efforts made and the satisfactory state of conservation of the property, including the sacred Bodhi Tree. They concur with the recommendations of the February 2011 mission that the

landscape setting is still vulnerable and requires urgent protection through a balanced vision which integrates the requirements of conservation, pilgrimage and community development, and through the formal designation of an adequate buffer zone for the immediate setting as well as adequate protective regulations for the proposed buffer zone as a matter of priority.

As a mid-term strategy, a serial extension of the property to include other sites with outstanding associations to the life of the Lord Buddha could be envisaged. Based on the established buffer zone, the Management Plan and the regional development plans need to be revised. They would suggest that the State Party take effective steps to enhance coordination through existing institutional frameworks in the national and State governments to mitigate any future threats which may arise through uncontrolled or unplanned urban and rural development that may affect the property's Outstanding Universal Value. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies support the pragmatic approach currently applied by the Bodhgaya Temple Management Committee (BTMC) to retain the property's special legal status, which is protected under the Bodhgaya Temple Act of 1949. Meanwhile, they recommend the State Party to conduct capacity-building activities for all local stakeholders concerned to raise awareness for World Heritage management requirements. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further recommend conducting a study on pilgrimage patterns to identify the most significant pressures and develop mitigation strategies.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.61

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.70**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Acknowledges the efforts made by the State Party to address the conservation issues at the property; and notes the pragmatic approach currently applied by the Bodhgaya Temple Management Committee (BTMC) to retain its special legal status, under the Bodhgaya Temple Act of 1949;*
4. *Also notes the results of the February 2011 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission, endorses its recommendations on the satisfactory condition of the property, including the sacred Bodhi Tree, and requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *Ensure urgent protection of the vulnerable setting and the wider landscape through a balanced vision, which integrates conservation, pilgrimage and community development,*
 - b) *Formally designate an adequate buffer zone for the immediate setting of the property and appropriate protection for the wider landscape,*
 - c) *Identify, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies a two-step approach, firstly, an adequate buffer zone for the protection of the immediate setting as well as a regulatory framework for the protection of the wider landscape, following as second step, a serial extension of the property to include other sites with outstanding associations to the life of Lord Buddha,*
 - d) *Revise the Management Plan and the regional development plan in light of the proposed buffer zone boundaries and regulations; and conduct a study of pilgrimage patterns and visitor behaviour to identify the most significant*

pressures and develop, on this basis, a comprehensive visitor/pilgrims management strategy,

- e) Undertake capacity-building activities for all local stakeholders concerned to raise awareness of World Heritage management requirements;
5. Encourages the State Party to submit the designated buffer zone as a minor boundary modification;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.

62. Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1979

Criteria
(i) (v) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/115/documents/>

International Assistance
Total amount granted to the property: USD 2,752
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/intassistance/1657/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount provided to the property: 5,710 Euros (France/UNESCO Cooperation Agreement)

Previous monitoring missions
July 2002: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; October 2002, World Heritage Centre/World Bank mission, June 2004 and May 2005: UNESCO Tehran Office fact-finding missions; May 2006: World Heritage Centre mission; June 2006, December 2006, April 2007, October 2008, and October 2009: UNESCO Tehran advisory missions; March 2010: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Uncoordinated urban development - construction of a large scale commercial complex;
b) Subway route through the historical axis of Esfahan.

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/115>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2012, the State Party submitted a report which addressed the progress on the gradual demolition of storeys 11 and 12 of the Jahan-Nama Building as well as the Report on the "Monitoring of Isfahan metro effects along Chahar-Bagh". The report did, however, not address the revised plans for the metro line constructions, the Environmental or Heritage Impact Assessments as requested, or the integrated urban conservation and Management Plan.

a) Construction of metro lines

Metro Line 1

The State Party reports that, at the request of the Iranian Cultural Heritage, Handicrafts and Tourism Organisation, an investigation into the possible damages that the construction and operation of the metro could cause was carried out by the School of Engineering of the University of Science and Technology. According to these studies, there will be no short term nor long term damages to the monumental buildings from the Isfahan metro. The research proposed the introduction of a permanent and continuous system for monitoring vibrations at adjacent monumental buildings and the reduction of vibrations through surface traffic by:

- i) Repair of asphalt defects in the vicinity of monumental structures;
- ii) Relocation of bus and car stations to at least 100 m away from the monumental structures located on the Chahar-Bagh Boulevard;
- iii) Reduction of traffic density on the Chahar-Bagh Boulevard, Si-o-se Pol Bridge and Chahar Bagh Madrasa and
- iv) Prevention of heavy vehicles (truck and trailers) from driving on the Avenue or in vicinity to the Si-o-se Pol Bridge and Chahar Bagh Madrasa.

Metro Line 2

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that in 2010 the State Party had assured that the metro line 2, initially planned to be routed underneath Meidan Esfahan, would be rerouted.

They note that public media reports claim that despite requests by UNESCO and the Isfahan Cultural Heritage, Tourism and Handicrafts Organization, the drilling of tunnels for metro line 2 has commenced along its original routing.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that information on the scope and status of the project needs to be provided by the State Party as a matter of urgency to allow for a review of its potential impacts on the property.

b) Integrated urban conservation and Management Plan

The report submitted by the State Party does not describe efforts or progress in the development of a decision-making and approval strategy for new constructions in the historic axis of Esfahan. However, the nomination dossier and the related Management Plan for the historic axis of Esfahan is under preparation and will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre in late 2012.

c) Jahan-Nama Building

Following the commitment made in 2006, the demolition of the 11th and 12th storey of the Jahan-Nama Building has been pursued. The 12th storey is completely removed, in the 11th storey the walls have been demolished but work continues in the removal of the internal structures due to technical difficulties. Although the initially foreseen timeframe has been considerably expanded, it can nevertheless be said that a possible completion of demolition could be achieved by the end of 2012.

d) Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and property boundaries

As a very early nomination inscribed in 1979, the Meidan Esfahan has not been inscribed with clearly defined boundaries or a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. The State Party has provided the World Heritage Centre with a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for review. As the basis of the requested management and integrated urban conservation plans, the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be adopted and clearly defined property and buffer zone boundaries need to be provided.

Conclusion

While the demolition of the Jahan-Nama Building has continued and seems to be completed soon, other progress seems to have been made for the extension nomination dossier and its related Management Plan. Reports in the public media suggest that the construction of metro line 2 has continued, but these reports could not be validated. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider it essential that information and documentation on this project be provided as a matter of urgency in order to clarify whether or not the metro line has been rerouted and whether work has commenced. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend to the World Heritage Committee to request a joint reactive monitoring mission to the property to consider the impact of the current metro constructions on the property and its wider setting.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.62

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34COM 7B.71**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note of the further reduction in height of the Jahan-Nama Building and reiterates its request to the State Party to confirm as soon as possible, in writing, to the World Heritage Centre, that the demolition has been completed;*
4. *Requests the State Party to submit, as a matter of urgency, to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, detailed information and documentation on the proposed route of metro line 2;*
5. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to develop a Management Plan for the property, in consultation with all stakeholders, and to ensure that this Management Plan becomes part of a larger strategic vision for integrated urban development and conservation;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to consider the impact of the current metro constructions on the property and its wider setting;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit maps precisely indicating the property boundaries and buffer zone;*
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 property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

63. Town of Luang Prabang (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 479rev)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

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

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (State of conservation report by the State Party not received)

65. 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

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/666/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted to the property: USD 70 000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/list/666/assistance/>

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; Euro 5,000 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

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/666>, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/632>

Current conservation issues

On 30 January 2012 the State Party submitted a report outlining the progress in the development of the Integrated Management Plan (IMP), activities for the conservation of archaeological remains and archeological surveys. Within the framework of the UNESCO Japan Funds-in-Trust (FIT) project for the “conservation and management of Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha” and the Oriental Cultural Heritage Sites Protection Alliance, eight international missions have been organised by UNESCO between 2011 and March 2012 to assist the Department of Archaeology and the Lumbini Development Trust in various aspects, in particular the development and finalization of the IMP.

a) *Integrated Management Plan (IMP)*

Based on four consultation and training workshops with stakeholders, a draft Integrated Management Framework document was produced and will be submitted to the Cabinet for adoption by the Government of Nepal. Once the Cabinet has adopted the Integrated Management Framework, the management system will be implemented on a trial basis during the fiscal year July 2012 to July 2013. Thereafter, the implementation section of the IMP will accordingly be finalized and, if necessary, further refined.

b) *Planned development projects*

The report notes that various projects are planned in and around Lumbini. These include an improvement scheme of the site infrastructure, presentation and visitor facilities supported by the Asian Development Bank (USD 12,750,000); the Greater Lumbini Master Plan project, which aims to create a World Peace City, covering an area of three districts (Rupandehi, Kapilavastu and Nawalparashi) and is being prepared in cooperation with the Korean International Cooperation Agency (KOICA); the proposed world's highest Buddha statue to be erected in the New Lumbini Village, outside the World Heritage property. The State Party expresses in its report, that these projects will not have any impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies do not fully share this view point with regard to some of the proposed development projects, and they reiterate that any decision on these proposals should be based on a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidelines on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties, and also be considered in the framework of the finalized IMP. In addition, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that notice on any planned development should be given as soon as possible, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

c) *Environmental degradation as result of industrial activity*

The State Party noted that an Environmental Impact Assessment of Industrial Development around Lumbini had been carried out by IUCN, Nepal, and that a draft report had been presented in August 2011. Following this, the Industrial Promotion Board of the Government of Nepal decided to prohibit the establishment of new industrial activities in and around Lumbini World Heritage property. Specifically, the prohibition states, that an area within 15 km from the northern, eastern and western boundaries of the Lumbini Project Area (1 mile x 3 miles as per Prof. Kenzo Tange's Master Plan) and towards the south up to the Indian boarder and 800 meter on both sides of the Lumbini - Bhairahawa corridor will be off limits for the establishment of new industries, except for those which do not emit carbon". The State Party has further contacted the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) for technical assistance to address the existing environmental degradation of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the environmental situation has worsened over the past years and that industrial development could adversely impact the setting of the property, part of which was considered as an extension at the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010). They further consider that for any future proposals, a Heritage Impact Assessment should be undertaken to consider the potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and its setting, as part of the wider Environmental Impact Assessments.

d) *Other issues*

The UN Secretary General and the UNESCO Director General are considering an international initiative in collaboration with the State Party to raise awareness of the need for better preservation and management of the property possibly through the establishment of an International Expert Committee for the Safeguarding of Lumbini in the framework of the Japan FIT project.

Several restoration projects have been implemented with the assistance of international partners, among them the in-situ restorations of Ashoka Pillar, the Nativity Sculpture and the Marker Stone. Archeological surveys confirmed the presence of Pre-Ashokan layers in Maya Devi Temple.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies hope that, through this initiative, a shared vision can be built by the national and international partners working at the property.

The Committee may take note of the progress made with respect to the development of the IMP but observe with concern the various development projects proposed and urge the need for a comprehensive Heritage Impact Assessments to be conducted to determine their potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The various missions and activities being undertaken should be in conformity with the IMP and the overall vision established for the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The State Party should further be encouraged to continue its efforts to reduce industrial activity in the property vicinity and develop programmes for environmental regeneration.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.65

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.74**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Notes the progress in developing the Integrated Management Plan (IMP) as well as the conservation measures taken for the property;*
4. *Requests the State Party to continue its work on the finalization of the Integrated Management Plan (IMP), and to continue its commitment to not approving any development project within the property or in the adjacent areas identified as having potential archaeological significance before the completion of the IMP and before conducting Heritage Impact Assessments, in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidelines on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to continue to develop also strategies to further reduce industrial activity in the vicinity of the property; and requests that for any future proposals an Heritage Impact Assessment should be undertaken to consider the potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and its setting, as part of a wider Environmental Impact Assessment, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre detailed information on any proposed major restoration or new construction in the vicinity of the property, 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 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.*

66. Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late finalization of the mission report)

67. Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late mission)

68. Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

69. Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603rev)

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
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/603/documents/>

International Assistance
Total amount granted to the property: USD 29,800
For details, see page + <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/603/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
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/603>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2012, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report in response to the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session, (Decision **35 COM 7B.80**). The report addressed the following:

a) *The scope and extent of the general plan 2010-2015*

The State Party states that the main goal of the general plan is the preservation of attributes of historical heritage; it is responsible for establishing the boundaries of the six districts of Samarkand. The property and buffer zone lie within the Central Planning District where all construction must comply with Uzbekistan's cultural heritage legislation. The general plan stipulates that all works within the property and buffer zone, be they infrastructure, traffic control or conservation works, will be controlled by the Management Plan.

b) *Clarification on the major Conservation and Restoration proposals in the general plan*

The report states that June 2011 saw the approval of the "State program on research, conservation, restoration and adaptation for up to date utilization of Samarkand cultural property up to 2015" and the Regional Tourism Development Plan. 22 projects are listed and those targeted for 2011-12 have been approved. Within the general plan, property preservation activities are developed for the condition analysis and partial preventative intervention into damaged or vulnerable structures of both large ensembles and separate monuments.

c) *Scope of World Bank Water and Sewage projects and impact on archaeological and historic structures*

The State Party reports that this project is rectifying the lack of a sewage system and inadequate water supply in the historic city centre but that appropriate monitoring by the Board of Monuments has ensured that no archaeological damage has occurred and there has been no negative impact on the property.

d) *Progress on and scope of the Management Plan*

International assistance organised subsequent to the 2009 mission has facilitated the significant progress with the preparation of the Management Plan, drafted in 2006 but now considerably expanded in scope. The Plan will include all requested issues – strategic and infrastructure planning, conservation projects and tourist development, and will ensure cooperation between government bodies, public organizations and other partners.

The report details progress on the preparation of the Management Plan, including the establishment of a working group and an action plan to oversee the work, the establishment of a database, submission of the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and the adoption of a Master Plan, Conservation Plan and Intervention Guidelines. Two Workshops with UNESCO/ICOMOS expert participation have been held and a third is planned for March 2012 to define the Management System. Liaison with stakeholders and government bodies is underway with new legislation being implemented to provide for funding for restoration projects. The preparation of conservation approaches for the different components of the property and the establishment of a management framework is set to be completed by March 2012. A Workshop is to be held in June 2012 for finalising the documents, with the aim of submission to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2013.

e) *New Urban Development projects*

The State Party reports that at present neither large construction nor infrastructure projects are foreseen within the property.

However this does not appear to reflect road proposals, details of which are included in the report. The maps provided show an overall traffic scheme with bypass roads, some within the property. This includes one road which has been moved slightly away from city walls in order to "respect historic topography of the Temurid period". No further details of these road

schemes are provided, such as approvals, timescales, details of width and construction, and whether or not impact assessments have been undertaken.

f) *State of conservation*

The State Party reports on the state of conservation of four districts of the property and the buffer zone. It notes that the roads through Afrosiab City are now only used for tourist routes and emergency vehicles, as requested in the 2007 mission report. The State Party lists the restoration and conservation work carried out in Timurid in 2011, and plans for the European City and the Three Monument Ensemble enclaves from 2011 to 2015, as targeted projects undertaken in accordance with the 2011 State programme. Within the Buffer Zone, the campaign of removal of modern and inappropriate structures will be continued with the budgets in place. The hotel and garage near the Siab market have already been removed.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the considerable progress towards the completion of the Management Plan due for submission in February 2013, as also the Conservation Plan and Intervention Guidelines, and the establishment of conservation approaches for different areas of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies underscore the need for the Management Plan to contain details of conservation principles to be adopted during conservation and restoration projects both for large monuments and traditional urban structures, as well as the methodology for their implementation through the scientific monitoring system advocated previously.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the maps provided on the overall traffic scheme for Samarkand, including new roads within the property and its buffer zone. They recall that the widening of the road between Arosiab and Timurid which was considered by the Committee to have a negative impact on the property, prompted the Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) to request the development of an overall traffic scheme for Samarkand in order to minimise traffic through the property. Such a scheme has not yet been submitted and needs to be developed in detail and submitted to the World Heritage Committee for its approval before any commitment is made on individual road improvements proposals and bypass schemes.

Various proposals advocated within the 2007 mission report are not mentioned in the 2011 nor the 2012 state of conservation reports, such as the reconstruction, landscaping and speed reduction of the new four lane road between Arosiab and Timurid, the relocation of parking areas and the prioritisation of conservation projects on traditional houses.

Overall it is recommended that the State Party should ensure that large development or infrastructure projects that will affect the property and Buffer Zone, including roads, are reported to the World Heritage Committee before their approval, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.69**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.80**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Welcomes the progress made by the State Party in the preparation of the Management Plan and encourages the State Party to continue its cooperation with Ministry of

Culture, local authorities, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to finalize the Management Plan for submission by **1 February 2013** for review by ICOMOS;

4. Requests the State Party to ensure that the Management Plan contains a clear articulation of conservation principles for restoration and conservation of historic structures and especially of the traditional urban fabric, and also contains the system of monitoring to ensure their implementation;
5. Notes the maps provided for an overall traffic scheme for the Samarkand area which includes proposed new roads in the property and its buffer zone, and also requests the State Party, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to develop and submit to the World Heritage Centre, as a matter of urgency, a draft traffic scheme including the size of the roads, traffic use and timescales for construction, to the World Heritage Centre for assessment by the Advisory Bodies, before any commitments are made to individual road proposals, as well as information concerning proposed, new constructions including parking schemes before their approval;
6. Further requests that once the overall draft traffic scheme has been scrutinised by the World Heritage Committee any detailed road proposals should be subject to an Heritage Impact Assessment in accordance with ICOMOS Guidance;
7. Also notes the list of proposed conservation projects within the State program up to 2015 and reiterates the recommendations of the 2007 mission report that priority should be given to the conservation of traditional houses;
8. Further notes the State Party's assertion that, at the current stage of urban development, neither new large constructions nor crucial infrastructure works are foreseen within the property and also reiterates the recommendation of the 2007 mission report that priority should be given to parking issues within the property and to mitigation of the impact of the four lane road between Afrosiab and Timurid;
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, including submission of the completed Management Plan and draft Traffic scheme for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

70. Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley (Andorra) (C 1160bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1160/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

Delay in the finalization of the Management Plan and completion of the entomological inventory for the property

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1160>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2012, in application of the decision taken at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) by the World Heritage Committee, the State Party submitted three examples of the revised Management Plan concerning the property, in Catalan and French, as well as a progress report on the implementation of the Management Plan. The State Party informed that the Management Plan entered into force on 28 December 2011, after having been approved in November 2011 by each of the four *Comuns* (the four local administrations concerned with the management of the Valley) on which territory where the property is located

According to the State Party report, the Management Commission comprises four members. Each of the four *Comuns* (Encamp, Andorra la Vella, Sant Julià de Lòria and Escaldes-Engordany) commissions a member who must be the *Consol* (elected member who is the chief of the *Comù*) or a municipal councillor. The annual budget concerning the implementation of the Management Plan was adopted on 29 December 2011. According to the State Party, the designation of the Director, as well as the effective programme development should begin during the first half of 2012.

Furthermore, the State Party emphasizes that the Ministry of Culture now has a dual role. On the one hand, complying with the body responsible for the management of the Valley, it has a role of counsel prior to decision-taking; on the other hand, in respect of the 9/2003 Law for Cultural Heritage of Andorra, it is the guarantor for the conservation of the property.

The State Party also submitted a Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for this property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the entry into force of the « Management Plan of the Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley ».

They consider that the Management Plan has been carefully crafted to provide a satisfactory structure for the management of the property, bringing together representatives of the four *Comuns* within an overall legal framework. Moreover, they consider that there are three areas where further clarification or development is needed:

1. The management objectives need to be clarified in relation to the Outstanding Universal Value for which the property was inscribed. As soon as the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value will be approved by the Committee, this should become the cornerstone of the Management Plan and the attributes that convey Outstanding Universal Value. In order to achieve this, a clear definition of its tangible and intangible attributes will need to be set out. This is relevant to paragraphs 1.1 and 5.1 of the Management Plan.
2. At the time of inscription, the World Heritage Committee encouraged the State Party to provide an access strategy which supports the needs of those activities necessary for the sustainable development of the Valley; this was recommended because of concerns over roads being developed within the Valley. The Management Plan is currently ambiguous on this point, as it states that "funding for vehicular access in the Valley....will be subject to specific agreement between the Government and *Comuns*". An overall access strategy needs to be developed.
3. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the emphasis on pastoralism and the promotion of local produce, but consider that there is scope to strengthen the Management Plan in order to link traditional processes to sustainable development of the property, as recommended by the Committee at its 28th session: "allowing for agricultural uses to support conservation and ecological objectives of built and natural assets".

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the World Heritage Committee invite the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed of any changes concerning this Management Plan and to submit a progress report on the implementation of the Management Plan in the framework of the Periodic Reporting Exercise.

Draft decision: 36 COM 7B.70

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.75**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note with satisfaction of the approval and entry into force of the "Management Plan of the Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley" on 28 December 2011;*
4. *Requests the State Party to update the Management Plan as soon as the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is adopted by the Committee;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to present a global access strategy for the property, as requested by the Committee at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004);*

6. *Invites the State Party to submit a progress report on the implementation of the above recommendations to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies within the second cycle of Periodic Reporting.*

71. Walled City of Baku (Azerbaijan) (C 958)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late finalization of the mission report)

72. Historic Centre of Brugge (Belgium) (C 996)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2000

Criteria
(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/996/documents/>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
March 2010: World Heritage/ICOMOS mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Potential impacts of new construction projects
- b) Gradual erosion of the attributes that convey the Outstanding Universal Value and consequently threaten the integrity of the property with regards to its overall coherence and originality.

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/996/>

Current conservation issues

The factors affecting the property, identified by the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission of March 2010, remain relevant. Following notice of two new projects (see below) within the perimeter of the property and likely to affect its integrity, the World Heritage Centre, recalling the provision of Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, requested comments from the State Party (letter of 27 December 2010). The local authority of Brugge replied (February 2011) as did the Belgian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO (29 March 2011). On 31 January 2012, the State Party transmitted a report on the progress made in the implementation of the Committee recommendations made during its 34th session in 2010 (Decision **34 COM 7B.79**). Moreover, a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property was sent on 28 January 2011 and is currently under review by ICOMOS. The State Party report indicates that, following the joint mission, the

Municipality of Brugge adopted on 25 June 2010, an action plan in response to the recommendations formulated in the mission report.

a) Responses to the Committee recommendations

The Management Plan, the final version of which is foreseen for summer 2012, in particular concerns the protection of urban canal parcels, the green belt of fortifications, green areas or those free of buildings, and monuments of a historical and/or architectural character. It must combine this protection with the need for economic revitalization of the historic centre and improvement of the quality of life, attractiveness of the historical and contemporary aspects of the city, as well as the development of tourism, commerce and the economy in general.

It is clear that this dual objective is not easily achievable. Especially since, in the light of regional and national legislation, the State Party considers that the overall protection of the perimeter of the property, recommended by the Committee under the national classification of “urban landscape”, is not possible: this would lead to insoluble problems of a legal or judicial nature. However, a Decree concerning intangible heritage and the notion of “protected landscape” is currently being prepared. More detailed information on the content and the level of protection that this notion encompasses might enable a satisfactory solution in line with the dual objectives of the Management Plan. Additional information on the notion of “protected landscapes” provided by the State Party would be appreciated.

b) The Prédikherenrei (National Archives Centre)

Construction work progressed considerably during the 2010-2011 period and in February 2012, and the roof is now ready to be placed in position. Without repeating the arguments presented (Annex 2 of the State Party report and the Permanent Delegation letter of 29 March 2011), the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the various warnings expressed in 2010 by the World Heritage Committee and the joint mission, have not produced any modification to the project prior to the commencement of the works.

This case is an indication of the gradual erosion of the urban fabric flagged up by the joint mission in 2010. In respect to this project, there has been no prior information sent by the State Party to the Secretariat of the World Heritage Committee, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The letter of the Permanent Delegation of 29 March 2011 mentions multiple concertations but no specific date of dispatch of this information to the Secretariat of the Committee, whereas officially the project has been studied since 2004 and the public presentation took place in December 2009.

c) The Minnewaterpark Terrace

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the ongoing procedure referred to (Annex 2 of the State Party report) in no way exonerates the Brugge authorities from anticipating the possible consequences of economic development projects mentioned therein. The site in question – in the perimeter of the property – and its area, require a harmonious integration of any large-scale project. Lacking this, any such project would certainly increase the erosion of the authenticity and integrity of the property.

d) General aspects of the property

Since the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission report of March 2010, the Historic Centre of Brugge continues to undergo negative erosion to its major characteristics upon which is based its Outstanding Universal Value. This phenomenon is due, among other things, to the numerous new construction projects appearing one after another, involving the demolition of older buildings judged to be of little or no heritage value.

In the light of the recommendations of the joint mission and the Committee, transmitted by the State Party to the city of Brugge, the city set up a control procedure for demolitions, presented in its response of February 2011 (p. 4/6). The city has added a chapter to its town planning code (Chapter 4 : *Protection of UNESCO World Heritage, Article 9, point B :*

Demolition) which prohibits the demolition of monuments presenting a historic value and/or a value linked to the urban landscape views. However, an exception can be made : when the replacement building foreseen in the project possesses a « sufficient architectural quality ». This new rule becomes law and introduces ambiguity in its interpretation.

The categorization into of seven levels of heritage value of the monuments follows along the same lines of possible reinterpretation. The scientific aspect is interesting. However, it is to be feared that it will leave the door open to eventual convenient delistings and thus demolitions.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider, in view of earlier controversial discussions regarding projects that do not take full account of the long historical context in the development of the Historic Centre of Brugge, that the management of the property does not have sufficient and adequate control over the development projects that have a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

They recognize the efforts of the State Party in the implementation of the recommendations in Decision **34 COM 7B.79** of the Committee, but consider that these efforts should be pursued by the State Party as concerns the implementation of points c), d) and e) of this decision.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge the efforts of the State Party in the preparation of the Management Plan. However, they recommend that the Committee request the State Party to finalise this Plan in 2013, also taking into account the *UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Historic Urban Landscape (November 2011)* and to ensure that the management of the property is based on the recognition of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and of Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft decision: 36 COM 7B.72

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decisions **33 COM 7B.94** and **34 COM 7B.79**, adopted respectively at its 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions,
3. Recognizes the efforts of the State Party in the preparation of the Management Plan and requests the State Party to finalise this Plan, also taking into account the *UNESCO Recommendation concerning the Historic Urban Landscape (November 2011)* and to submit it in 2013 to the World Heritage Centre for examination by the Advisory Bodies, and to ensure that the management of the property is based on the recognition of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and reiterates recommendations c), d) and e) of Decision **34 COM 7B.7** adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) ;
4. Also reiterates its concern regarding the gradual erosion of the attributes that convey the Outstanding Universal Value, as continued erosion is a threat to the integrity of the property;
5. Also requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, of any project presenting a potential impact to the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property;

6. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a detailed report on the progress achieved in the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

73. 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

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/616/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2008 and 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

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/616>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2012, a report on the state of conservation of the Historic Centre of Prague was submitted by the State Party in response to the World Heritage Committee's Decision **35 COM 7B.89**. This report addresses all items requested by the Committee and contains additional information in response to all recommendations of the 2010 reactive monitoring mission, on current conservation issues identified by the national authorities as well as a description of all major restoration, conservation or construction works that took place since the last report in 2011, including information on works planned in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The State Party also submitted a request for a minor modification to the buffer zone, which will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document WHC-12/36.COM/8B.Add).

a) Limitations on high-rise developments

The State Party reported that while a new land-use plan is under development, an intermediate amendment to the existing land-use plan had been finalized and is awaiting approval of the Prague City Assembly expected in the first quarter of 2012. The amendment defines buildings of excessive height in three categories: (1) buildings above 40 meters, (2) buildings of significant mass or volume not complying with the standard city proportions, and (3) buildings, which may impact panoramic views. Once the Decree is approved, the area in which buildings of excessive height are banned will have been enlarged and 3D skyline

models will determine criteria and benchmarks for exceptional approval of excessive heights outside the prohibition zone.

The Pankrác Plain will be included in the zone in which excessive height buildings are entirely banned. The State Party also reports that the construction permissions of the Epoque skyscrapers, issued before the World Heritage Committee recommendation on height limits in its Decision **32 COM 7B.86**, were successfully revoked in August 2011. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider the land-use plan amendment, once passed, an important achievement in the protection of the historic centre of Prague and welcome the information that the construction permission of the Epoque towers was finally revoked.

b) Physical downgrading of the Eastern Highway

Following the recommendation of the 2010 reactive monitoring mission the State Party is committed to physically downgrade the North-South Trunk Road (Eastern Highway) as soon as the Blanca tunnel provides an alternative route, which is expected for 2014. At present, a new concept for the transformation of the North-South Trunk Road is under preparation and shall be based on principles of converting the road to an urban boulevard by reducing its width to two lanes and introducing pedestrian and bicycle paths.

c) Vyšehrad and Žižkov Stations

The rehabilitation of Vyšehrad Station according to the State Party will involve restoration and repairs to the historic structure and construction of two new buildings in its vicinity, which will not exceed the standard height and proportions of surrounding buildings. The rehabilitation has not yet been approved by the respective building permission authority. For Žižkov Station visualization studies of the different proposals had been prepared. However, since in the meantime the Ministry of Culture requested to declare the group of buildings a cultural monument, all plans will need to be revised, since none of these plans was in accordance with the regulations and restrictions imposed for cultural monuments. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS welcome the information on a request for declaration of the Žižkov Station as a cultural monument and would like to be kept informed about emerging new proposals.

d) Regulations applying to infill, rehabilitation and conservation

In 2009, the City Council adopted the "Concept for a more efficient care for the heritage in the City of Prague" prepared by the Culture, Monument Care and Tourism Department. It includes methodological guidelines for urban interior solutions specifically for the area of the property as well as a methodology for assessing new structures and annexes. Following a resolution of the City Council on 30 August 2011, these methods will be further developed and specified on the basis of a comprehensive four-phase architectural and urban analysis of the property.

e) Management Plan

In 2009 the State Party had submitted a draft Management Plan for the property. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS encourage the State Party to finalize this Management Plan, taking into account the comments provided by ICOMOS in May 2009 and the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in 2010, and submit the finalized Management Plan for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS welcome the information received and acknowledge the progress made. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to notify the World Heritage Centre once the amendment to the land-use plan has been officially adopted by the City Assembly, and to pursue the development of proposals for the physical downgrading of the North-South Trunk Road and the finalization of

the Management Plan. They further recommend encouraging the State Party to continue informing the World Heritage Centre, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, about any envisaged developments before making decisions that may be difficult to reverse.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.73

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.89**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Welcomes the information that the building permissions for the Epoque Towers on the Pankrác Plain have been revoked and acknowledges the progress towards a land-use plan amendment extending the height restriction zone on the basis of a ban on buildings of excessive height and detailed regulations for the authorisation of high buildings outside the prohibition zone;*
4. *Requests the State Party to notify the World Heritage Centre when the amendment to the land-use plan has been passed by the Prague City Assembly;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to provide the finalized Management Plan to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2013**;*
6. *Encourages the State Party to continue informing the World Heritage Centre, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, about any envisaged developments, major restorations or rehabilitations;*
7. *Further 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 the progress towards a design for downgrading the North-South Trunk Road and the rehabilitation plans for Vyšehrad and Žižkov Stations.*

74. Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay (France) (C 80 bis)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late finalization of the mission report)

75. Provins, Town of Medieval Fairs (France) (C 873 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2001

Criteria
(ii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/873/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

Revision of the ZPPAUP weakening the legal protection of the property

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/873>

Current conservation issues

In application of the decision taken during its 34th session by the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010), the State Party submitted a report on 31 January 2012.

In response to the first request by the Committee to review the decision concerning the revision of the ZPPAUP (Architectural, Urban and Landscape Heritage Protection Zones), the State Party indicates that such a decision falls under the competence of the communes and the State has no legal power to review it. In this case, with regard to the Provins ZPPAUP, the State is unable to review the procedure for revision which was finalised in 2008.

However, the State Party draws attention to the fact that the modified elements of the regulation of this ZPPAUP cannot be applied because the procedure in force requires that the Local Urban Plan (PLU) be in conformity with the ZPPAUP. Whereas, the PLU of Provins, approved by the Municipal Council on 30 June 2008, was cancelled by a judgement of the Administrative Tribunal on 24 November 2011. Consequently, the revision of the ZPPAUP is obsolete.

Furthermore, the State Party informs of the necessarily limited duration of the Provins ZPPAUP due to the 12 July 2010 law that requires the transformation of the ZPPAUPs into architecture and heritage enhancement areas (AVAP) before 15 July 2015.

The State Party confirms that it would ensure the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and its integrity, in the framework of the transformation of the ZPPAUP into AVAP. In the event that the Mayor of Provins should not wish to transform the ZPPAUP into AVAP, protection levels around the historical monuments (31 December 1913 Law) and sites would be reestablished and would then apply to Provins.

In November 2011, the World Heritage Centre was informed about the project for a wind farm at Châlautre-la-Grande, 9 km from the property. The information was transmitted to the State Party for their comments. In response to this request, and in conformity with the Committee request of 2010 to « provide the World Heritage Centre with detailed information and impact studies of any project affecting the property before granting any irreversible authorization », the State Party indicates that all the State services concerned had issued unfavourable advice with regard to this wind farm project. Moreover, the State Party informs of another wind farm project in Villenauxe-la-Grande, 15 km from Provins. After having received a favourable opinion from the State services, the Commission for Sites and the Investigating Commissioner, the building permit for this project was refused by the Prefects of Seine-et-Marne and the Aube.

In response to the last request of the Committee to submit a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and the progress achieved in the implementation of the

recommendations of the Committee, the State Party informs of a system of financial assistance, established by the city of Provins to a level of 10 to 15% of the cost of the work relating to the façades and roofing viewed from the public area.

The State Party adds that in the framework of a convention between the State and the Town of Provins, concluded in December 2004, 16 million Euros (8 million from the Town and 8 million from the State) are devoted to the restoration of the historic monuments of the Town up until 2013. In this framework, work has been carried out on the curtain wall of the towers B and A, namely « aux Pourceaux » and on the restoration of different parts of the Saint Ayoul Church.

Furthermore, the State Party confirms that it will continue to work on an improved coherence of protection regulations pertaining to the different monuments of the Town.

The State Party also submitted a draft Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for this property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the information provided by the State Party concerning the revision of the Architectural, Urban, and Landscape Heritage Protection Zones (ZPPAUP) and the possible transformation of the Provins ZPPAUPs into architecture and heritage enhancement areas (AVAP) before 15 July 2015. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the national and local authorities to do their utmost to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value and the attributes conveying this value, and even strengthen them, in the framework of this or any other transformation process of protection regulations concerning the property.

They also take note of the unfavourable advice in respect to the two wind farm projects, as well as progress achieved in the implementation of the Committee recommendations.

They further recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed of any project that might have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and if need be, to use ICOMOS “*Guidance on heritage impact assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties*”, and to submit a report on any progress made in the implementation of the new regulations replacing the ZPPAUP.

Draft decision: 36 COM 7B.75

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.84**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party in response to the concerns raised by the revision of the Architectural, Urban, and Landscape Heritage Protection Zones (ZPPAUP) and their possible transformation into architecture and heritage enhancement areas (AVAP) before 15 July 2015;*
4. *Notes with satisfaction of the convention between the State and the Town of Provins concluded on 9 December 2004, comprising 16 million Euros devoted to the restoration of historic monuments of the Town, as well as the unfavourable advice concerning the two wind farm projects;*
5. *Requests the State Party to do its utmost so that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and the attributes conveying this value be preserved, and even reinforced,*

in the framework of a transformation of the protection regulations concerning the property, and to inform the World Heritage Centre;

6. *Also requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed of any project that might have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and if need be, to use the ICOMOS Guidance on heritage impact assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties.*

76. Villa Adriana (Tivoli) (Italy) (C 907)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

77. Portovenere, Cinque Terre and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto) (Italy) (C 826)

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
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/826/documents/>

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
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/826/>

Current conservation issues

On 8 February 2012, a report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage property "Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto)" was submitted by the State Party.

a) Damages caused by floods of 26 October 2011

The state of conservation report specifically addressed the impact of severe flash flooding at the property on 26 October 2011. The report stated that cloudbursts around the towns of

Monterosso and Vernazza had been followed by landslides that had engulfed the settlements with water. No information has been provided as to damage to the landscape around the settlements.

Despite the damage suffered, the villages hit by the deluge are said to be still recognizable in terms of their buildings and urban layout. A first examination has shown limited damage to the old paving and to some buildings. The local authorities have already undertaken a general survey of the state of conservation and vulnerability of the historic buildings, and for each the cost of necessary recovery work has been estimated.

The report also states that further surveys are underway to obtain more details regarding the state of conservation of the property. Meanwhile, the Liguria region has taken steps to safeguard the areas affected by the floods through putting in place a ban on new building and on work to existing buildings that goes beyond mere conservation work. The Liguria region also intends to re-draw the maps of hydrogeological risk.

Three people in Vernazza and one person in Monterosso lost their lives in the floods. The press reported that streets in Vernazza and Monterosso were filled with rocks, mud and debris up to 5 metres deep after the disaster.

On 12 March 2012, the State Party invited an advisory mission to assess the overall state of conservation of the property and to provide technical advice on remedial measures and risk preparedness.

b) Others

On 31 January 2012, the State Party submitted a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to the World Heritage Centre. The statement is currently under review.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that further information will be necessary to assess the state of conservation of the property after the natural disaster of 26 October 2011. They understand that repairing the damages will require time and the support of the local community.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would like to express their readiness to offer what support and advice may be within their means.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.77

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Extends its sympathy to the victims of the floods of October 2011 and their families;
3. Takes note of the emergency response provided by the State Party and encourages the State Party to conduct a detailed survey in order to obtain further information on the state of conservation of the property;
4. Commends the steps undertaken by the regional authorities for the safeguarding of the property;
5. Notes that the State Party has invited an advisory mission to assess the overall state of conservation of the property and to provide technical advice on remedial measures and risk preparedness;

6. 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.

78. Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2000

Criteria
(v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/994/documents/>

International Assistance
Total amount granted to the property: USD 50,000
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/994/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
August 2001: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN mission; November 2003: World Heritage Centre mission; July 2009: ICOMOS/IUCN Technical Advisory mission (invited by Lithuania); December 2010: WHC/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Potential pollution from the oil exploitation of the D-6 oil field in the Baltic Sea by the Russian Federation;
- Lack of bilateral cooperation between Lithuania and the Russian Federation including joint assessment of environmental impact of the D-6 project;
- Impacts of sewage spill accident which took place at Klaipeda Water Treatment Station (Lithuania);
- New and possibly illegal constructions;
- Sand dunes erosion;
- Possible tourism economic zone in Kaliningrad.

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/994>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January and 1 February 2012, the Lithuanian and the Russian States Parties respectively submitted a state of conservation report that outlines joint activities between the two States Parties on the implementation of the recommendations of the joint UNESCO World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission (December 2010), as a follow-up to the World Heritage Committee Decision **35 COM 7B.99**.

- Designation of a New Economic Zone and Proposed new leisure complexes in the Kaliningrad region*

The mission reviewed four proposed large Leisure Complexes in the Kurshskaja Kosa National Park and recommended that these should not be constructed because of their adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It also considered that the identification of "The Tourist and Recreational Zone of the Curonian Spit", established by the Russian Federal Government in February 2007, should be reconsidered as it is not in conformity with the protection of the property.

The States Parties' report states that the proposed Economic Development Zone in the Kaliningrad region has been suspended and the regional government is considering the creation of an alternative area outside the property boundaries. No details are provided as to the status of the proposed leisure projects.

b) *Legal Protection*

The mission recommended that, in order to control development within the National Park (Russia), settlements should be delineated in order to define areas for houses and gardens that do not impact on the landscape. The State Party has reported that this has now been done. Furthermore, the mission recommended that all new construction, except those related to security and information, be forbidden on the fore-dunes and the dunes.

The States Parties' report states that, in the Lithuanian part of the property, new construction, except related to security and protection, on the fore-dune and the dunes is now strictly controlled and forbidden under the new planning regulations. New regulations for the Curonian Spit National Park (Russia) dated 1 September 2010 and adopted by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of the Russian Federation, forbid building any new constructions on the fore-dunes except structures related to safety (passes) and information (information boards along trekking trails).

c) *Need for coordinated management mechanism in line with the requirements of the Operational Guidelines;*

The mission recommended that the two States Parties prepare a joint draft Management Plan developing a joint vision and a platform of joint actions, as a precursor to the development of comprehensive joint Management Plan for the Curonian Spit to be prepared by 2013.

The States Parties' report states that on 29 April 2011 the administration of the two National Parks in Lithuania and the Russian Federation signed an agreement to strengthen management collaboration. In addition a two-year cooperation programme was prepared to cover all fields of collaboration. During 2011, the staff of both institutions organised several meetings and discussed the possibility of a new trans-boundary biosphere reserve and the requests of the World Heritage Committee. In respect of the latter, actions were agreed in relation to preparing a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, a joint tourism strategy (see below), a joint traffic Management Plan by 31 March 2012, and the structure of a joint Management Plan by 1 April 2012. They are also planning a common workshop in September 2012 with representatives of the World Heritage Centre.

d) *Overall tourism strategy*

The mission recommended that planning regulations needed to be established in the Russian Federation which might identify appropriate areas for small scale sustainable touristic development. The States Parties' report states that Zones for development of small scale sustainable tourism were identified during 2011 in the zoning of the Curonian Spit National Park (Russia). The joint Tourism Strategy will consider the pre-conditions for sustainable tourism and gather data on carrying capacities using work in a small area in Lithuania as a pilot project. In terms of timetable, it is stated that the Tourism Strategy will be presented to the 37th session of the Committee in 2013.

e) *Fire Protection*

The mission recommended that systems for detection and defence against fires be included in the agreement between the trans-boundary parks in the two parts of the property. The States Parties' report stated that measures for fire prevention are included in the joint cooperation programme.

f) *Management Plan*

It is reported that the revision of the Curonian Spit National Park Management Plan (Lithuania) and the new municipal general plan for Neringa municipality were both subject to public consultation. Both these plans considered local socio-economic parameters and were based on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The aim is to approve both these territorial planning documents in March – April 2012. The plan of the boundaries of the Curonian Spit National Park (Lithuania) entered into force on 30 September 2011.

g) *Other matters*

The report includes the following: the possibility of a liquefied gas terminal at Klaipeda (for which procedures of Strategic Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment including possible impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property will be taken into account by the State Party), work on the delineation of a buffer zone around the National Park (Russia) and within the sea and lagoon on the Lithuanian side; a programme on the study of local cultural heritage on the Lithuanian side; and restoration of the dunes on both parts of the property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge the submission of a joint States Parties' report and the positive progress made towards greater collaboration, particularly in relation to harmonising protection, the development of a joint tourism strategy, a joint traffic Management Plan, and the development of a joint structure for management.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note the decision of the Russian Federation to suspend the proposed Economic Development Zone in the Kaliningrad region, in line with the joint Mission recommendations. They do, however, consider that clarity is needed on the status of the proposed leisure complexes that were considered by the mission to be unacceptable in terms of their impact on the landscape and on its Outstanding Universal Value.

Progress with new plans for the National Park (Lithuania) and the general plan for Neringa municipality are also noted as responding to the recommendations of the 2009 mission.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the possibility of a liquefied gas terminal outside the boundary of the property at Klaipeda in Lithuania and consider that full impact assessments (Strategic Environmental and Heritage Impact Assessments) should be undertaken by the State Party, prior to any decision on such a development, in order to consider the potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The assessments should be provided to the World Heritage Centre in line with the requirements of Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.78

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decisions **31 COM 7B.114**, **32 COM 7B.98** and **34 COM 7B.91** adopted at its 31st (Christchurch, 2007), 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions respectively;
3. Welcomes the submission of the first joint report by the two States Parties;

4. Recognizes the efforts made by both States Parties to ensure the safeguarding of the property and encourages them to continue such efforts in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
5. Also welcomes the progress made in terms of greater collaboration between the National Parks in both parts of the property and the joint actions that have been agreed to take forward work on an overall Tourism Strategy, a joint Traffic Management Plan and joint Management Structures;
6. Notes that the State Party of the Russian Federation has suspended the proposed Economic Development Zone in the Kaliningrad region;
7. Requests confirmation from the State Party of the Russian Federation, by **1 September 2012**, that the proposed large leisure complexes will not be constructed;
8. Takes note of the possibility of a liquefied gas terminal outside the property at Klaipeda and also requests the State Party of Lithuania to undertake full impact assessments (Strategic Environmental and Heritage Impact Assessments) prior to any decision on such a development, in order to consider the potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. These assessments should be provided to the World Heritage Centre in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
9. Also notes the progress with the revised National Park Plan for Lithuania and further requests the State Party of Lithuania to provide three printed and electronic copies of the revised Management Plan for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
10. Requests furthermore both States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a joint 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 38th session in 2014.

79. Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro) (C 125)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1979

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

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
1979-2003

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/125/documents/>

International Assistance
Total amount granted to the property: USD 70,000
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/125/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
2003: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission; January 2006: Management Planning Course; February 2008: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Earthquake damage
- b) Lack of Management Planning/system
- c) Inadequate legal system
- d) Accelerated urban development and urban pressure
- e) Proposed major bridge at Verige
- f) Lack of buffer zone – requested since 2003

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/125>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2012, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report which addresses the requests of the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions.

a) *Verige Bridge and the by-pass project*

A Visual Impact Assessment of the proposed Verige bridge and its associated road network was carried out between June and November 2009, in line with the recommendations of the joint UNESCO/ICOMOS mission in 2008 and the request of the World Heritage Committee.

The impact assessment was part of a wider project to develop an Integrated Spatial Plan for the conservation of landscapes in Boka Kotorska Bay, through the harmonisation of spatial plans of three neighbouring municipalities and the development of an integrated transport plan. The project was supported by the German Technical Cooperation Agency (GTZ).

The assessment concluded that the proposed bridge and access roads, viaducts, stations, tunnels, etc. would have an extremely strong and irreversible impact on the landscape and key visual links would be compromised. Further, the height of the road bridge (53 m) would limit access of maritime vessels of greater height into the Bay of Kotor and, the proposed by-pass, the coastal motorway around the bays of Kotor and Risan, would be too narrow to alleviate the increase in traffic from the link between the two motorways and the local roads.

The recommendations of the impact assessment were to carry out detailed studies on an alternative tunnel crossing of the bay, and if that proved impossible, to study modified bridge proposals, including speed restrictions on the coastal highway and changes to the access roads and to put in place an overall integrated transport policy. The Government of Montenegro adopted the results of the impact study in March 2010. Apparently all work is currently on hold.

However, the bypass around the Bay of Kotor, about which the Committee at its 33rd session expressed its great concern, has already received funding from the European Investment Bank and the project work is apparently continuing.

b) *Management Plan*

As part of the spatial plan project, an expert workshop was held in May 2011 to develop a Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which was submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre on 4 February 2011. The expert workshop also revised the Management Plan, which was adopted by the Government of Montenegro in December 2011. The latter has not been submitted to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review.

There are intentions of a larger reform of the institutional management. It is estimated that the reform will start after the adoption of a Law on the Protection of the Natural Region and Cultural-Historical Region of Kotor. The 2011 report mentions the intention to create an Agency for the protection and management with coordination functions. No other details are provided. Meanwhile coordinated management is still lacking.

c) Legal Framework

A new Law on Cultural Properties was adopted in 2010. This act protects the cultural landscape as cultural heritage, regulates the proposed buffer zone and legitimises the Management Plan. As yet, it is not clear how this will translate into detailed measures to protect the property and its proposed buffer zone.

d) Buffer Zone

A Buffer Zone has been delineated and submitted for evaluation covering the Bay of Kotor as recommended by the 2008 Mission. It will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document WHC-12/36.COM/8B).

e) Accelerated urban development and urban pressure

In the absence of coordinated management and detailed legal protection, there is evidence of increasing tourism development. However, few details were provided by the State Party.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made with the legal protection and the finalisation and adoption of the Management Plan which they suggests should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies. An overall coordinated management system for the property and detailed prescriptions for its legal protection, as recommended by the last mission, are still to be developed.

They also note the development of the Visual Impact Assessment of the Verige Bridge and its associated road network and support the clear outcome that the proposed bridge would have a highly negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They consider that the bridge scheme should be formally abandoned and efforts made to pursue an underground tunnel, the development of ferry service in the Bay and improvements to the general system of roads at local, regional and international levels. The bridge project has highlighted the deep problems facing the general transport system of the region and there remains an urgent need to develop the proposed integrated transport strategy linked to the integrated spatial development plan of the three neighbouring municipalities.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the proposed by-pass road has been given funding by the European Investment Bank and work may already be progressing even though an Impact Assessment has been undertaken which acknowledges the detrimental impact of the by-pass road on the cultural and natural heritage values. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies therefore consider that work needs to be halted and revised as part of an integrated transport strategy.

Draft Decision 36 COM 7B.79

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.114**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Welcomes the progress made in updating and adopting the Management Plan;
4. Requests the State Party to submit three printed and electronic copies of the revised Management Plan, including information how the issue of tourism pressure is addressed, to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;

5. Takes note that the State Party has submitted a draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property, as requested in the Decision **32 COM 7B.101**; as well as a proposal for a Buffer zone, as requested in the Decision **33 COM 7B.114**;
6. Notes the progress made on developing legal protection, but urges the State Party to develop detailed prescriptions for its implementation and for the overall coordinated management of the property;
7. Also urges the State Party, in the light of the negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value identified by the Visual Impact Assessment, to abandon the idea of a bridge at Verige, to explore alternative means of linking the bays, such as a tunnel, and improved ferry services, and to halt the work on the by-pass road in the Kotor Bay;
8. Highlights the continued need to put in place as soon as possible an integrated spatial development plan of the three neighbouring municipalities and a regional transport strategy that includes alternatives to the Verige bridge project and its associated road network and the by-pass road in the Kotor Bay;
9. 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 and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

80. Centennial Hall in Wroclaw (Poland) (C 1165)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

81. Alto Douro Wine Region (Portugal) (C 1046)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2001

Criteria
(iii) (iv) (v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1046/documents/>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
April 2011: ICOMOS advisory mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1046>

Current conservation issues

On 8 February 2012, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report that responded to the recommendations of the ICOMOS advisory mission invited by the State Party to consider the potential impact of the Foz Tua Hydro-electric Dam Project. The mission was carried out from 4 to 6 April 2011. By that time, planning for the Foz Tua Hydro-electric Dam Project had been completed, and initial construction work had already commenced.

a) Foz Tua Hydro-electric Dam Project:

The Dam Project is part of a National Plan for Dams of High Hydroelectric Potential developed by the Government of Portugal in 2007.

The proposed Foz Tua Hydro-electric Dam Project would be located one kilometre from where the River Tua joins the River Douro. It consists of a dam and reservoir in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property and a hydro-electric power station located 400 m downstream from the dam within the boundaries of the property. Associated infrastructure, such as power lines, would also be located within the property. Overall the area affected within the property would cover 2.9 ha (out of the property's total area of 24,600 ha).

The dam would reach a height of 90 m above the river and would have a span of 270 metres. It would create a reservoir located in the buffer zone that would flood an estimated 421 ha of the Tua valley.

The Dam Project, despite being considered in the National Energy Plan dated 1989 and the Douro River Basin Plan 1999, was not mentioned in the nomination file. In 2008 the Portuguese Water Institute promoted a public tender for the project. The project was conditionally approved in 2010. The State Party only notified the World Heritage Centre of the project upon request in 2010. At the time of the mission, impacts of the project were still being evaluated by the national environmental authorities.

b) Results of the ICOMOS Advisory Mission:

The mission noted that although an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) had been undertaken this did not include an assessment of the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The mission considered the potential impact of the overall project on the property and concluded that if the Outstanding Universal Value of the landscape had been taken into consideration, the EIA would have determined that the project would have a profound effect on a wide area of the property, resulting in the permanent physical loss of part of the cultural landscape.

The mission considered that the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value would thus be severe and irreversible. The mission did not consider that the impact of the dam could be mitigated, as suggested by the State Party, by the creation of initiatives that would maintain the memory of the cultural and natural heritage affected by the dam, or by the creation of a museum. The project would not contribute to the key management aim of conserving and improving the living, evolving vini-cultural landscape that was set out at the time of inscription. Overall, the mission considered that the Management Plan had not been put into action and that there was a lack of an overall effective management system.

The mission recommended that the State Party reconsider the Foz Tua Hydro-electric Dam Project as part of a review of the overall National Programme of Dams for High Hydroelectric Power Potential. It also considered that the management system for the property needed

revising and consideration should be given to strengthening protection for the setting of the property.

c) Main Points of the State Party's State of Conservation Report:

In its report, the State Party stated that the Foz Tua Hydro-electric Dam Project had been put out to public consultation between 6 December 2011 and 31 January 2012. It also stated that projects such as this may only go ahead after a favourable or conditionally favourable Environmental Impact Assessment is issued by the Secretary of State for Environmental and Territorial Planning. The deadline for issuing such document was 12 April 2012. However, on 11 May 2009 the project already received a conditionally favourable EIA.

In its comments on the mission report, the State Party stated that water had been extracted from the River Douro since the 1950s and this had added to the scenic and heritage value of the property. It also stated that, as the property is considered as an evolving cultural landscape, 'life' and 'evolution' should continue to be assured. The dam would not impact specifically on the vineyards, which it sees as the core attributes of the property.

Further the State Party stated that amended designs had been drawn up for the buildings and associated structures, some of which are now proposed to be put underground in order to reduce their visual impact. The power plant has been divided into two buildings and the slope of the reservoir adjusted to 45 degrees. No detailed plans were provided.

Construction started in April 2011 and is continuing. Work has been undertaken on excavations on the River Tua downstream river bed as far as the river mouth, the dam abutments on both banks, and the exterior platform of the power plant. Over 70% of the power plant access tunnel is underway. Excavation work is complete on the River Tua diversion tunnel and the access routes to the construction site. The State Party recognizes that the project involves major construction work causing significant transformations at local level. However, it states that the development of the project will be based on 'premises of landscape integration'.

The report also refers to a draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value that was submitted to the World Heritage Centre in February 2012, and it further states that the Management Plan is to be reviewed, taking into account the monitoring of the state of conservation of the cultural landscape.

Finally, the State Party underlines its readiness for cooperation and expresses its wish that another mission be carried out by the Advisory Bodies as soon as possible to verify the state of the development and to access all affected and potentially affected places of the property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the report of the Advisory Mission and its conclusion that the Foz Tua Hydro-electric Dam Project constitutes a potential severe threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They also note that information on this project, although already included in earlier national energy provision strategies, was not formally communicated to the World Heritage Centre until 2010 by which time an EIA had already been given a conditionally favourable approval.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the World Heritage Committee expresses its concern that the planning processes for this project do not seem to have taken full account of the World Heritage status through a thorough analysis of the project's impact on the Outstanding Universal Value. While acknowledging the State Party's invitation of the advisory mission in April 2011, they are also concerned that no time was allowed for the recommendations of this mission to be considered by the World Heritage Committee before construction work commenced.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further note that the State Party has stated that project work commenced in April 2011 and is continuing. Revisions to the design

of the power station buildings and to various other aspects of the landscape works are said to be underway, but no detailed plans have yet been provided. The overall project, however, including the dam and resulting reservoir in the buffer zone, appears to be maintained according to plans presented to the advisory mission.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that, as a matter of urgency, any construction works should be halted until full and detailed revised plans of the dam, power station and other landscape works linked to infrastructure and a heritage impact assessment have been submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies. Work should be halted until a joint reactive monitoring mission has been undertaken to review the potential impacts of the revised project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and the mission's recommendations have been transmitted to and commented by the State Party. If the impacts of the revised plans are considered as being adverse, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would recommend that the overall rationale for the Foz Tua Hydroelectric Dam project needs to be re-considered and alternative energy saving projects investigated. If the impacts of those construction works already carried out within the property and buffer zone are confirmed to constitute an ascertained or potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would recommend that the World Heritage Committee consider the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 37th session in 2013.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.81

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **25 COM X.A**, adopted at its 25th session (Helsinki, 2001),*
3. *Notes with concern the conclusions of the ICOMOS advisory mission that the potential impacts of the Foz Tua Hydro-electric Dam Project on the property and its setting would cause irreversible damage to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
4. *Also notes with concern that planning processes for this project have not taken full account of the World Heritage status of the property through an analysis of impact on its Outstanding Universal Value, and that an Environmental Impact Assessment had already given a conditionally favourable approval;*
5. *Regrets that information on this project was not mentioned in the nomination dossier and was not communicated to the World Heritage Centre before commitments have been made, as required by Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Expresses its concern that construction works commenced in April 2011, before the recommendations of the advisory mission were known and before the World Heritage Committee could consider the project;*
7. *Urges the State Party to immediately halt any construction work of the Foz Tua Dam and any related infrastructure;*
8. *Notes that the State Party is revising the plans for the dam, power station and other landscape works linked to infrastructure and requests that full details of these plans, together with a heritage impact assessment, be submitted as soon as possible to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;*

9. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property to consider the potential impact of the revised Foz Tua Hydro-electric Dam project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and to consider the property's management system, the protection of the setting and the overall state of conservation of the property;*
10. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2013, an updated report on the revision or reconsideration of the Foz Tua Hydro-Electric Dam project and on the overall state of conservation of the property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

82. Historic Centre of Sighișoara (Romania) (C 902)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

Criteria

(iii) (v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/902/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2002 : Joint UNESCO / ICOMOS mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Park and development projects and revalorisation in general, submission of restoration and construction projects to the World Heritage Centre lacking;
- b) Deterioration of monuments in general and fortifications in particular, weak protection and maintenance measures;
- c) Lack of an approved Protection and Management Plan

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/902>

Current conservation issues

The State Party report, received on 3 February 2012, provides information on follow-up actions undertaken by the local and national authorities following Decision **34 COM 7B.93**, as follows:

a) Monitoring of the state of conservation

An evaluation of the work has been prepared for 2010-2011, covering 40 work sites in the protected area, with a description of the main ones; others are announced for Sections 12, 16 and 22 of the historic fortifications, but some sections of the wall and the Tinsmiths' Tower are still classified as constructions under threat for which at this time there is no concrete funding project. Rehabilitation projects of ancient buildings are ongoing or foreseen, as well as infrastructure work in the Lower Town. A document presents the development project of the Citadel garden, a zone where major intervention is required.

b) Protection and management of the site

The State Party indicated the existence of a *Protection and Management Programme* (approved in November 2011, Decision N° 1102) as well as its willingness to continue in a rational manner the restoration and conservation work of the constituent elements of the property and its Outstanding Universal Value.

In the framework of the new national law on the management of cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, the Municipality has established the *World Heritage Bureau of Sighișoara* attached to the Town Planning Department. It is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the *Management Plan* (2011-2017).

Within the Zonal Urban Plan (ZUP) the protected property is governed by a *Local Urban Regulation* (LUR). It was approved by the Municipal Council in September 2011 and is shortly to be approved by the Government. The State Party indicates that there is no intent, or project, or building or restoration permit that could irremediably and irreversibly affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. All interventions must be approved by the competent institutions of the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, in accordance with the protection of historic monuments.

As indicated, a Protection and Management Programme of Monuments exists, but the overall *Management Plan* for the historic centre is not yet finalised, and remains in draft form. Participation in the European network HerO (Heritage as Opportunity) is evoked in support of its preparation.

Two recent municipal decisions regulate traffic in the Citadel and conditions for the exercise of commercial activities of a touristic nature (cafés, restaurants, traditional crafts, etc).

The HERITPROT project, approved in December 2011, aims to provide better protection of the property in the event of natural and technological risks, in particular protection against fire at the historic property.

c) Rehabilitation, restoration, construction

The State Party underlines that the regulatory framework for protection and the management documents shall facilitate the urban development and revitalisation of the historic fabric, whilst safeguarding the authenticity and integrity of the town centre. In this framework, the State Party proposes an overview of the projects foreseen for the revitalisation of the Historic Centre of Sighișoara, in a perspective of sustainable development and the reuse of historic buildings and areas. In particular, for public projects, a Tourist Information Centre with a cultural element and a museum are foreseen. Other measures are envisaged: to render vacant areas located in the perimeter of the property and its buffer zone constructible; to authorize of the raising of some historic buildings, to replace buildings incompatible with the value of the property. Structural work is also foreseen (parking areas, mechanical access to the Citadel from the Lower Town, diversion road, etc.).

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the detailed information concerning the actions undertaken by the State Party. However, they express their concern with regard to the development projects mentioned in the report, and recommend that the Committee invite the State Party to prepare and submit to the World Heritage Centre impact studies on the Outstanding Universal Value of any restoration or construction project foreseen in the perimeter of the property, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

They consider that the draft Management Plan submitted by the State Party needs to be further developed and completed, in order to be approved by all the parties concerned and to be implemented without delay under the transversal authority of the *World Heritage Bureau*

of Sighișoara. It should define an effective conservation and protection framework and indicate the management system established.

They underline that it is primordial that the State Party pay particular attention to the conservation of the ensemble of the historic monuments within the property, and especially those in a poor state of conservation and which do not benefit yet from a conservation programme.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.82

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.93**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note of the measures established by the State Party to ensure the monitoring of the state of conservation of the property, as well as its protection and management, in particular the institution of the World Heritage Bureau of Sighișoara, and encourages it to pursue all the activities undertaken to ensure a good conservation of the Historic Centre of Sighișoara;*
4. *Expresses its concern with respect to the development projects mentioned in the report and invites the State Party to prepare and submit to the World Heritage Centre visual impact studies of any restoration or construction project foreseen in the perimeter of the property, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
5. *Recognizes also the efforts of the State Party in the preparation of a Management Plan, but considers that the current project remains at present insufficient and must involve all the parties concerned in the management of the property in order to become effective, multidisciplinary and far-reaching;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit a final version of the Management Plan to the World Heritage Centre for examination by the Advisory Bodies, prior to its approval by the national authorities;*
7. *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 and on the implementation of the above.*

83. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

84. Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslav (Russian Federation) (C 1170)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

85. Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540)

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

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/540/documents>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 18,000 from the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust

Previous monitoring missions

February 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission; January/February 2007: International Conference for Eastern and Central Europe Countries on the Application of Scientific and Technological Achievements in the Management and Preservation of Historic Cities inscribed on the World Heritage List, St Petersburg; 2009 and March 2010: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Quality of new design projects in the inscribed zone;
- b) High-rise development ;
- c) Confusion over definition and extent of inscribed property and its buffer zones.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/540>

Current conservation issues

On 28 February 2012, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011).

a) *Boundary issues*

The State Party informs that since 2005 systematic work on the retrospective inventory of the property has been carried out by the authorities. A national working group has been formed in 2010 by the Committee on State Control, Use and Protection of Historical and Cultural Landmarks of St. Petersburg (KGIOP), with the objective of clarifying the components of the serial property and its boundaries. The State Party also transmitted within the report the conclusions and outcomes of the International Expert Forum on boundary issues held in Saint Petersburg in May 2011 during which an international open-ended group of experts has been established. This group will inventory and clarify the boundaries of the property on the

basis of the report prepared by the national working group and the "Atlas" of the World Heritage property's components prepared by the KGIOP.

b) Legal framework

The Federal Law "On Cultural Heritage of the Peoples of Russian Federation" is applicable to certain individual structures within the property.

The Master Plan of St. Petersburg, approved in 2005, adopted areas of protection of cultural heritage sites in accordance with the established zone mode. These include historic buildings, skyline, panoramas and views. Parameters for construction and reconstruction are regulated throughout the whole property and in the proposed buffer zone. In 2009, on the basis of the Master Plan, Land Use and Development Rules were adopted, including territorial zoning and city planning regulations which prohibit new construction in the protected areas except for the regeneration of the historical landscape.

The State Party underlined that the recognition of the property as a landmark would not be possible without amendments to the federal legislation. In this regard, since 2011, the City Government is exploring, with the State Duma, ways to enhance the legal protection for the World Heritage property.

c) Revised "Okhta Centre" project

The St. Petersburg Government by its Decree of 8 December 2010 invalidated its previously issued decision of 22 September 2009 which provided authorization for deviation from the boundary parameters of construction of "Okhta-Center". The project of the "Okhta Centre" tower construction was cancelled. The revised architectural project has not been officially submitted to any authority yet. In September 2011, the investor Joint Stock Company "Gazprom" requested the authorities to submit to the World Heritage Centre within the framework of Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* a formal request of information regarding the international rules of law and procedures of the approval of a new project of the Lakhta Public and Business Center. Following a letter of the World Heritage Centre of 25 October 2011, the State Party submitted within the report an explanatory note prepared by the investor clarifying the exact situation of a new location and providing information about the new project of the Lakhta Center.

The new construction is planned in Primorskiy District of St. Petersburg, on the outskirts of the city, 6 miles away from the historic center of St. Petersburg. According to the State Party, the plot of land for the project was not classified as an area of historical and cultural significance and is located outside the zones of protection of cultural heritage and does not fall within the boundaries of the protected areas of World Heritage or their buffer zones. The Russian State Hydrometeorological University carried out a special assessment of climatic characteristics in the Primorskiy District which concluded that the cloudy weather prevailing in St. Petersburg (237 to 256 days a year) makes it difficult to observe the tall building up to its top and retains only the lower 100 - 200 meters visible.

The concept of the project includes construction of a skyscraper with a major office (the same design developed for the "Okhta Center" tower is used for the "Lakhta Center"), research and sports center, yacht club, career oriented park for children, hotel, exhibition halls, as well as shopping and entertainment facilities. The Kalinin District federal court of St. Petersburg, and later at the Municipal Court of St. Petersburg, has recognized the legitimacy of the investor's permission because it will not affect the visual perception of the protected panoramas. In June 2011 public hearings were held in the Primorskiy District regarding the Lakhta business Center.

d) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

A revised draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was submitted to the World Heritage Centre, as requested by the World Heritage Committee.

e) Management of the property

The supervision over the status of the property is carried out by KGIOP and the Department for State Protection, Preservation and Use of the Cultural Heritage Properties of the Committee for Culture of the Government of Leningrad Region, within the limits of their authority. The possibility to coordinate actions of the entities of the Russian Federation is very complicated due to the fact that each of these constituent entities, in accordance with the current Russian law carries out economic activities on its territory based on its own financial plans and independent master plans for development of their territory.

f) State of conservation

The Government of St. Petersburg has established preservation of the historic centre as a priority which prevails over the concept of compromise and so-called rational balance between preservation and development. The development of a long-term programme for the conservation and restoration of the Historic Center of St. Petersburg (2012-2018) has been started in order to provide comprehensive rehabilitation of the historic environment, taking into account social interests and interests of private investors.

g) Communities involvement

The report informs that the Governor of St. Petersburg has engaged in a dialogue with the public city-protection movement, through the Committee on Protection of Landmarks. Representatives of social organizations and movements are members of the Council for the Conservation of Cultural Heritage of the Government of St. Petersburg.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note the cancelation of the “Okhta Centre” Tower project and the planning of the new construction “Lakhta Center” in the Primorskiy District of St. Petersburg. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the new project accompanied by a detailed heritage impact assessment, in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties, should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies before any final decisions are made. The assessment should take into account any potential impact of the project not only to the Historic City of St. Petersburg but also the numerous components of the property, such as the Peterhof Palace, Kronshtadt, etc.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that certain key issues related to the property’s preservation addressed by the 2010 reactive monitoring mission still remain unresolved. These include the lack of a joint Master Plan of the property’s entire territory and its buffer zone in St. Petersburg and Leningrad Region proposing the legal protection modes in accordance with principles of integrated conservation. Also, the management of the property is still shared between two Federal entities. There is no Management Plan for the property, which might cover stakeholders, activities and resources. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would like to recall the recommendations of two previous monitoring missions concerning the designation of a principal management authority with sufficient authority to control the authenticity and integrity of the property, as well as the need to develop an overall Management Plan for the property.

They also note that the City Government is exploring, with the State Duma, ways to enhance the legal protection for the World Heritage property and would appreciate to receive detailed documents regarding these initiatives. They recommend to the Committee to invite the State Party to study, in coordination with the World Heritage Centre, feasibility to develop a legal mechanism for protection and management of the World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation.

Finally, they also note the submission of the revised draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.85

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.104**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Notes the conclusions of the International expert forum on boundary issues held in Saint Petersburg regarding the establishment of an international open-ended group of experts on boundary issue;
4. Welcomes the efforts of the State Party deployed for cancelation of the "Okhta-Center" tower project, also notes the development of a new skyscraper project of the Lakhta business Center in the Primorskiy District of St. Petersburg and requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, a detailed heritage impact assessment for this new project prepared in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties, before any final decisions are made;
5. Invites the State Party to designate a principal management authority with sufficient authority to control the property, as well as to develop an overall Management Plan for the property, including a Plan for Environmental Design and Urbanism for the entire territory, as well as a Safeguarding Plan defining appropriate degrees of intervention for each element of the property;
6. Also invites the State Party to study, in coordination with the World Heritage Centre, the feasibility to develop a legal mechanism for the protection and management of the World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation;
7. Takes note that the State Party submitted a draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property, as requested in Decision **35 COM 7B.104**;
8. 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, and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

86. Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (No State Party's report received on the state of conservation)

87. Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/381/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2002: ICOMOS mission; February 2009: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressure (Projects at “Huerto de las Adoratrices”, “Plaza de los Bandos” and “Vaguada de la Palma”);
- b) Lack of comprehensive Management Plan.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/381>

Current conservation issues

Since 2002, the World Heritage Committee has been expressing concern about the lack of a comprehensive Management Plan and various urban development projects, in particular the “Huerto de las Adoratrices”, the “Plaza de los Bandos” and the “Vaguada de la Palma”. In January 2012, the State Party submitted documentation regarding the state of conservation of the Old City of Salamanca, consisting of a letter from the City Council of Salamanca on the current state of urban development projects mentioned in Decision **34 COM 7B.99**, and of a summary of the draft World Heritage property Management Plan. It also submitted a draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property.

On 3 March 2012, the World Heritage Centre received a detailed document from a local NGO providing information about the status of the local planning documents and several urban development projects.

a) Management Plan

The English summary of the property Management Plan outlines the rationale of the plan and the relevant documents and tools in place, such as the General Urban Development Plan (PGOU) and the Special Plan for the Protection of the Historical Area (PEPCH), which is under preparation. The outline includes an analysis of the property’s criteria for inscription without, however, referring to the draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 1 February 2012.

While the State Party report does not provide any information on the legal status of the Management Plan in relation to the municipal urban planning documents, it confirms that the document was jointly prepared by the Regional Government and Local City Council. It further states that the legally binding PGOU was approved in line with the goals of the Management Plan and that the “Special Plan for the Protection of the Historical Area” would have to take into consideration the provisions of the Management Plan. The summary includes chapters

on the designation of different functional zones (called “management areas”) of the city and on management tools. It also addresses the recommendations of the 2009 mission regarding the revision of the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone. On 4 May 2012 the State Party also provided the complete draft Management Plan in Spanish, which is being reviewed by the Advisory Bodies.

The information received from the NGO recalls that the only currently valid, legally binding planning document is the PGOU, approved by the City Council in 2007 and that the PEPCH, mandatory under regional legislation and the importance of which was underlined by the 2009 reactive monitoring mission, has not yet been finalized. The NGO points out that there is a deficiency in conservation measures due to several individual modifications to the PGOU made in favor of development projects, and that the city still lacks a Transport and Mobility Plan. It further reports that the elaboration process for the property Management Plan has been lacking transparency and citizen participation.

b) Urban Development Projects

In its letter, the City Council of Salamanca states that none of the three urban development projects has been carried out at the time of reporting:

- The “*Huerto de las Adoratrices*” project has been suspended by the private investor Fundación Caja Duero. It is further stated that – if resumed – any future project would have to comply with the provisions of the Management Plan and the PEPCH and would require authorization and approval by the Regional Government and the City Council.
- The underground parking project at “*Plaza de los Bandos*” has been abandoned by the City Council so as to comply with Decision **34 COM 7B.99**.
- As to the Tourist Reception Centre project in “*Vaguada de la Palma*”, the City Council has currently suspended the project, thus complying with Decision **34 COM 7B.99** that requested the State Party to refrain from further development in the Vaguada de la Palma until the integrated Management Plan had been finalized and approved in conjunction with the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

According to the information provided by the NGO, although the above-mentioned projects have been suspended or abandoned, this has been done without withdrawing the development approvals in the modified PGOU. The following additional development projects, currently considered within the boundaries of the property, are considered as being problematic: housing constructions at the Cerro de San Vicente, the extension of the University’s Department of Geography and History, as well as modifications to the Convent of the Franciscanas.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the progress accomplished in the preparation of the Management Plan. They are of the view that it is crucial to ensure that the Special Plan for Protection of the Historical Area (PEPCH) be finalized and approved as soon as possible so as to provide a legally binding tool to reinforce the Management Plan of the property. It is therefore suggested that the draft Management Plan be reviewed by the Advisory Bodies and the PEPCH be submitted for information in order to ensure that both plans and their provisions for any potential urban development proposals in the property and its buffer zone are in accordance with the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

Further, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that all valid development permits for the suspended development projects should be revised. They also recommend to the World Heritage Committee to express concern that currently, the only valid, legally binding planning documents (PGOU) can be modified in favour of single development projects.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.87

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.99**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Takes note of the draft Management Plan of the property and requests the State Party to take into account the results of its review by the Advisory Bodies;
4. Also takes note that the State Party has submitted a draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property;
5. Urges the State Party to complete, as soon as possible, the Special Plan for Protection of the Historical Area mandated by regional legislation (2002) which will take into consideration the provisions of the Management Plan and to submit it to the World Heritage Centre;
6. Expresses its satisfaction that the State Party has decided to abandon the “Plaza de los Bandos” project, and to suspend the “Huerto de las Adoratrices” and the “Vaguada de la Palma” projects, and also requests the State Party to revoke the relevant planning decisions;
7. Also urges the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre in due course about any plans to resume the above projects and any other major development projects that may negatively impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, before any irreversible commitments are made, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines.

88. Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of complementary information from the State Party)

89. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1985

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

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

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

International Assistance
Total amount granted to the property: USD 327,208

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

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

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

Previous monitoring missions

January 2000, May 2001, 2002, December 2003, 2004: World Heritage Centre missions; April 2006, May 2008, April 2009: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/356>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report of some 1,500 pages on 31 January 2012. On 10 February 2012 it provided four supplementary pages. Additional information was also submitted on the outcomes of a World Heritage Coordination Meeting held on 28 January 2012, and on 19 April 2012 on the first report of the Advisory Expert Committee

a) *Golden Horn Bridge*

The State Party report states that in response to the request of the Committee to "consider all ways possible to mitigate the impacts of the Golden Horn metro bridge", an Independent Advisory Expert Committee has been set up by the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality. It consists of four international experts, who had previously worked on the bridge, local and international senior advisors and committees of the Istanbul Natural and Cultural Sites and the Site Management Directorate. The State Party report mentions that the work undertaken by the experts will be shared periodically with the World Heritage Committee and related stakeholders during the construction of the bridge by the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality.

The State Party also states that the Metro Bridge Project across Golden Horn has been revised according to the 'revisions defined in the independent expert reports prepared in 2011 and implementation works have been carried out within this scope'. The report thus makes clear that work is progressing according to the plans presented to the Committee at its last session and that no further modifications have been made. Seventeen piers are being constructed. Rescue archaeology has been undertaken on the Genoese walls and on the shore areas affected.

Representatives of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS were invited and agreed to attend a meeting with the Advisory Expert Committee on 28 January 2012. However, they were informed on 27 January that the meeting had been postponed. On 25 April 2012, a meeting between representatives of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, and members of the Advisory Expert Committee took place at the World Heritage Centre. It was also attended by representatives of the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality and the Permanent Delegation.

At this meeting, members of the Expert Advisory Committee reported that, as work on the bridge piers was on-going, and, as 85% of the structural elements of the bridge had been manufactured, no further structural changes to the bridge were possible other than those reported to the Committee at its last session (reducing the height of the pylons from 88m to 53m or 63m – to be decided in accordance with the material for the upper part of the pylons from cables to top, reducing the width of the cables from 24mm to 17mm and the length of the metro station from 180m to 90m).

They therefore considered that the only mitigation measures that could be possible were related to colour and lighting, a reduction in noise pollution and the design of the landscaping at either end. It was agreed that these could be discussed at a further meeting at the end of May 2012 in Istanbul.

The Experts also noted that the considerable height of the deck of the bridge, that brings with it the need for extremely tall piers, was dictated by the height of the metro tunnels that were fixed well in advance of discussions on the design of the bridge.

b) *Urban Renewal*

A report by the Commission on Housing and Urban Development of the Istanbul Municipality on housing development that might impact the silhouette of Istanbul was approved in October 2011. Based on a "views analysis", this calls for the development of an integrated Silhouette Master Plan for all areas of the city that might impact the silhouette. The Plan will define the silhouette and outline measures necessary to respect it. In the meantime, the Commission called for restrictive measures to be put in place to limit the height of buildings.

The main report provides extensive details on proposed work in renewal areas across the city, to a level of detail that is difficult to assess from a written report.

c) *Marmaray Rail Tube Tunnel*

Rescue excavations have been carried out at Aksaray and Yenikapı Metro Stations, including on Neolithic footprints, shipwrecks, mosaic floors and chapels and in all over 1,300 finds have been recorded. Necessary revision was made to the certain aspects of the project to preserve some specific items in situ.

d) *Bosporus Transition Tunnel Project for Motor Vehicles*

The State Party submitted, as annexes 3 and 4, the final report of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and the report on the consultation process regarding this project. These extensive reports are being reviewed by ICOMOS.

e) *Management Plan*

The Management Plan has been revised to take account of the Committee's decision. The revised plan was approved in October 2011 by the World Heritage Coordination and Supervision Council and has been submitted to relevant Municipal authorities and approved by them. The Plan was also submitted to ICOMOS for review.

The State Party report informs that the Plan was prepared by a wide range of stakeholders from central and local governments, universities, non-governmental organisations and local inhabitants coming together to set out a vision for the property. The Management Plan covers wider Istanbul Historic Peninsula as it was not deemed appropriate to consider the areas of the historic peninsula outside the four inscribed sites as a buffer zone but rather as sites of value in their own right. There is thus no differentiation made between the inscribed areas and their wider setting of the Historic Peninsula, although the Action Plans and Projects relates to the four inscribed sites.

The Plan provides a good profile of the Historic Peninsula combining data on recent planning issues, projects, land profile, earthquake sensitivity and so on. The revised Plan is now highly aspirational and seeks to address the key structural issues facing the Historic Peninsula as a basis for the conservation of cultural heritage. It acknowledges current

weaknesses related to understanding of the property, lack of coordinated approaches, strategies and policies, and the need to undertake capacity building. It aims to harmonise legislative, transportation, conservation, tourism and renewal approaches across the Plan area.

The authorities intend to review the Plan on an annual basis in a cooperative spirit of sharing knowledge and experience. Regarding the first Annual Review, ICOMOS has suggested that consideration be given to the following: stressing the links between the four sites that form the serial property and that they form one property not four; setting out the attributes that convey the Outstanding Universal Value overall for the four sites; defining the links between the four sites and the zones of the Historic Peninsula in order to understand how the neighbouring zones contribute to the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value and to the setting of the inscribed property; developing knowledge of cultural heritage more specifically on the Outstanding Universal Value and the attributes of this Value; articulating development threats; refining and coordinating management policies; refining projects to make them more achievable; amplifying the process of overlay between the Management Plan and other plans such as Conservation and Renewal Plans.

f) *Conservation work*

The Conservation Plan of the Historic Peninsula was approved by the related Conservation Councils and Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality in 2011. This is a map scale 1/5000 that identifies conservation areas and their status. The four sites of the property are first Degree Conservation Sites. Proposed work in the four areas is set out in the report. This includes conservation work, removing unlisted and illegal buildings, reducing streets to their original level, and constraints on development. The report also provides considerable detail on conservation and awareness raising activities. These include: establishing an Historic Peninsula Implementation and Research Centre by Yıldız Technical University in 2011 raising public awareness, and training communities on the values of the Historic Peninsula; conducting modular training program on stone conservation and restoration for graduates of Architectural Vocational High Schools and Vocational School of Higher Education; launching, in September 2011, a training program on “Training on Conservation of Cultural Heritage from Museums to House” with the support of the Ministry of Development and Istanbul Development Agency; and publishing a free magazine on conservation and restoration activities prepared regularly.

Conclusion

At its last meeting, the Committee expressed its great concern that the Golden Horn Bridge, even if amended as then proposed, would nevertheless still have an overall negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and recommended that an independent expert Advisory Committee be established, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre, to consider all ways possible to mitigate the impacts of the bridge.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that although an Independent Advisory Expert Committee has been established, this does not include representatives of the World Heritage Centre or the Advisory Bodies. Disappointingly, since the previous session of the World Heritage Committee, despite the urgency to address the issue of the visual impact of the proposed bridge, there has been only one very recent opportunity for formal dialogue between the Advisory Expert Panel and the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies on this issue.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, note that, according to information received from the Advisory Expert Committee, construction of the bridge is progressing according to the minor revisions announced to the Committee during its last session and that, as the construction of the piers is well under way and 85% of the component parts of the bridge have been manufactured, there is no way to mitigate the impact of the bridge any further by changing its form.

The bridge design has not therefore been substantially modified since 2011. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recall that, the Committee at its last session expressed “great concern that the bridge, even if amended as proposed, would nevertheless still have an overall negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.” The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that further work is urgently needed on possible changes to colour and lighting, as being the only remaining options to reduce visual impact.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that a mission is needed in the near future to discuss with the Expert Committee what further changes might be possible.

The Committee’s recommendations at its last meeting included the need for an overall coordinated approach to the strategic management of the Historic Peninsula. The Committee requested that the remit of the Independent Expert Advisory Committee should include not only the bridge but also the development of a strategic framework for infrastructural development and conservation, and overall guidance on the management of the property. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory bodies consider that this aspect is crucial in the light of the great impact that the height of the metro tunnels has apparently had on the scale and height of the proposed bridge.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the good progress made with the revision of the Management Plan. They consider that the idea of the Plan addressing the whole Historic Peninsula is to be strongly commended – in terms of allowing greater coordination and prioritisation across all disciplines to address common issues and the coherence and visual integrity of the large area. ICOMOS has suggested areas of the Plan that could be strengthened at the first annual review.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also recommend that the Committee commend the proposals for the development of a Silhouette Master Plan for the city that will define the silhouette, articulate key views and set out height limits for buildings.

In contrast to the lack of information on the bridge, abundant information has been provided in the State Party’s report on proposed renewal and conservation projects for the four areas of the city that make up the property. What remains unclear, however, is how these projects relate to the Management Plan, the Conservation Plan and other urban instruments. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that, given the concerns of the Committee at several sessions on specific renewal schemes and the difficulty of assessing all the information provided without the wider context, it would be helpful if these now detailed proposals could be considered on site through a mission.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.89

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.102** adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Notes that an Advisory Expert Committee has been established, as requested by the Committee, but expresses its regret that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have not been involved in the work of this Committee until its 8th meeting in April 2012 at UNESCO;*
4. *Regrets that, according to the information received, no further mitigation measures to the negative visual impact of the proposed Golden Horn Bridge have so far been proposed beyond those already announced by the State Party and examined by the*

Committee in 2011, and that, as construction work has progressed, no further structural changes are possible;

5. *Considers that the Bridge, as currently being constructed, will have an overall negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and urges the State Party to pursue, as a matter of urgency, any further possible work to mitigate the negative visual impact of the proposed Bridge such as through changes to colour and lighting, and to discuss emerging proposals with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
6. *Requests the State Party to invite an urgent joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess progress in mitigating the visual impacts of the proposed Golden Horn Bridge, to consider proposed renewal and conservation projects, as well as progress with the overall strategic management of the property, and to assess the overall state of conservation of the property;*
7. *Acknowledges the detailed information provided by the State Party on the revision of the Management Plan and on proposed renewal and conservation projects and other conservation initiatives;*
8. *Further acknowledges the efforts made by the State Party to address the need for conservation plans, an effective management system, development strategies for traffic and tourism, and a buffer zone;*
9. *Also considers that the revised Management Plan is a significant improvement, commends the State Party for its scope in relation to the overall Historic Peninsula, and also requests it to address, at the first annual review of the Management Plan, the recommendations that ICOMOS has provided;*
10. *Also commends the proposals to develop a Silhouette Master Plan for the Historic Peninsula that will lead to a definition of the silhouette and appropriate height controls;*
11. *Acknowledging the concerns expressed by the World Heritage Committee in previous sessions on renewal projects in various areas of the Historic Peninsula, further considers that the detailed information now provided by the State Party on proposed renewal and conservation projects should be appraised on site;*
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 on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

90. Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late request for complementary information to the State Party)

91. Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

92. Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom) (C 426bis)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

93. Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

94. Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape (United Kingdom) (C 1215)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of complementary information from the State Party)

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

95. Historic Bridgetown and its Garrison (Barbados) (C 1376)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2011

Criteria
(ii) (iii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1376/documents>

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
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1376/documents/>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on 1 February 2012 addressing the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription, specifically that the State Party implement a programme of studies and training on traditional building conservation, crafts and materials, and in collaboration with local tertiary institutions, and implement a programme of measuring and documenting all the listed buildings within the property. The report also addresses the request of the World Heritage Committee for a report on the implementation of the Management Plan.

a) Programme of studies and training in traditional building conservation

The report indicates that in November 2011 a conservator from the Ponce Museum in Puerto Rico was contracted to restore a statue, and also carried out an on-site training session for workers from the Ministry of Transport and Works and the National Conservation Commission responsible for the daily maintenance of statues. This expert has been requested by the Ministry of Family, Culture, Sports and Youth to submit a proposal to provide training on traditional building conservation in 2012. The Ministry is currently awaiting the submission of this proposal. It is also reported that the Ministry has started discussions with the Ministry of Transport and Works to extend this training to incorporate heritage building and restoration.

No details are provided on how this programme might involve collaboration with local tertiary training institutions.

b) Programme for measuring and documenting all listed buildings within the property

The report mentions that other day to day actions have commenced and are carried out to ensure the proper protection of the property. Most of these actions are set out under Section 4 of the property's Management Plan; however no specific activities are mentioned.

The report indicates that a consultant will be appointed to undertake a programme for measuring and documenting 21 of the 115 listed buildings, and provides some details of the tasks of the consultancy: detailed multi-media information to support the maintenance of the listed buildings; support to the development of a planning process with respect to listed buildings located within the property; and to contribute to the sustainable management of the inscribed property. The consultancy will be divided into two phases. Phase one is expected to last six months. An overall budget of USD 100,000 has been provided, however, it is not stated when this work is expected to start. In the Management Plan submitted with the nomination, it is stated that fifty-three percent of the listed buildings are owned by the Government of Barbados and its various agencies, the remainder of the buildings – twenty-seven percent owned by private commercial entities, seventeen percent by private individuals, and four percent by religious organizations. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider it important that public and private properties are taken into consideration in terms of conditions of authenticity and integrity in order to avoid threats from future development or interventions.

c) Implementation of the Management Plan

At the time of inscription, the Management Plan had not been adopted or implemented. The report does not specifically address whether the Management Plan has now been officially adopted and the status of its implementation. The report provides details of the development control process currently in place and the legal protection – both of which were acknowledged in the evaluation of the nomination.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that arrangements are being planned for a training programme on traditional building conservation. They do, however, consider that such a programme should be led by an expert on traditional craftsmanship and building conservation in view of the concerns regarding the property's integrity. They also consider that, as requested by the Committee, such a training programme should have links with local tertiary institutions, and that a national programme of studies and training in traditional crafts, material and conservation be developed in collaboration with local or regional universities and technical institutions.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note the programme being planned to document listed buildings.

In terms of the Management Plan, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that it is not clear if the Plan has been adopted and what is the status of its implementation. In the nomination dossier it was stated that the funds to implement the Management Plan will come through the annual budgets of the individual agencies involved, from the 2013-2015 Government budget, subject to approval, from the local private sector and from UNESCO international assistance. It is not stated whether these funds have been made available. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the adoption of the Management Plan, which was stated in the nomination as reflecting a paradigm shift in the Caribbean towards a more multi-disciplinary approach to management, is essential to ensuring that an adequate management entity for the property is in place, and that management is directed towards sustaining Outstanding Universal Value.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.95

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 8B.42**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Notes that a programme for traditional building conservation is being planned; and encourages the State Party to ensure that this is directed by experts trained in traditional building conservation and that there is involvement from local tertiary institutions through the development of a national programme in collaboration with local or regional universities and technical institutions;
4. Requests the State Party to provide further details of both programmes, including timelines and to submit this information to the World Heritage Centre;
5. Acknowledges the intention of the State Party to appoint consultants to undertake a comprehensive technical assessment of twenty-one specified listed buildings, and also encourages the State Party to consider enlarging its scope to include non listed buildings within the property;
6. Also notes that there is no confirmation that the Management Plan has been officially adopted or implemented, nor whether the necessary funding for its implementation has been put in place, and also requests the State Party to provide confirmation of these;
7. Further 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 and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

96. City of Potosi (Bolivia) (C 420)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

97. Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (State of conservation report by the State Party not received)

98. Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia) (C 285)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of the State Party's report on the state of conservation)

99. National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Complementary information needed)

100. 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

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/129/documents/>

International Assistance

Global amount granted to the property: USD 170,900

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/129/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2003: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; 2005: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; 2011: World Heritage Centre / 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 tunnels excavated 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

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/129>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 1 February 2012. From 21 to 26 November, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out to assess the state of conservation of the property. The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/36COM/documents>

a) Construction of an Aerodrome at Rio Amarillo

The mission reviewed the history of the airport project, which has been on-going since 2003, and noted that although the State Party had taken the decision to build the airport at Concepcion, the cost of constructing a road between this site and Copan has proved to be prohibitively expensive. The mission reviewed the new impact studies for the Rio Amarillo airport that had been produced following the 2005 mission. The mission considers that these

demonstrate that there will be no direct impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, although the wider cultural and natural setting of the inscribed site - from which it draws its significance and which is protected by national law - will be affected. In order to minimize the impact of the airport on the landscape and to fully understand the relationship of the property to its wider setting, the mission considered that a detailed archaeological study, and if necessary, the relevant rescue excavations will need to be undertaken on the airport site.

Furthermore, they considered that the construction would need to be as limited as possible and the runway limited to 1200 metres in order that the main archaeological site of *Piedras Negras* would not be affected. It would also need to comprehensively plan for potential indirect effects to the property, particularly in regard to increase in visitor numbers, the limits for tourism development and the strict enforcement of regulations. These aspects would need to be considered within the framework of a coherent territorial planning and management strategy which should have a clearly regional vision.

b) Boundaries and buffer zone

A revised map and buffer zone was included in the state of conservation report. This will be evaluated as part of the retrospective inventory process of the Periodic Reporting Exercise for Latin America and the Caribbean, and during the 2013 evaluations for minor boundary modifications. The Management Plan mentions that regulatory measures prescribed, formulated in 1982 and approved in 1998, will need to be updated and harmonized with new territorial planning laws, and that regulations established in 1997 need to be updated to include all areas that are part of the area declared as national monuments. The State Party mentions that enforcement of current measures is a challenge that has been addressed through the acquisition of private lands. However, this process has been halted since 2009. The mission was not presented with new or additional cartographic material for evaluation but noted the need to clarify zoning as part of the process for updating the Management Plan. It also underscored the need to work closely with the Local Government to ensure the protection of the property, given existing development pressures and to continue the process of acquisition of land in the proposed buffer zone to mitigate impacts from changes in land use. It recommended that a monitoring system be set up to map changes in land use and to integrate these results in decision making processes and for the enforcement of regulatory and protective measures. It also recommended that the feasibility of moving the main traffic, possible through Highway CA-11, away from the World Heritage property be evaluated.

c) Management Plan

The State Party reports that the Management Plan, published in 2005, is currently under review and will be updated through a participatory process. Risk management and public use plans will be revised and made explicit in the newer version which is expected to be concluded by February 2013. The Public Use Plan, which was to be drafted by September 2011 through funding by the Inter American Development Bank, was not developed. A new process has started with the Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain) to articulate its formulation with the updating of the Management Plan.

The mission noted that management issues have remained unaddressed or have had limited progress due to the political and financial situation in the country. The mission also reported that no clear indications were given how the Public Use Plan and the Risk Management Plan will be integrated into the general Management Plan and how this latter Plan will be updated. It highlighted the need to coordinate planning tools for the property with those at the local and regional levels. It also noted that carrying capacity for the property has to be established and used as a basis for the development of the Public Use Plan.

d) Conservation programme for the tunnels and conservation guidelines for the property

A project was implemented at Copan, through Inter American Development Bank funding, for the consolidation of external surfaces at sections of the Acropolis and some collapsed sections of the tunnels. The report on the interventions is included. The mission noted that the overall state of conservation of the property is good and underscored issues that required attention. Among these, there is a need to centrally collect monitoring data generated by diverse projects so as to inform management decisions. Also, criteria for potential transfer of sculptures from the site to the museum are needed, as well as for roofing of sculptures that will remain *in situ*. As for the tunnels, the mission reports there is no formal or documented monitoring being done, there is a potential threat derived from biological contaminants, there is water filtration that can damage stucco surfaces and potentially affect the stability of the tunnels. It mentioned that interventions to date have been carried out on an *ad hoc* basis. The mission considers that a comprehensive action plan for the conservation and maintenance of the tunnels needs to be developed.

e) Protective shelter for the hieroglyphic stairway and laboratory for sculpture conservation

A brief preliminary report on the prototype shelter installed on Structure 9B-83 at Las Sepulturas was included. A test year of one year is foreseen to assess its functionality and carry out environmental monitoring to assess its adequacy and efficacy as an alternative to the existing shelter. The mission noted that discussions are needed not only in terms of the effectiveness of the design but also in terms of how the “sails” will be fixed to the pre-hispanic building, considering the amount of perforations and the potential for severe damage in case of strong winds. As for the laboratory, the State Party informs it will be located within the existing Museum, in an area that functions as storage space. The mission verified that no new construction has been undertaken for this purpose.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the findings of the mission that the development of an airport at Rio Amarillo would not impact adversely the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They also note that the mission recommended that the construction of the airport would need to be undertaken within clear constraints in order to not impact adversely the archaeology of the area which is part of the wider natural and cultural setting of the property protected by national law.

Although the general state of conservation of the property was found to be satisfactory, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that there are still issues which have remained unaddressed for the past years, including the updating of the Management Plan, with provisions for risk management and public use based on updated studies, the development of a comprehensive conservation strategy for the tunnels and the updating of regulatory measures for the buffer zone to ensure the protection of the property in light of increasing development pressures.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.100

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.126**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Notes that no direct impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the inscribed property is to be expected from the construction of the Rio Amarillo Aerodrome and

requests the State Party, should a decision be made to proceed with its construction, to update the Environmental Impact Assessment and carry out a Heritage Impact Assessment to identify mitigation measures;

4. *Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party regarding the implementation of conservation measures for the property and reiterates its request to fully develop a comprehensive strategy for the conservation of the tunnels and the establishment of conservation guidelines for interventions at the property;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to finalise the process for updating the Management Plan for the property, including provisions for risk management and a public use plan based on carrying capacities studies, and upon completion to provide three printed and electronic copies of the draft revised Management Plan for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to update, approve and enforce the regulatory measures for the management of different zones prescribed in the Plan and to work with the Local Government to ensure the protection of the property against development pressures;*
7. *Urges the State Party to integrate the updated Management Plan within local and regional planning instruments to develop a coherent territorial planning and management strategy with a regional vision;*
8. *Moreover requests the State Party to submit, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, the results from the prototype protective shelter for the Hieroglyphic Stairway as well as the technical specifications for the final design, for review prior to implementation;*
9. *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.*

101. Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

Criteria

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/414/documents>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November - December 2004: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Urban development pressures in the areas surrounding the property

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/414>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 7 February 2012.

The report was compiled by the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH) and includes information on the process of assessment of the physical state of conservation of the inscribed property and the recommendations made. The recording forms for each of the areas and monuments are also enclosed. The work carried out constitutes an important database in guiding decision-making and identifying priorities for interventions. The main factors and causes of decay affecting the fabric are identified. In addition to deterioration resulting from environmental and natural causes, the report underscores that both the lack of maintenance and the issues related to inadequate or non-functioning drainage systems and shelters are important in areas currently closed to the public. The presentation and homogeneity in the use of protective shelters is also mentioned as these have different designs and materials depending on the time period in which they were installed.

The report also notes that access to areas not excavated or closed to the public need stronger restrictions to mitigate deterioration generated by accumulation of trash, structural wear and vandalism. It also notes the need to install walkways and barriers in areas that receive the largest flow of visitors to mitigate impact on stucco reliefs and wall paintings. It indicates that the maintenance and monitoring that the excavated areas require cannot be sustained with the allocated resources and funds given the extent of the task.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that although the report submitted by the State Party provides information on current physical conservation conditions of the monumental areas of the property, it does not respond to the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). No guidelines have been submitted for conservation interventions and no information is provided on the progress made towards the concrete implementation of the management system that was prescribed in the Management Plan. Similarly, the report does not provide updated information on how other issues that have been identified as pressing concerns for the property, its buffer zone and wider setting, particularly in respect to peddlers, land use and urban development, are being addressed. No additional information was submitted in regard to the light and sound show proposals nor is the current status of the project mentioned. No explanation on the functioning of the inter-institutional commission proposed in the Management Plan was included.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the State Party provides additional information on the aforementioned issues and encourages it to fully implement the Management Plan for the property and to secure the resources for its sustained operation.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.101

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.111**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the conservation conditions of the property and encourages it to use the resulting baseline documentation for the development of a priority action plan and for subsequent monitoring of conditions;
4. Urges the State Party to take the necessary steps to ensure the full implementation of the Management Plan and to secure the required human and financial resources for its systematic and sustained operation;
5. Requests the State Party to submit additional information on the state of conservation of the property, its buffer zone and wider setting and their related regulations, and on actions being taken to address pressing concerns, including peddlers, land use and urban development and reiterates its request to elaborate conservation guidelines for intervention, including those for drainage systems and protective shelters;
6. Invites the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS any new proposals for development and public use at the property, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, for review prior to approval and implementation;
7. 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 and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

102. 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

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/135/documents>

International Assistance

Total amount granted to the property: USD 77,188

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/135/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, 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.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/135>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 1 February 2012. In addition to general site information, the report includes as well information related to the work undertaken by the State Party in the preparation of the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Succinct information was included relating to factors affecting the property, management and monitoring. The draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was submitted to the World Heritage Centre and is presently being reviewed by ICOMOS.

a) Definition of boundaries and buffer zone for the components of the property

The report indicates that the boundaries for San Lorenzo, including a buffer zone, are under review by the Ministry of Economy and Finance as part of the final steps to transfer the property to INAC's jurisdiction. As for Portobelo, the definition of boundaries for each fortified structure remains a task to be accomplished as part of the ongoing Land Use Plan for the District of Portobelo. No timeframe has been provided for the completion of this definition, and the progress made is similar to that reported in 2010.

b) State of conservation

The report includes information similar to that provided in past years pertaining to the factors affecting the property. Based on the identification of the most endangered areas, an Emergency Plan was developed to prioritise interventions in areas with risk of collapse, however, no interventions have been implemented in these areas. The conservation survey was not included in the report. Interventions were classified as minor (crack repair, replacement of missing stone and brick, biological control and drainage cleaning) and major (which require structural interventions). The State Party's report states that in 2011, minor interventions were developed at both components of the property. Designs for future structural interventions were identified and building specifications and administrative documents are in the process of development. Interventions were mainly limited to the removal of all debris from the 2010 landslide. The "counteractive plan" – Plan Portobelo 2011-2012 is included in the report to address major threats such as landslides and deterioration. The State Party also reports that a reforestation programme will take place after the reinforcement of areas susceptible to landslides. Progress made in the actions listed continues to be in the planning stages and no urgent interventions, critical to maintaining the integrity of the property have been carried out. Also no timeframe has been provided for the implementation of these urgent and major structural interventions.

c) Management arrangements

The report indicates that the *Patronato of Portobelo and San Lorenzo* currently has 19 employees in charge of preventive maintenance and basic masonry repair, in addition to 1 field architect. Capacity building needs are also noted. As for financial resources, in 2011 funding was increased compared to previous years. With the exception of the amount used

for salary and administrative processes, no indication is provided on the specific use of these funds in relation to the property's conservation. No budget provisions for 2012 have been included nor is there any indication of the sustainability of these resources.

In terms of the Management Plan, no information is provided on the current status of its development. In the 2011 State Party report, it was indicated that the terms of reference for the Plan's development were being formulated and that this process would commence in June 2011. The Management Plan for the property has been pending since the 2001 reactive monitoring mission recommended its drafting.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that no progress has been made in the implementation of measures adopted at the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee (UNESCO, 2011). Efforts continue to be inadequate to address the poor and fragile state of conservation of the property. Despite the budget increase, the implementation of measures to address the conservation of the built fabric, urban expansion, encroachment and reforestation have remained in the planning stages for over ten years. The Emergency Plan has only been partially developed and no precise indication on the expected timeframe for implementation has been provided. There are still critical needs in terms of staffing and resources, as well as capacities to systematically implement conservation, management and protection actions for the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies reiterate that the prevailing conditions will take significant time and resources to be reversed, and there is at present an imminent risk of collapse of the structures, with no assessment of mechanical risks completed. The property currently faces significant ascertained threats as indicated in Paragraph 179 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and the World Heritage Committee might wish to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to garner the necessary support and mobilise resources for the implementation of the Emergency Plan and related appropriate measures to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of this property is not irreversibly compromised.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.102

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.129**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2010),*
3. *Notes the limited implementation of activities being carried out by the State Party with regards to the fragile state of conservation of the property;*
4. *Reiterates 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 its Outstanding Universal Value, and the lack of significant progress made in addressing the decay conditions of the property;*
5. *Urges the State Party to finalize the processes related to the establishment of boundaries, buffer zones and the related regulations of the two components of the inscribed property, and to submit them within the Retrospective Inventory process of the Periodic Reporting exercise in the Latin America and the Caribbean region;*

6. *Considers that the State Party has not complied with all the requests expressed by previous World Heritage Committee Decisions, and that therefore the property is in danger in conformity with Chapter IV.B of the Operational Guidelines and **decides to inscribe the Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;***
7. *Adopts the following Desired state of conservation for the property, for its future removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger:*
- a) *The approval and full implementation of an emergency plan, a comprehensive assessment of structural and mechanical risks, preventative conservation strategy and maintenance measures at San Lorenzo and Portobelo,*
 - 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;*
8. *Also adopts the following corrective measures and the timeframe for their implementation:*
- a) *To be carried out immediately (by September 2012-March 2013)*
 - (i) *Risk assessment completed for all structures and built materials, and an 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 (by September 2013)*

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

- (iv) *Development of a Management Plan begun,*
- (v) *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 (by September 2014):*

Second Phase of the Emergency Plan implemented

Protection

- (i) *National laws and policies for the conservation of built heritage at San Lorenzo and Portobelo developed,*

Management and planning

- (ii) *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,*
- (iii) *Management, territorial and urban development plans integrated,*
- (iv) *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 (by September 2015):*

- (i) *Implementation of the Emergency Plan completed,*
- (ii) *Operational management arrangements and budgets for the continued implementation of the approved Management Plan secured,*

9. *Requests* the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a financial estimation of the costs associated with the implementation of each of the corrective measures, and invites the State Party to consider a request for international assistance from the World Heritage Fund for technical support ;
10. *Also urges* the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, as well as other relevant bodies, to cooperate with the State Party to implement the adopted corrective measures;
11. *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.

103. Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (Late receipt of complementary information from the State Party)

104. Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)

See Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add (State of conservation report by the State Party not received)

105. Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (C 747)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1995

Criteria
(iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/747/documents/>

International Assistance
Total amount granted to the property: USD 35,000
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/intassistance/1979>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
Total amount provided to the property: 2008 ICOMOS Technical mission financed by the Spanish Funds-in-Trust for World Heritage. USD 5076.50: 2011 WHC Technical Mission financed by the Spanish Funds-in-Trust for World Heritage

Previous monitoring missions
April 2002 and May 2004: ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions; June 2008: ICOMOS technical mission; September 2009 World Heritage Centre mission (update of the Tentative List); November 2011: World Heritage Centre technical mission for assistance in Management Planning.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Inappropriate architectural and urban design for a marina and hotel-casino in a building block at the old harbour;
b) Lack of a comprehensive participatory Management Plan for the Historic Quarter.

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/747>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on the property on 1 February 2012 and also submitted the Management Plan for the property as requested by the World Heritage Committee.

The report notes the challenges that have been faced in terms of decision-making for the management of the property and how these will be addressed through the implementation of the Management Plan, particularly in regard to urban rehabilitation and its articulation with the Local Plan for Sustainable Land Use Planning and Development for the City of Colonia del Sacramento, based on Law 18308 of 2008. This is expected to address tensions between heritage conservation and social revitalization through participatory processes and through the precise definition of land use plans and guidelines for interventions. To develop these management tools, systematic surveys have been undertaken, as well as updating of architectural records dating from 2005 which are expected to improve monitoring of significant components of the property and defining of specific conservation actions or projects for rehabilitation. The Management Plan includes, in its Section 4, plans for the delineation of the historic area and its buffer zone to safeguard the historic, landscape and visual values of the property, considering a border along the coastline in all its extension. Nevertheless, the cartography submitted does not comply with the requirements and guidelines established, and the State Party is currently preparing its official submission within the framework of the Retrospective inventory process of the Periodic Reporting exercise of Latin America and the Caribbean.

The report also notes how management arrangements will operate to improve decision making at the property to ensure the protection of attributes that sustain its Outstanding Universal Value. A bill for the creation of the Colonia del Sacramento Heritage Committee is included in the Management Plan. This entity is foreseen as an autonomous and coordinating authority to integrate and make compatible the various administrations presently responsible for the property, the local Government of Colonia, the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Commission of Cultural Heritage for the Nation and the Honorary Executive Council. They also consider models for the participation of civil society

The report also provides information on actions being implemented for the management of open spaces and natural remnants and landscapes that surround the historic city and awareness raising programmes. Until December 2011, the Plan was still at the Departmental Executive Office to be submitted to the Departmental Board of Colonia for study, assessment and official adoption.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made by the State Party in formulating a much needed Management Plan for the property. Notwithstanding that the plan can begin to be implemented through the inter-institutional agreements already in place, they consider that steps need to be taken to finalise the approval process at the national and local level in order to ensure its sustained implementation and the enforcement of the regulatory measures prescribed. The State Party is encouraged to explore securing the necessary human and financial resources for full and systematic implementation. It is important to underscore the need for articulating the developed Management Plan with the Local Plan for Sustainable Land Use Planning and Development for the City of Colonia del Sacramento to ensure harmonisation of planning tools for the property and the implementation of a coherent approach to its conservation and management.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.105

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision 35 COM 7B.135, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),

3. *Welcomes the development of the Management Plan for the property and requests the State Party to finalise its approval process at the national and local level;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to continue its efforts in the harmonisation of planning tools for the property, in particular the articulation of the recently developed Management Plan with the Local Plan for Sustainable Land Use Planning and Development;*
5. *Reiterates its invitation to the State Party to consider, within the framework of the Retrospective inventory exercise, the extension of the property and/or its buffer zone to include the "Bay and Islands of the City of Colonia del Sacramento" and to submit a proposal to the World Heritage Committee for approval;*
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 and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*