



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

# World Heritage

# 41 COM

**WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add.2**

**Paris, 8 June 2017**

**Original: English / French**

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

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

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Forty-first session**

**Krakow, Poland  
2-12 July 2017**

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

## **SUMMARY**

This document contains information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. The World Heritage Committee is requested to review the reports on the state of conservation of properties contained in this document. The full reports of Reactive Monitoring missions requested by the World Heritage Committee are available at the following Web address in their original language: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/41COM/documents>

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

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

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

## Table of content

<b>NATURAL PROPERTIES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.....</b>	<b>3</b>
15. Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California (Mexico) (N 1182ter).....	3
<b>MIXED PROPERTIES .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.....</b>	<b>6</b>
36. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274) .....	6
<b>CULTURAL PROPERTIES .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA .....</b>	<b>11</b>
55. Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey including Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 426bis).....	11
<b>AFRICA .....</b>	<b>15</b>
71. Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956bis) .....	15
<b>ARAB STATES .....</b>	<b>19</b>
75. Qal'at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun (Bahrain) (C 1192ter).....	19
<b>ASIA-PACIFIC .....</b>	<b>22</b>
95. Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121bis).....	22
96. Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan) (C 171).....	26

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

## NATURAL PROPERTIES

### LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

#### 15. Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California (Mexico) (N 1182ter)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2005

Criteria (vii)(ix)(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1182/documents/>

International Assistance

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1182/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

April 2017: joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Serious concerns about the imminent extinction of an endemic porpoise species (vaquita) and over the conservation status of a marine fish (totoaba)
- Illegal fishing

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1182/>

Current conservation issues

On 1 March 2017, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. A joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission visited the property from 9 to 15 April 2017. Both reports are available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1182/documents/>. Furthermore, on 23 May 2017, additional information was provided by the State Party regarding scientific literature and reports on national programmes conducted from 2007 to 2016 at the property.

The State Party provides a comprehensive overview of various conservation and research programmes in different components of the property. With regards to the situation with the vaquita and totoaba, the State Party reports the following:

- The 2015 International Vaquita Marine Expedition estimated the population of the vaquita at about 59 individuals;
- On 15 April 2015 the 2015-2017 Integral Strategy to Protect Vaquita was launched, which temporarily suspended all commercial fishing using gillnets and/or longline by small or artisanal vessels operating in the Northern Gulf of California for a period of two years and established economic compensation programmes for affected fishermen. The enforcement of the suspension is a coordinated effort of the Office of Federal Attorney for Environment of the

Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, National Commission of Aquaculture and Fisheries, and the Mexican Navy;

- The Strategy also launched an inter-institutional programme for removal of derelict fishing gear in the Northern Gulf of California. Research on alternative fishing gear has commenced; however, one of the initially developed alternative lightweight trawls was considered commercially unviable and therefore development of alternative solutions has continued;
- Enforcement efforts have been increased, including through the use of an unmanned aircraft system with the assistance of the Navy which enabled an increase of surveillance efforts.

During its visit, the mission received confirmation that the temporary ban on gillnet use has been extended until 31 May 2017.

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

The measures undertaken by the State Party to prevent the extinction of the critically endangered vaquita should be noted with appreciation, including the highest commitment of the various institutions, particularly the National Commission of Natural Protected Areas (CONANP), to the conservation of the property. The unprecedented cooperation between different institutions, including the Mexican Navy, aimed at coordination of efforts in combatting illegal fishing should be welcomed. However, despite the commendable efforts undertaken by the State Party, the extinction of the vaquita is imminent. On the one hand, it needs to be underlined that combatting illegal trafficking of totoaba swim bladder requires international cooperation between all countries of the source-transit-destination chain, including efforts to reduce the demand in China for this illegally traded product. Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee reiterate its call to the States Parties, which are transit and destination countries for this illegal trade, to continue and increase their cooperation with the State Party of Mexico in addressing the issue of illegal trade in totoaba swim bladders, in particular through the implementation of the recommendations made by the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). On the other hand, a number of additional measures need to be urgently undertaken by the State Party, including establishment of a permanent ban on the use, sale, manufacture and possession of gillnets within the Vaquita Refuge and the current Gillnet and Longline Suspension Zone where a temporary ban has been extended until 31 May 2017 and development of alternative gear for legal fisheries which would not cause bycatch of vaquita, other marine mammal species, sharks or turtles. While efforts to combat illegal fishing have been unprecedented in their scale and institutional involvement and cooperation, it should be noted that the mission concluded that illegal fishing is an ongoing problem. Therefore, the effectiveness of the ban can only be guaranteed if its enforcement continues and is strengthened further, including by strict application of penalties and prosecutions in cases where illegal activities have been confirmed.

The mission considers that the property remains in an overall good state of conservation; however, it concluded that the risk of imminent extinction of the vaquita, which is specifically recognized as part of the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and endemic to the Gulf of California, and whose numbers declined from approximately 300 at the time of the inscription of the property to 59 in 2015, and further to an estimation of 30 individuals in 2016 made by the *Comité Internacional para la Recuperación de la Vaquita* (CIRVA), represents a clear ascertained danger to the OUV of the property in line with Paragraph 180 c) i) of the *Operational Guidelines*. The mission further concluded that entanglement in gillnets is the main cause of vaquita mortality and that the illegal trade in totoaba swim bladder is the central driver of the problem. Furthermore, although exact estimates of the population of the totoaba are not available, there is concern that the increased pressure from targeted fishing of this species is not sustainable. Therefore it is recommended that the Committee inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and request the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, a set of corrective measures and a proposal for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR) focused on the measures needed to address the issue of illegal fishing and to enable shifting of legal fisheries to be regulated and sustainable and based on the use of fishing gear that does not cause bycatch of marine mammals, sharks and turtles in order to ensure the long-term protection of the OUV of the property.

**Draft Decision: 41 COM 7B.15**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add.2,
2. Recalling Decision **40 COM 7B.75**, adopted at its 40th session (Istanbul/UNESCO, 2016),
3. Notes with appreciation the State Party's ongoing commitment and efforts aimed at the preservation of the critically endangered vaquita and totoaba, particularly through the establishment of an unprecedented level of cooperation between different national authorities, including the Mexican Navy;
4. Notes with utmost concern the conclusions of the 2017 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission that the decline of the critically endangered vaquita has continued to an estimated 30 individuals and that the main cause of its mortality is entanglement in illegal gillnets;
5. While noting the confirmation of the mission that other attributes of the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) remain in good condition, considers that the risk of imminent extinction of the vaquita, specifically recognized as part of the property's OUV and endemic to the Gulf of California, represents an ascertained danger to the OUV of the property in line with Paragraph 180 c) i) of the Operational Guidelines;
6. **Decides to inscribe the Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California (Mexico) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;**
7. Urges the State Party to implement all recommendations of the mission, particularly the establishment of a permanent ban on gillnets use, sale, manufacture and possession at sea and on land within the Vaquita Refuge and the current Gillnet and Longline Suspension Zone and in the adjacent land areas and development of alternative gear for legal fisheries which would not cause bycatch of vaquita and other marine mammal species, sharks and turtles;
8. Reiterate its calls to the States Parties, which are transit and destination countries for illegal trade in totoaba swim bladder, to support the State Party of Mexico to halt this illegal trade, in particular through the implementation of the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES);
9. Requests the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, a set of corrective measures and a proposal for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR), for examination by the Committee at its 42nd session in 2018;
10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2018**, 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 42nd session in 2018.

## **MIXED PROPERTIES**

### **LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

#### **36. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)**

*Year of inscription on the World Heritage List* 1983

*Criteria* (i)(iii)(vii)(ix)

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

*Previous Committee Decisions* see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/274/documents/>

##### *International Assistance*

Requests approved: 11 (from 1986-2001)

Total amount approved: USD 166,625

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/274/assistance/>

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

Total amount granted: USD 15,000 Extra-Budgetary Spanish FIT support for the social participation workshop requested by the World Heritage Committee (Decision **30 COM 7B.35**).

##### *Previous monitoring missions*

1989, 1990, 1991, 2003 and 2005: technical missions; October 1997: Joint IUCN/ICOMOS technical mission; October 1999: World Heritage Centre, IUCN/ICOMOS joint technical mission; June 2002 and April 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring missions; January 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS Reinforced Monitoring mission; February 2010: World Heritage Centre technical emergency mission; May 2012: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN Advisory mission; January 2016: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS/ICCROM Advisory mission; February 2017: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission.

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

- Delays in reviewing the Master Plan and developing detailed yearly operational plans, and inadequate budgetary support for effective implementation
- No evaluation of transport options, related geological studies, or the impact of bus traffic on increasing the risk of landslides (issue resolved)
- Lack of impact studies related to the carrying capacity of the Citadel and Inca Trail (issue resolved)
- Delays in the development and implementation of a Public Use Plan (issue resolved)
- Delays in implementing urban planning and control measures for Machu Picchu Village, the main point of entry to the property, which has impacted on the visual values of the property (issue resolved)
- Lack of effective management of the property
- Lack of risk management plans related to natural disasters
- Inadequate governance arrangements including lack of adequate coordination of activities between different institutions and stakeholders involved in the management of the property (issue resolved)
- Uncontrolled visitor access to the western part of the Sanctuary

*Illustrative material* see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/274/>

### Current conservation issues

A joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS/ICCROM Advisory mission visited the property in January 2016. In February 2016, the State Party submitted a progress report, and in December 2016, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property. Subsequently a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission visited the property in February 2017. Both mission reports and summaries of both State Party reports are available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/274/documents/>. Finally, additional information regarding a road project in Machu Picchu Village (*Alameda Siete Maravillas*) was submitted in February 2017, and further, in April 2017, information, regarding the proposal for the creation of a Biosphere Reserve and progress in the implementation of the Master Plan.

The State Party reports the following:

- The Master Plan of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu was updated and approved in 2015. The management unit (UGM, Unidad de Gestión del Santuario Histórico de Machu Picchu) was reinforced with the establishment of a Technical Committee and an Action Committee involving relevant local and national authorities. Its new regulation is still pending for approval. In December 2016, the Technical Committee approved the following documents for the property:
  - ✓ A Legal Harmonization Study,
  - ✓ The Comprehensive Strategy for Amazonian (Western) Access, which aims to control and guide the development of this access in order to reach the same level of services as the Andean (principal) access,
  - ✓ A management effectiveness assessment, which includes an evaluation of the governance of current management, a proposal for a new sustainable tourism management model, and the evaluation of the implementation of the Master Plan (Plan Maestro),
  - ✓ The Public Use Plan (PUP), following which two Ministerial resolutions were adopted in February 2017, regarding Tourism Visitation and Use in the Archaeological Site (Llaqta), and Tourism Use of the Inca Trail (red de caminos incas). These regulations cover themes related to access, circuits, period and time for visiting, guiding services, reservations, waste separation, expected conduct, etc. and include a clear section on obligations, prohibitions and sanctions to contraventions;
- The Carrying Capacity and Limit of Acceptable Change Study of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu, approved in January 2016 by the Decentralized Bureau of Culture-Cusco of the Ministry of Culture (DDC), highlights that, currently, the carrying capacity of the property is exceeded on a daily basis due to the formation of congestion in certain areas of the Llaqta. Alternative scenarios were developed and a theoretical maximum number of 6,000 visitors per day was suggested, which would need to be supported by improving the management of tourism flow and closing some congestion points to the public, and would need to be the subject of a rigorous monitoring to establish the actual maximum figure. The two other studies undertaken by DDC and the National Service of Protected Natural Areas (SERNANP) suggested that the carrying capacities for the Inca Trail and the Hiram Bingham road are respectively 500 visitors and 24 buses per day. It is recognized that the current number of buses should be maintained and that a hydrological study should be conducted in order to minimize the erosion of the surface of the Hiram Bingham road and prevent landslides;
- The Municipality of the District of Machu Picchu and the Municipality of the Province of Urubamba approved in 2015 and 2016, respectively, the Urban Planning Scheme of Machu Picchu District, which regulates urban development and land use, and limits the expansion of the village perimeter;
- A Risk Prevention Plan was approved by the Municipality of the District of Machu Picchu in 2015, and measures have been taken to improve the physical conditions of the environment such as removing stones that blocked the rivers' flow, protecting footpaths from landslides, and performing disaster simulations with the villagers.

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

The measures taken by the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 2016 Advisory mission and previous Committee's decisions **37 COM 7B.35** and **39 COM 7B.36** should be welcomed,

as they have been comprehensively addressed by the State Party, with sufficient progress to overcome the threats built up over a period of six years.

An Advisory mission with a Workshop followed by a Reactive Monitoring mission a year later proved to be a successful method to provide technical support to the State Party in relation to strengthening governance arrangements, and in response to the very specific circumstances of this property.

The missions found that there is a new political will to protect the property through a joint, multi-institutional effort. Nevertheless, although governance arrangements have improved, this positive momentum will still need fostering and there remain specific challenges that require the Committee's attention.

The Reactive Monitoring mission confirmed that in spite of increasing visitor numbers and challenges in the inhabited portion of the site, the archaeological site (Llaqta), and most of the nature reserve surrounding it are in an adequate state of conservation, although the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property is still vulnerable to visitors and development pressures.

The establishment of the UGM, as well as the adoption of the Master Plan in 2015 have improved the governance of the property and its wider landscape and are well noted. Especially the future inclusion of the Santa Teresa district municipality (without territory within the property, but an important gateway to the property from the Amazonian side), it is a clear sign of commitment of UGM to be inclusive and to consider a wider context for the management of the property.

Efforts to improve visitors' management at the property are noted, including regulation of the Amazonian (Western) Access, the development of the PUP, and infrastructure improvements in the hiking trail along the train track. However, the Reactive Monitoring mission noted that developments are still driven by the desire to increase the number of visitors and their service offer, rather than the property's conservation needs. Development of tourism infrastructure has to be closely regulated and controlled in order to preserve the natural and cultural values of the area, as well as the visual integrity of the property. New infrastructure, such as the visitor centres, Alameda Siete Maravillas, and infrastructure along the Amazonian (Western) Access, should be limited to what is absolutely necessary to guarantee visitors' safety to visitors and fully guided by the conservation of the property. Potential impacts from proposed developments on the OUV of the property should be rigorously assessed in line with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessments and the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage properties.

The development of diverse carrying capacity studies is appreciated, while noting that they are also driven by the desire to increase the number of visitors and not focused on conservation. It is therefore recommended that the Committee request the State Party to identify and enforce carrying capacities with the primary objective of conservation of OUV, including addressing problems related to erosion, disturbance to fauna and flora, and increasing solid waste and general pollution. Once completed, carrying capacity should be enforced by applying clear limits to visitor numbers along with the promotion of alternative visitor sites outside the Llaqta.

Recalling the Committee's previously repeated concerns over the absence of use regulations, the approved PUP is a good step forward to a detailed assessment of how the current uses and the proposed activities to be developed in the property may affect the OUV of the property, but should, however, be complemented with a more detailed implementation plan and operative regulations based on assessments of the potential impact of these activities on conservation objectives. Furthermore, the approved touristic use regulations refer only to tourist use, while the other types of use mentioned in the PUP (including agriculture, transport, and research) are not included. Regulations and sanctions including these types of uses should therefore be developed.

Regarding Machu Picchu District Urban Regulation, it is recommended that the Committee commend the State Party for the strong commitment shown in the implementation of the Urban Planning Scheme, which has achieved significant improvements in the urban landscape and the visual aspect of the village.

Following the adoption of the Risk Reduction and Prevention Plan further effort is required to remove remaining buildings in high risk areas (e.g. on the banks of the Urubamba River), in close coordination between all levels of government.

Moreover, it is recommended that the Committee request the State Party to fully implement the recommendations made by the 2017 Reactive Monitoring mission, in order to resolve all remaining issues, including those mentioned above.



Concerning new developments, despite references made by the State Party during both missions to new infrastructure transport projects, no official information was provided in this regard and an updated technical assessment was, therefore, not possible. However given their potential closeness to the property and the larger volume of tourists they may bring to the region, it is essential that the State Party submit, once available and prior to their approval or implementation, detailed information on the proposed infrastructure transport projects, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Finally, it is suggested that the Committee recommend the State Party to develop an integral vision for the whole property, based on attributes of OUV and their conservation needs, rather than primarily on tourism, and linked to an integral natural and cultural monitoring system, with defined indicators, in order to quickly identify threats and address them in a timely manner. The approval of UGM new regulation is a first step and will certainly contribute towards the implementation of this integral vision for the property.

### **Draft Decision: 41 COM 7B.36**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add.2,
2. Recalling Decisions **37 COM 7B.35** and **39 COM 7B.36**, adopted at its 37th (Phnom Penh, 2013) and 39th (Bonn, 2015) sessions respectively,
3. Notes with appreciation the measures taken by the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 2016 Advisory mission and previous Committee decisions,
4. Requests the State Party to fully implement the recommendations of the 2017 Reactive Monitoring mission;
5. Commends the State Party for the reinforcement of the property's Management Unit UGM (*Unidad de Gestión del Santuario Histórico de Machu Picchu*), which improved the governance of the property and the wider landscape, and also requests the State Party to finalize the approval of the UGM's new regulation;
6. Also commends the State Party for the strong commitment shown in the implementation of the Urban Plan of Machu Picchu district, which has achieved significant improvements in the urban landscape;
7. Takes note of the completion of carrying capacity studies, regulation for the Amazonian Access, and the development of a Public Use Plan (PUP) and Touristic Use regulations for the property; notes with concern that carrying capacity, use regulations and developments in the property are not based on the primary objective of conservation of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and further requests the State Party to:
  - a) Review the carrying capacities on the basis of conservation needs and application of clear limits to visitors,
  - b) Develop use regulations and sanctions to other types of uses beyond tourism,
  - c) Ensure that proposed developments are rigorously assessed in terms of their impact on OUV, in line with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment and the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage properties;
8. Notes the proposed development of several major infrastructure projects in the region, and requests furthermore the State Party, to submit to the World Heritage Centre, for

*review by the Advisory Bodies, detailed information on planned infrastructure transport projects in the region, that might impact the OUV, prior to their approval or implementation, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*

9. *Recommends that the State Party define an overall vision for the property, based on the attributes of OUV and conservation needs, rather than primarily on tourism, and linked to an integral natural and cultural monitoring system, with defined indicators, in order to identify remaining and potential new threats in a timely and systematic manner;*
10. *Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2018**, 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 43rd session in 2019.*

## **CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

### **EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

#### **55. Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey including Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 426bis)**

*Year of inscription on the World Heritage List* 1987

*Criteria* (i)(ii)(iv)

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

*Previous Committee Decisions* see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/426/documents/>

##### *International Assistance*

Requests approved: 0

Total amount approved: USD 0

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/426/assistance>

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

N/A

##### *Previous monitoring missions*

November 2006: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission; December 2011: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission; February 2017: joint ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission

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

- Construction proposals in the immediate vicinity of the property that could have an adverse impact on the setting, related vistas and integrity of the property
- Lack of an in-depth visual impact study on possible impacts of development projects, as well as lack of an approved management plan
- Need for protection of the immediate surroundings of the property through an adequate buffer zone

*Illustrative material* see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/426/>

##### *Current conservation issues*

On 28 November 2016, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report. A joint ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission visited the property from 21 to 23 February 2017. Both reports are available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/426/documents>

The State Party reported on:

- London's new and updated planning policies for Greater London and local boroughs to further include measures to protect the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property.
- The current state of development projects such as at Elizabeth House in Waterloo and the Vauxhall/Nine Elms sites.
- Review of the 2007 Management Plan, launched in 2016 and led by the Westminster City Council at the request of the Westminster WHS Steering Group;
- Conservation works and infrastructure improvements at the Palace of Westminster including archeological work, the temporary education centre, and the planned Restoration and Renewal (R&R) Programme

- Conservation work and the adaptive reuse of the Triforium at Westminster Abbey to serve as a new museum;
- A proposal for a new Holocaust Memorial in the vicinity of the property.

The State Party confirmed its commitment to notifying the Committee of proposals that may affect the property and its wider setting, but has noted that the Committee's timeline is incompatible with the United Kingdom statutory timeframe for planning decisions. Once a local planning authority has made a planning decision, it is not possible for the State Party to challenge it, unless the Secretary of State has called it in.

The report of the Reactive Monitoring mission identifies general issues about the consent processes within the property and its setting; urban planning issues; the cumulative impacts of development projects, particularly tall buildings; management mechanisms including the role of Historic England; the conservation and renewal work at Westminster Palace and at Westminster Abbey. The report also includes recommendations regarding the property and the potential benefits of creating links and consistent approaches between the four World Heritage properties in London, and in the United Kingdom more generally.

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

The State Party has not intervened with regard to major projects such as One Nine Elms Lane and Elizabeth House, as requested previously by the Committee. The Reactive Monitoring mission confirmed that these and other proposed developments have the potential to create an adverse effect on important views to and from the property, thereby negatively impacting on OUV.

Although the Greater London Authority (GLA) and borough authorities continue to develop planning guidance documents to improve procedures linked to the protection of the attributes of OUV, these policies have not had a significant impact on the approval and construction of buildings "on the ground". Use of tools such as dynamic 3D modelling should be utilized as much as possible to ensure that new proposals do not have a negative impact on OUV, by themselves, or also cumulatively with other proposals. Developments are being approved against the advice of Historic England, whose guidance needs to be given stronger weight in determining when to call in an application, so that the State Party may meet its obligations under the *World Heritage Convention* more effectively.

It is recommended that the Committee request the State Party to develop consistency between its obligations, and those of the local government authorities, in addressing appropriate planning mechanisms integrating the protection of OUV. Furthermore, planning policies should be reconsidered to ensure that the notion of balancing protection of OUV and other benefits of development projects be more strongly weighted towards the requirement to protect OUV. There is a need to link the strategic city development vision with heritage-led regulatory planning documents to provide clear legal guidelines for consistent management of all World Heritage properties in London.

Regarding the Palace of Westminster, major restoration and renewal works are being planned for the building and its services. As some of this work may include demolitions, additions, or changes to existing building fabric, the Committee should invite the State Party to submit details for these projects to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for advice.

Regarding Westminster Abbey and the new museum space planned for the Triforium, work has already begun on this adaptive reuse project, including the construction of an access tower on the exterior of the abbey. While judged not to have a negative impact on OUV, it would have been preferable for information on this major work to have been submitted to the World Heritage Centre during planning stages. It is recommended that the Committee ask for full documentation of the work being carried out to be sent to the World Heritage Centre and may also wish to ask the State Party to ensure that any future major restoration or adaptive reuse projects be submitted as per Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

It is also recommended that the Committee request the State Party to implement all 23 recommendations of the Reactive Monitoring mission report.

**Draft Decision: 41 COM 7B.55**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add.2,
2. Recalling Decision **38 COM 7B.36** and **39 COM 7B.87**, adopted at its 38th (Doha, 2014) and 39th (Bonn, 2015) sessions respectively,
3. Takes note of the State Party's efforts to strengthen the policy and planning framework through guidance documents, but notes nevertheless that there is still an inadequate urban planning framework to manage development in the setting of the property, with the result that developments, which have been approved contrary to the advice of English Heritage, are causing cumulative negative impact on the OUV of the property;
4. Strongly regrets that the State Party did not comply with the requests made in Decision **38 COM 7B.36** to ensure that the proposal of the Nine Elms Regeneration Development Market Towers, Vauxhall Cross and Vauxhall Island Site project be revised and reconsidered, following concerns raised by English Heritage (now Historic England), and notes with concern that these projects have been built, and therefore, requests that the advice of Historic England, be given a stronger weight in determining when to call in an application for development within the property or within its setting.
5. Also notes with concern that once a local planning authority has made a planning decision, it is not possible to challenge it, unless the State Secretary calls it in, and also notes that the State Party considers the World Heritage Committee's timeline to be incompatible with applicable statutory planning timeframes and requirements.
6. Further notes that the lack of an urban planning framework creates a need to assess individual projects and requests the State Party to ensure that, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, any large-scale projects which may be proposed in the future in the immediate and wider setting of the property be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, before any decision is taken or approval is issued;
7. Recommends therefore, that planning policies be reconsidered to ensure that balancing between protection of OUV and the other benefits of development projects is more strongly weighted towards the requirement to protect OUV, in accordance with the obligations of the State Party under the World Heritage Convention, and underlines the need to link the strategic city development vision with heritage-led regulatory planning documents in order to provide clear legal guidelines to manage all World Heritage properties in London in a consistent manner.
8. Also takes notes that major conservation works are planned as part of a Restoration and Renewal project for the Palace of Westminster and also requests the State Party to submit details, including Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) prepared in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidelines on HIAs for World Heritage cultural properties, to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, as soon as these are available and before any decision is taken or approval is issued;
9. Further requests the State Party to finalize the review of the Management Plan for the property as soon as possible and to submit an electronic and three printed copies to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;

10. *Taking note of the 23 recommendations of the 2017 Reactive Monitoring mission, to identify potential courses of action to address ways of strengthening protection, including planning frameworks and management structures and limit the impacts development projects and other current planning applications on the OUV of the property, and requests furthermore the State Party to expedite their implementation;*
11. *Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2018**, 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 43rd session in 2019.*

## AFRICA

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2000

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/956/documents/>

#### International Assistance

Requests approved: 1 (from 1997-1997)

Total amount approved: USD 11,500

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/956/assistance/>

#### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 192,697.13 from the France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement

#### Previous monitoring missions

March-April 2004: Joint World Heritage Centre/France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement mission; April 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission; 2007: France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement mission; February 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission; March 2014: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission with participation of an expert from the France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement; May 2017: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission with the participation of an expert from the European Space Agency (ESA).

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

- Lack of monitoring and control mechanism
- Lack of a conservation and management plan (existence of a Safeguarding and Enhancement Plan serving as a Conservation and Management Plan)
- New constructions, architectural modifications and urban projects affecting authenticity and integrity
- Inappropriate housing restoration
- Environmental disorder due to the modification of the mouth of the Senegal River
- Extremely poor state of conservation of numerous derelict buildings endangering occupants
- Lack of a site manager (Issue resolved)

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/956/>

#### Current conservation issues

On 30 January 2017, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/956/documents> and providing the following information:

- Insufficient application of the Safeguarding and Enhancement Plan (PSMV 2015-2020) serving as the Management Plan. It is proposed to revitalize the Safeguarding and Management Committee of the property, under the responsibility of the Regional Committee for Development; two work meetings were foreseen to disseminate the regulatory provisions and coordinate initiatives, at the beginning of 2017;

- A police unit is installed at Saint-Louis for surveillance and ground conservation (October 2016) and a special Committee to instruct the work permits and control their implementation within the property and the buffer zone shall be established in February 2017;
- Regional and local urban services must establish a descriptive list of the derelict buildings and determine the priorities for intervention. A common fund has been announced, partly subsidized by both public and private grants, to support this work; the sum announced amounts to 2,250 milliards of CFA francs (approx. 3.5 million euros);
- An architect will be made available to the local authorities. In particular, he must define the tools and standard framework for the measures to be established and supervise the training of the management and conservation agents for the property.

In conformity with Decision **40 COM 7B.18**, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission took place from 6 to 12 May 2017.

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

During its 40th session in 2016, the Committee expressed strong concern regarding the very low rate of implementation of the 2014 Reactive Monitoring mission recommendations, as well as the recommendations formulated by the Committee since 2010 relating to : severe degradation and the lack of restoration and maintenance of several historic buildings; the participatory management of the property; the integration of regulatory measures; the recruitment of sworn-in agents; the control mechanism for monitoring modifications and new constructions; diagnostic study on the most derelict public buildings; securing funding resources; capacity building and awareness raising.

The 2017 mission noted that, although a significant number of the 2014 reactive monitoring mission recommendations are gradually being implemented, several listed or remarkable buildings are in a reasonable state of conservation, and the overall situation is nevertheless rather more contrasted. Slow degradation has been noted in some cases, particularly for buildings already identified in 2005 (PSMV) as being in a bad state of conservation or ruin, and 45% of the 117 units studied in the framework of the Tourism Development Programme (PDT). There are several cases of degradation where, in 2005, the buildings were considered healthy (26% of the 117 units studied).

The priority areas identified in the report submitted in 2017 by the State Party concern, notably, the Cathedral, the Governor's Palace, the mosque and interventions on private buildings. Indeed, the Tourism Development Programme has been able to raise strong support for rehabilitation from the private sector. Therefore, it is essential that this dynamic is continued and that pilot rehabilitation actions are carried out in order to sustain motivation.

With regard to the breach and its evolution, the problems have not yet been resolved; however, an international call for tender was launched and the EIFFAGE Group has been retained.

Concerning management, a distinct improvement in the coordination of the stakeholders is noted compared to 2014. Some collaboration tools have been introduced (extended Safeguard Committee, Action Plan, some joint conservation or enhancement projects, etc.). Nonetheless, major efforts must be pursued to consolidate and formalize this collaborative framework.

With regard to the control, monitoring and protection measures, the basis for an efficacious monitoring system has been established, following a long consultation process with all the stakeholders. It still remains for the State Party to examine the operational implementation by organizing systematic meetings and by imposing construction permits for all works.

The mission also noted the conclusions of the audit, requested by the French Development Agency (AFD) to assess the implementation of the PDT, following the analysis which showed a very negative balance in terms of disbursement rate (less than 8%), too complex technical set-up, and a very complex thematic (heritage) requiring precise and regular monitoring to respond to both local and international expectations.

It should be noted that the Committee has expressed its concern with regard to the very low rate of implementation of the recommendations of the 2014 Reactive Monitoring mission and those it emitted since 2010 and evoked during its 40th session in 2016, that is the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in the absence of significant progress.

Although progress has been achieved as regards an agreement for the strengthening of management and planning, and some conservation activities have been carried out, the overall condition of the



property is not yet stabilized and in some parts there remains a state of deterioration compared to that of 2005. Until such times as a more precise revitalization plan is established and strengthened monitoring reveals that the deterioration has been curbed in time, the property remains threatened by the degradation of its attributes. The inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger can only be avoided by supporting the progress already begun to counterbalance the permanent threats to the property.

**Draft Decision: 41 COM 7B.71**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add.2,*
2. *Recalling Decision **40 COM 7B.18**, adopted at its 40th session (Istanbul/UNESCO, 2016),*
3. *Notes the recent measures taken by the State Party to strengthen and adapt the governance of the property and deal with the issues to conserve its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), in particular:*
  - a) *The creation of a single Regional Committee responsible for the authorization of the constructions and work concerning the property,*
  - b) *The creation of a specialised police unit installed at Saint Louis for surveillance and ground soil conservation activities,*
  - c) *The announcement of the establishment of an inventory of the most threatened public and private buildings and a plan for priority restoration to be conducted with support from a dedicated financial fund,*
  - d) *The proposal to recruit an architect-urbanist for the project;*
4. *Commends the consistent mobilization of the local communities (Associations, District Councils, etc.) and the effective involvement of the private partners in the safeguarding actions for the property;*
5. *Notes nevertheless, that the property remains vulnerable because the earlier deterioration was not halted and urges the State Party to pursue its efforts to improve the management and governance of the property, and to put in place the following measures:*
  - a) *Revitalize the management structure of the property and clarify the role of the many bodies involved in the current management of the property and their coordination,*
  - b) *Confirm the preparation of a documented technical inventory (database) of the endangered buildings to envisage their maintenance and appropriate restoration, and to achieve this, to implement the following points:*
    - (i) *The Commission for the authorization of work must have the resources to monitor their implementation and intervene in the event of non-conformity,*
    - (ii) *Planning with a timetable of priority work to be urgently conducted and in the medium-term to rehabilitate the most dilapidated or threatened historic buildings,*
    - (iii) *The effective establishment of the public and private fund to guarantee the implementation of these works, and its operating methods,*

- (iv) *The confirmation of the recruitment of an architect town planner specialized in the technical and architectural direction of a plan for the restoration of historic buildings expressing an Outstanding Universal Value,*
  - (v) *The development of a permanent team to prescribe good practices and technical intervention for conservation, in support of the architect-urbanist to be made available to the project,*
  - (vi) *The development and implementation of a monitoring system to record building conditions over time,*
  - c) *Develop a communication strategy aimed at sharing the values of the property with the inhabitants, in particular through the establishment of the Heritage House,*
  - d) *Establish monitoring of the geomorphological evolution of the mouth of the Senegal River to assess the potential or possible threats to the conservation of the physical integrity of the soil supporting the property;*
6. ***Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2018, 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 42nd session in 2018, with a view to considering, if documented progress has not been achieved, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

## ARAB STATES

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 2005

Criteria (ii)(iii)(iv)

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

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

#### International Assistance

Requests approved: 1 (2002)

Total amount approved: USD 26,500

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

#### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

#### Previous monitoring missions

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

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

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

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

#### Current conservation issues

On 7 March 2017, the State Party submitted a report, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1192/documents/>, and addresses the Committee's requests at its 39th session (Bonn, 2015). The report provides the following information:

- The implementation of the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (2013-2018) (CCMP) by the Bahrain Authority for Culture and Antiquities (BACA) led to the inclusion of the gardens within the boundaries of the property and the cooperation of the owners and tenants of these lands, notably to preserve the farming activities;
- Financial constraints have delayed the implementation of the CCMP, the first review of which should take place end of 2017 with a final review scheduled for 2019;
- The state of conservation of the property remains unchanged as the result of regular monitoring and maintenance, training of staff working at the site and a close follow-up of the random small scale development initiatives within the buffer zone;

- Archaeological studies are being conducted at the site while visitor's experience is improved through additional information and awareness measures as well as increased access to the gardens surrounding the archeological area;
- The draft amendment to Legislative Decree No. 11 of 1995 is still under examination by the Parliament thus delaying the signature of memoranda of understanding with the owners of lands for the time being;
- A national urban study carried out by the Directorate of Urban Planning is expected to come up with a strategy "*overseeing all the components and contributors of urban life*" that should contribute to the protection of the property;
- Regarding the road connectivity development for Nurana Island, the project's developer is expected to submit an updated Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). In the meantime, BACA and the other concerned Bahraini institutions have reached an agreement with the project's investors to retain the tunnel as the only feasible option;
- BACA has carried out "*detailed studies for the zoning of the vicinity*" of the property, using the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) approach and submitted them to the concerned government bodies;
- BACA also submitted a proposal aiming at reinforcing the protection of the property's attributes, including a vision document for the property and its buffer zone, a new zoning code, specific requirements at the parcel level and a call for HIAs for large-scale projects around the property. The proposal was submitted to the concerned government bodies in October 2016.

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

The State Party is pursuing its efforts to ensure the protection and conservation of the property. However, it appears from the report that the optimal implementation of the CCMP (2013-2018) depends on the improvement of the budgetary conditions, the approval of the revision of the Heritage Law (Legislative Decree No. 11 of 1995). The Committee may wish to urge the State Party to fully implement the CCMP and to include within it the proposals developed by the Bahrain Authority for Culture and Antiquities (BACA) for a vision document, new zoning codes, and requirements for HIAs.

The adoption of the tunnel, as the only feasible option for the road connectivity development for Nurana Island, is a positive step towards the preservation of the attributes of the property. However, it is important that the updated HIA should accurately and comprehensively identify the impacts of the proposed tunnel on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, as a basis for sound decision-making, and so that appropriate mitigative actions can be implemented. Therefore, the revised HIA should conform with the ICOMOS Guidance on HIAs for Cultural World Heritage Properties.

The decision of BACA to use the HUL approach to conduct the series of studies which led to the proposal it submitted to the national decision-making bodies "*to consider cultural heritage as the added value and opportunity to enhance future development projects*" is welcome. This approach is in line with sustainable urban development, as reflected in the UNESCO Global Report on Culture and Sustainable Urban Development, presented by the Organization at Habitat III Conference in 2016.

The urban study carried out by the Directorate of Urban Planning at national level in order to come up with a strategy "*overseeing all the components and contributors of urban life*" could be a good starting point towards a wider reflection on the stakes related to the urban development of the areas surrounding the property. This reflection would integrate all the issues raised in the State Party's report and would come up with long term and large-scale proposed actions in which the sustainable preservation of the property's OUV, with all the attributes which convey it, would be fully taken into consideration.

A meeting on this subject, involving all concerned stakeholders and national institutions as well as the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, could help conducting this reflection and supporting the efforts of the State Party in the conservation and management of the property.

**Draft Decision: 41 COM 7B.75**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add.2,
2. Recalling Decision **39 COM 7B.48**, adopted at its 39th session (Bonn, 2015),
3. Notes the progress achieved by the State Party in the implementation of the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (2008-2013);
4. Also notes with satisfaction that the tunnel has been adopted as the only feasible option for the road connectivity development for Nurana Island;
5. Further notes that the revision of the Heritage Law is still under revision and invites the State Party to consider this revision as a priority, particularly to enable the signature of memoranda of understanding with the owners of lands located within the area designated for the extension of the property, in order to improve its management and conservation;
6. Urges the State Party to implement fully the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan and to include within it the proposals developed by the Bahrain Authority for Culture and Antiquities (BACA) for a vision document, new zoning codes, and requirements for Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs);
7. Encourages the State Party to pursue the use of the approach carried by the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape as well as the urban study carried out by the Directorate of Urban Planning at national level in order to conduct a wider reflection on the stakes related to the urban development of the areas surrounding the property;
8. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, as soon as they are available:
  - a) The results of the updated HIA carried out by the developer of the the road connectivity development for Nurana Island, in line with the ICOMOS Guidance on HIAs for Cultural World Heritage Properties,
  - b) The results of the consultation based on the proposal elaborated by BACA aiming at reinforcing the protection of the property's attributes, including a vision document for the integrated management of the property and its buffer zone, a new zoning code, specific requirements at the parcel level and a call for HIA for big scale projects around the property;
9. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre the results of the first review of the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan as soon as it has taken place;
10. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2018**, 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 43rd session in 2019.

## ASIA-PACIFIC

### 95. Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1979

Criteria (iii)(iv)(vi)

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

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

#### International Assistance

Requests approved: 16 (from 1979 à 2015)

Total amount approved: USD 434,319

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

#### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 10 million (1979-2001) from the International Safeguarding Campaign; USD 45,000 (2005) and USD 20,000 (2011) from Netherlands Funds-in-Trust. Several UNESCO extra-budgetary projects have been approved in late 2015/early 2016 for the post-earthquake emergency safeguarding, conservation and rehabilitation process of the Kathmandu Valley

#### Previous monitoring missions

February 2003: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; April 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission; March 2011: UNESCO international expert advisory mission; November 2011: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission; October-November 2015: Joint World Heritage Centre /ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission; March 2017: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission

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

- Earthquake (Severe earthquake of 25 April 2015)
- Housing (Uncontrolled urban development resulting in the loss of traditional urban fabric, in particular privately-owned houses)
- Management systems/management plan (Lack of a coordinated management mechanism)
- Ground transport infrastructure (Construction of a forest road)
- Underground transport infrastructure (Project for tunnel road in Pashupati Monument Zone)
- Air transport infrastructure (Project for the extension of the Kathmandu International Airport)
- Localized utilities (New development projects, in particular the crematorium in Pashupati Monument Zone and the reconstruction of Bhaidegah Temple)

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

#### Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2017, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/121/documents>. A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission visited the property on 20-25 March 2017 (mission report available at the link above).

The State Party's report highlights the following:

- Following the disaster, an Earthquake Response Coordination Office was established at the Department of Archaeology (DoA) to facilitate coordination between the Government of Nepal, the

UNESCO Office in Kathmandu and the international community during the emergency salvaging, protection and planning efforts;

- Although all seven Protected Monument Zones suffered from the 2015 earthquake and the main monuments were affected, this concerned only some 17% of all monuments located within the World Heritage property, which the State Party does not consider especially significant;
- The State Party considers that these monuments can be rehabilitated through the Nepalese tradition of cyclical renewal;
- The DoA has already prepared and implemented post-earthquake guidelines for conservation, reconstruction and rehabilitation. The State Party considers that there will be no negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property at the end of the reconstruction and rehabilitation process;
- Research has been undertaken for every monument in order to diagnose any major damage; this will serve as a basis for decisions on conservation approaches (conservation, reconstruction, or rehabilitation);
- All post-earthquake conservation, reconstruction and rehabilitation activities have been carried out in accordance with the Recovery Master Plan, and both reconstruction and rehabilitation works are carried out with community participation;
- All national authorities concerned with heritage rehabilitation have been working in close coordination;
- The integrated Management Plan was reviewed just before the earthquake; it has since been reviewed again and is awaiting approval;
- Training and capacity-building programmes focusing on earthquake recovery and first aid have been organized by different national and international organizations, including ICCROM, in close cooperation with DoA.

In its report, the State Party also provides brief details of progress with work on individual monuments.

The report of the 2017 mission provides more detailed assessments of the damage to and state of conservation of all seven Monument Zones. It notably covers the work carried out, the resulting achievements and highlights what remains to be addressed, while assessing with the planning and management structures. The mission report specifically highlights the following concerns:

- On many monuments, work has barely begun: badly damaged structures are inadequately supported or protected and many neighbouring structures have been demolished;
- Work undertaken so far has not been based on a systematic assessment and mapping of the damage, nor has a centralized database been established to list which elements have been damaged and which have survived;
- Local ground conditions around the monuments have been adequately investigated;
- No recovery plans exist to guide the work being undertaken;
- What constitutes the attributes of OUV and what is meant by 'the recovery of OUV' appears not to be well understood;
- Much of the restoration work consists of uncontrolled reconstruction of poor quality, resulting in considerable loss of significant fabric, and the research on traditional building techniques, along with the studies of later alterations, are inadequate;
- The contractors who have been appointed are not all experienced in historic building conservation;
- Late 19th- and 20th-century buildings have been demolished without adequately assessing their contribution to the evolution of the monument zones;
- Traditional houses with their ground-floor shops have suffered from the earthquakes and the recovery process; large numbers have been demolished and are being replaced with concrete-framed structures;
- Coordination between the DoA, the National Reconstruction Authority, site managers, local communities and various project partners (both local and international) appears to be poor;

- To enable the efficient and effective management of the post-disaster recovery, the DoA requires far greater capacity (e.g. architectural expertise and experience in heritage conservation) and resources (human, technological and financial).

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

It is recommended that the Committee acknowledge the strong commitment of the State Party, the considerable amount of work that it has undertaken for the recovery of the property, particularly by salvaging important elements, and its capacity-building efforts. However, the scale and scope of the disaster must be acknowledged, along with the fact that the response required goes well beyond the capacity and resources of the Department of Archaeology.

The recommendations formulated by the previous Reactive Monitoring mission of 2016 have not been fully implemented, notably concerning the preparation of a Recovery Master Plan for each of the seven monument zones or the review and update of the Integrated Management Plan, neither of which have been submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review the Advisory Bodies.

The detailed results of the 2017 mission clearly highlight that the property is facing serious deterioration of its architectural and town-planning coherence. This has arisen not only from the immediate impact of the earthquakes, but worryingly also from some of the work undertaken during the subsequent recovery process, which is adding to the erosion of the property's integrity and authenticity.

The mission describes in clear detail the scale and scope of damage to all the monument zones three years after the earthquake, the lack of any support or protection for many damaged areas, the demolition of ancillary structures, and the degradation of housing areas and commercial properties. The slow pace of recovery and the damaging restoration work carried out on some of the monuments appears to reflect the current management weaknesses across the property, the lack of adequate planning or coordination, and the overall lack of capacity to undertake the necessary documentation, research and analyses that should underpin all of the work.

Notwithstanding the good measures adopted by the State Party, the recovery process is not currently at an adequate scale to deal with the major challenges that have arisen following the earthquake. Planning coordination needs to be further strengthened and there is a lack of evidence to support the work undertaken, which often does not respect the distinctive traditional materials and local practices. All of this is impacting adversely on the OUV of the property and has potential to inflict even greater damage in the future. Therefore, it is clear that the property is currently facing actual and potential threats to its OUV, in accordance with Paragraph 179 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The potential and ascertained threats identified by the 2017 mission are so considerable that the recovery process needs to be quickened and made more effective. It is suggested that much greater input, collaboration and coordination of support from the international community could help to achieve this shift. There is also an urgent need for the development of a coherent and coordinated overall Recovery Plan, along with Recovery Plans for individual monument zones.

The property needs more support and more structures that allow a proportionate response to these threats. This response should be linked to social and economic development, so that the recovery of the property can be clearly linked to wider community benefits. To this end, it is recommended that the Committee inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in order to enable a greater mobilization of the international community and its extensive network of experts and resources, and as a means of assisting the State Party in the task of recovering the property and its OUV.

Finally, it should be noted that the mission discussed in detail with the State Party the technical, planning, legal and management measures that are needed to recover the attributes of the OUV. These could be considered as contributing to a Desired state of conservation for the property (DSOCR) to be proposed by the State Party in response to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.



**Draft Decision: 41 COM 7B.95**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add.2,
2. Recalling Decision **40 COM 7B.41**, adopted at its 40th session (Istanbul/UNESCO, 2016),
3. Acknowledges the strong commitment of the State Party and work that it has undertaken for the recovery of the property, particularly by salvaging important elements, and its capacity-building efforts;
4. Takes note of the report of March 2017 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission to the property;
5. Also acknowledges the scale and scope of the disaster, as described by the 2017 mission, the laudable yet inadequate response to recovery, and the continuing, serious deterioration of the property's architectural and town-planning coherence resulting not only from the immediate impacts of the earthquakes, but worryingly also from some of the work undertaken during the subsequent recovery process, which is eroding the property's integrity and authenticity;
6. Recognizes that the slow pace of recovery and the damaging restoration work on some monuments appears to reflect the current management weaknesses across the property, the lack of adequate planning or coordination and the overall lack of capacity to undertake the necessary documentation, research and analyses that should underpin all recovery work;
7. Considers that the potential and ascertained threats to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property are so considerable that the recovery process needs to be quickened and made more effective, and that the scale and scope of the disaster and the response required goes well beyond the capacity and resources of the Department of Archaeology (DoA), and also considers that much greater input, collaboration and coordination of support from the international community could likely help to achieve this shift;
8. Further considers that inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger will enable a greater mobilization of the international community and its extensive network of experts and resources, as a means of assisting the State Party in the recovery the property and its OUV;
9. **Decides therefore, in conformity with Paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines, to inscribe Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;**
10. Requests the State Party to prepare, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a proposal for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR) and a set of corrective measures and a timeframe for their implementation, for approval by the Committee at 42nd session in 2018;
11. Calls upon the international community to support the State Party's urgent recovery work through financial, technical or expert assistance;

12. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2018**, 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 42nd session in 2018.

## 96. Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan) (C 171)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List 1981

Criteria (i)(ii)(iii)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger 2000-2012

Previous Committee Decisions see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/171/documents/>

### International Assistance

Requests approved: 5 (from 1981 to 2000)

Total amount approved: USD 121,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/171/assistance/>

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 975,000 from the UNESCO/Norway Funds-in-Trust, the UNESCO/Japan Funds-in-Trust, the Getty Foundation, and the United States Embassy in Pakistan.

### Previous monitoring missions

October 2000: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission; April 2001 and June 2003: UNESCO experts' Advisory Missions; November 2005: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission; February 2009: joint UNESCO Office in Tehran/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission; April-May 2012: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Housing; Land conversion (Encroachments and urban pressure)
- Management systems/management plan (Inadequate management mechanisms; lack of definition of boundaries of the Lahore Fort and Shalamar Gardens)
- Legal framework (Incomplete legislation)
- Financial resources (Lack of sufficient financial resources to implement management mechanisms)
- Underground transport infrastructure; Ground transport infrastructure (Development of the Orange Line Metro (aerial portion of the line))

Illustrative material see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/171/>

### Current conservation issues

On 30 January 2017, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, which is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/171/documents> and addresses a number of conservation issues raised by the Committee at its previous sessions, as follows:

- The Orange Line Metro project has been designed to minimize the impacts of vibrations on the Shalamar Gardens. A visual impact study will be submitted as soon as it has been carried out;
- Despite efforts made by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, at the time of writing this report, the State Party has not invited the Reactive Monitoring mission requested by the Committee at its last session (Decision **40 COM 7B.43**). On 29 March 2017, the State Party wrote to the Director of the World Heritage Centre, indicating that the mission will be invited only after the Supreme Court's final verdict on the case of the Orange Line Metro project has been released;

- The work set out in the 2006 Conservation Plan for the property has been carried out over the past years, for a cost of USD 2.89 million. This includes the consolidation of monuments and improvements to public facilities, security arrangements and structural monitoring measures. Concerning the Lahore Fort, work was undertaken at the Royal Kitchen where, after years of neglect, some structures had fallen and others had been submerged in undergrowth. The remains have been fully documented, ground levels lowered and retaining walls constructed. The flooring adjacent to the Sikh Wall has been consolidated, while the Picture Wall has been surveyed and its condition report been prepared in collaboration with the Aga Khan Culture Service Pakistan. Improvements have also been made to the garden planting and its water management. For the Shalamar Gardens, restoration work started in 2016 on the Naqqar Khana Complex (now the entrance) and the Hydraulic Tank, where retaining walls have been constructed;
- The Walled City of the Lahore Authority has produced a revised Conservation Plan for the Fort that is undergoing approval. A revised Conservation Plan for the Shalamar Gardens is expected to be approved shortly. Both plans will be shared with the World Heritage Centre once approved. A Revitalization Plan for the Pakistan Institute of Archaeological Training & Research has been prepared, as well as a set of training modules in the fields of cultural heritage conservation and management. This includes advice on resource requirements for the management of World Heritage and other heritage properties;
- A committee has been set up to work on a proposed modification of the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone. As displacement of people is involved, the committee includes stakeholders and community representatives.

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

By the time of the preparation of this working document, no visual impact study or detailed report on the progress made with the enlargement of the buffer zone has reached the World Heritage Centre. It should be noted that the State Party already reported in 2016 that it had begun the process of revising the buffer zone. Therefore, it would be important for the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to receive a draft of this proposal, so that a technical review can be provided.

The conservation works undertaken at the Lahore Fort and the ones currently ongoing at the Shalamar Gardens are well noted. The State Party should however ensure that all such work is documented and that the necessary archaeological inputs are provided.

Concerning the Orange Line Metro project, little detailed information has been provided in the State Party's report. The Government of Punjab has appealed against the verdict of the Lahore High Court in August 2016, which stopped all construction work within 61 meters of eleven heritage buildings, including the Shalamar Gardens and five other special premises in Lahore. However, work has progressed on the elevated metro line in all the areas beyond this 60-metres limit, and by the time of the preparation of this working document, construction work had reached 113 m to the west and 345 m to the East of the entrance to the Shalamar Gardens. In addition, the average distance between the proposed elevated viaduct deck and the Shalamar Gardens is 17.8 m from the south-west corner and 24 m from the south-east corner of Shalamar Gardens, while the minimum distance of the proposed viaduct from the main entrance of Shalamar Gardens is 36.1 m and the minimum distance from the proposed pier of the viaduct is 41.1 m. The vertical distance from the bottom of the proposed deck is 12 m from the road level.

Although in its report, the State Party argues that, on the basis of the report elaborated by the Pakistani engineering firm carrying out the project (NESPAK), there would be no potential negative impact on the Shalamar Gardens arising from vibrations on structures near the track, it should be underlined that the full potential impact of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the Shalamar Gardens goes far beyond the potential impact of vibrations.

As the requested visual impact assessment has not been completed, and since no comprehensive Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) in line with the ICOMOS Guidelines has been carried out to address not only the issue of vibrations, but also the visual and noise impacts, the full impact of the Orange Line Metro project is yet to be formally defined. It must also be noted that the HIA submitted by the State Party in 2016 was not in line with internationally recommended standards for such studies, and hence failed to address the full range of impacts of the project. It is therefore not clear on which grounds the State Party concluded that the Orange Line Metro project would have no negative

impacts on the OUV of the property, nor on what basis the Department of Archaeology of the Government of Punjab issued a Non-objection Certificate for this project.

Since the Committee considered the project last year, construction work has continued on both sides of the Shalamar Gardens to such an extent that it is already impacting on the setting and integrity of the Shalamar gardens. If the existing sections are joined by an elevated track passing in front of the Shalamar gardens at very close distance, as detailed above, this will irreversibly compromise the authenticity and integrity of the property, thereby potentially threatening its OUV.

Taking into consideration (i) the impacts of the ongoing construction work on the setting and integrity of the Gardens; (ii) the absence of a comprehensive management mechanism which can control and monitor urban encroachment as well as the related development projects in the vicinity of the property; and (iii) the absence of any mitigation measures proposed by the State Party, it is recommended that the Committee immediately inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in accordance with Paragraph 179(b) of the *Operational Guidelines*.

It is also recommended that the Committee request the State Party to immediately invite a Reactive Monitoring mission to the property, with a view to considering whether and how comprehensive mitigation measures might be defined, and what measures could be implemented to reverse these threats, in consultation with key provincial and national stakeholders. It is also recommended that the Committee request the State Party to immediately stop construction work on the Orange Metro Line where it approaches the Shalamar Gardens.

### **Draft Decision: 41 COM 7B.96**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC/17/41.COM/7B.Add.2,*
2. *Recalling Decision **40 COM 7B.43**, adopted at its 40th session (Istanbul/UNESCO, 2016),*
3. *Reiterates its extreme concern at the potential impact of the elevated Orange Line Metro, which is to pass at 17.8/24 metres from the Shalamar Gardens; and notes with concern that further construction work on the line to the East and West of the property, carried out since the last Committee, is already having an ascertained impact on the setting and integrity of the property;*
4. *Deeply regrets that the State Party did not invite the Reactive Monitoring mission, as requested by the Committee at its 40th session, and that no exhaustive impact assessments for this project have been undertaken, including the visual assessment requested by the Committee, to determine any and all impacts that the project may have on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, and thus whether and how these might be mitigated;*
5. *Expresses its utmost concern that a Non-objection Certificate has been issued by the Department of Archaeology, and that the Supreme Court of Pakistan is likely to issue a decision on the Orange Line Metro project before the requested Reactive Monitoring mission has visited the property;*
6. *Taking into account that (a) construction work has already progressed close to the property of the Shalamar Gardens; (b) no comprehensive management mechanism exists to control and monitor urban encroachment; and (c) the State Party has not complied with the requests made by the Committee, nor proposed any clear way forward to address the threats, considers that construction work undertaken and planned for the Orange Metro Line represents a threat to the OUV of the property,*

notably its integrity and authenticity, in accordance with Paragraph 179(b) of the Operational Guidelines;

7. **Decides, therefore, to inscribe the Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;**
8. Requests the State Party to prepare, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a proposal for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR) and a set of corrective measures and a timeframe for their implementation, for approval by the Committee at its 42nd session in 2018;
9. Urges the State Party to suspend without delay any further work in the immediate vicinity of the Shalamar Gardens and also requests the State Party, as a matter of urgency:
  - a) to identify an alternative location for this specific section of the Orange Line Metro project, which may otherwise continue to have significant adverse impacts on the property;
  - b) to carry out, as soon as possible, a comprehensive Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) in line with the 2011 ICOMOS Guidelines on HIAs for Cultural World Heritage Properties, including a visual impact study and a study on the impact of noise, in order to inform the search for alternative locations ;
  - c) to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the property, **at the latest by the end of 2017**, to discuss with the relevant authorities alternative locations as well as mitigation measures for the negative impacts already caused by the project, and to review the management and protection arrangements of the property, including the enlargement of the buffer zone;
10. Considers that the highest priority must be given to considering how the Shalamar Gardens and their spiritual associations can be sustained alongside any necessary measures to satisfy the needs of a growing city, by setting out the precise and detailed nature of the potential impacts of the Orange Line Metro project on the OUV of the property, and whether and how mitigation measures can be undertaken before any irreversible decision is taken;
11. Reiterates the great need to adequately manage and effectively control encroachment and urban development in and around the property, and therefore further requests the State Party to immediately undertake setting studies and procedures in this regard, which will be taken into account when proposing an enlargement of the property's buffer zone;
12. Notes the conservation work that has been undertaken at Lahore Fort and is in progress at the Shalamar Gardens, and requests furthermore the State Party to ensure that all such work is documented, together with any necessary archaeological inputs;
13. Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2018**, 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 42nd session in 2018.