



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

# World Heritage

# 32 COM

Distribution Limited

WHC-08/32.COM/7B

Paris, 22 May 2008

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-Second Session  
Quebec City, Canada  
2 - 10 July 2008

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

#### SUMMARY

As per Decision **7 EXT.COM 4B.1, paragraph 9**, this document contains information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, and is separated in three categories:

1. State of conservation reports for adoption requiring discussion by the World Heritage Committee, and especially concerning properties considered for in-Danger listing;
2. State of conservation reports for adoption requiring no discussion by the World Heritage Committee.

**Decision required:** 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. 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/archive/2008/>



## Table of content

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	6
II.	NEW AND EMERGING ISSUES.....	7
III.	STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT .....	7
IV.	REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST .....	9
	NATURAL PROPERTIES .....	9
	AFRICA .....	9
	1. Mount Kenya (Kenya) (N 800).....	9
	2. Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N 1162) .....	11
	3. Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199).....	12
	4. Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia / Zimbabwe) (N 509) .....	12
	ARAB STATES.....	16
	5. Wadi Al-Hitan (Whale Valley) (Egypt) (N 1186).....	16
	6. Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506).....	17
	7. Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia) (N 8).....	18
	ASIA-PACIFIC.....	19
	8. Purnululu National Park (Australia) (N 1094).....	19
	9. Macquarie Island (Australia) (N 629 rev) .....	21
	10. The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) (N 798).....	24
	11. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083) .....	27
	12. Kaziranga National Park (India) (N 337).....	30
	13. Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340).....	32
	14. Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167) .....	32
	15. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955) .....	37
	16. Shiretoko (Japan) (N 1193) .....	37
	17. Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590).....	41
	EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA .....	44
	18. Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands) (Italy) (N 908) .....	44
	19. Durmitor National Park (Montenegro) (N 100).....	46
	20. Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Białowieża Forest (Belarus / Poland) (N 33-627) ....	48
	21. Danube Delta (Romania) (N 588).....	51
	22. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768 rev) .....	51
	23. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765 bis).....	54
	24. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754).....	58
	25. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900).....	58
	26. Natural System of "Wrangel Island" Reserve (Russian Federation) (N 1023)...	59

27. Henderson Island (United Kingdom) (N 487).....	60
28. Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast (United Kingdom) (N 369).....	62
29. Yellowstone National Park (United States of America) (N 28).....	64
30. Everglades National Park (United States of America) (N 76).....	67
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....	72
31. Iguazu National Park (Argentina) (N 303).....	72
32. Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N 355).....	72
33. Belize Barrier Reef System (Belize) (N 764) .....	72
34. Los Katios National Park (Colombia) (N 1083).....	74
35. Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205 bis) .....	75
36. Alexander von Humboldt National Park (Cuba) (N 839 rev).....	76
37. Sangay National Park (Ecuador) (N 250).....	79
38. Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196) .....	79
39. Manú National Park (Peru) (N 402) .....	79
40. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161).....	79
MIXED PROPERTIES.....	80
ASIA-PACIFIC.....	80
41. Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181 bis).....	80
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA .....	81
42. Pyrénées – Mont Perdu (France / Spain) (C/N 773 bis).....	81
43. Mount Athos (Greece) (C/N 454).....	84
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....	87
44. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274) .....	87
CULTURAL PROPERTIES .....	88
AFRICA .....	88
45. Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323).....	88
46. Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15) .....	90
47. Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia) (C 18).....	90
48. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055).....	90
49. Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev).....	93
50. Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev) .....	93
51. Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599).....	97
52. Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape (South Africa) (C 1265) .....	100
53. Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956 bis).....	100
54. Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173 rev).....	102
ARAB STATES.....	103
55. M'Zab Valley (Algeria) (C 188) .....	103

56.	Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193) .....	105
57.	Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87) .....	107
58.	Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89).....	107
59.	Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093).....	109
60.	Tyr (Lebanon) (C 299) .....	109
61.	Medina of Essaouira (Ancient Mogador) (Morocco) (C 753 rev) .....	111
62.	Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433).....	113
63.	Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20) .....	114
ASIA-PACIFIC.....		115
64.	The Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) (C 322).....	115
65.	Angkor (Cambodia) (C 668).....	117
66.	Classical Gardens of Suzhou (China) (C 813 bis).....	120
67.	Old Town of Lijiang (China) (C 811) .....	122
68.	Historic Centre of Macao (China) (C 1110) .....	125
69.	Red Fort Complex (India) (C 231 rev) .....	127
70.	Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241) .....	129
71.	Sangiran Early Man Site (Indonesia) (C 593).....	131
72.	Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115).....	134
73.	Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (C 870) .....	136
74.	Town of Luang Prabang (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 479 rev) .....	139
75.	Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666).....	142
76.	Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121).....	145
77.	Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451) .....	146
78.	Parthian Fortresses of Nisa (Turkmenistan) (C 1242).....	147
79.	Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603 rev) .....	148
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA .....		152
80.	Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley (Andorra) (C 1160 bis).....	152
81.	Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784) .....	152
82.	Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033) .....	154
83.	Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786) .....	154
84.	Belfries of Belgium and France (Belgium and France) (C 943 and 943 bis) ...	155
85.	Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 rev) .....	157
86.	Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616).....	159
87.	Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia) (C 822) .....	159
88.	Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (France) (C 85)	162
89.	Bordeaux, Port of the Moon (France) (C 1256) .....	162
90.	Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708) .....	163

91. Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710) .....	163
92. Cologne Cathedral (Germany) (C 292 rev).....	163
93. Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066).....	164
94. Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400 and 400 bis) .....	165
95. Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape (Hungary) (C 1063) .....	166
96. Skellig Michael (Ireland) (C 757) .....	168
97. Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia) (C 852).....	170
98. Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994).....	170
99. Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania) (C 541) .....	172
100. Megalithic Temples of Malta (Malta) (C 132 bis) .....	175
101. Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro) (C 125).....	176
102. Auschwitz Birkenau .....	179
German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp (1940-1945) (Poland) (C 31).....	179
103. Historic Centre of Sighisoara (Romania) (C 902) .....	181
104. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544) .....	184
105. Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540) .....	186
106. Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545).....	188
107. Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation) (C 1170).....	189
108. Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320 bis) .....	190
109. Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev) .....	190
110. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356) .....	193
111. Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis) .....	193
112. Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488).....	195
113. Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom) (C 426) .....	195
114. Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom) (C 373).....	198
115. Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150).....	200
116. City of Bath (United Kingdom) (C 428) .....	203
117. Old and New Towns of Edinburgh (United Kingdom) (C 728 ) .....	205
118. Heart of Neolithic Orkney (United Kingdom) (C 514).....	207
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....	210
119. Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia) (C 567 rev).....	210
120. Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia) (C 285) ...	212
121. City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2) .....	213

122. Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129) .....	214
123. Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414) .....	214
124. Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412) .....	216
125. Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135) .....	218
126. Archaeological site of Panamá Viejo and Historic Distric of Panamá (Panama) (C 790 bis) .....	218
127. Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016).....	220

## 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 Bureau and the 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*).

By its Decision **7 EXT.COM 4B.1**, the Committee had requested that the Director of the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, propose at its 29th session:

- a) Criteria to present State of Conservation reports before the Committee;
- b) Criteria orienting the inclusion of a property in the category "for adoption requiring discussion" and the category "for adoption requiring no discussion";

These criteria were proposed by the World Heritage Centre in 2006 and are reiterated within this introductory section.

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 (Cf. Documents *WHC-08/32.COM/7A* and *WHC-08/32.COM/7A.Add*);
- Properties for which state-of-conservation reports and/or reactive monitoring missions were requested by the Committee at previous sessions;
- Properties which have come under serious threat since the last session of the Committee and which require urgent actions;
- Properties where, upon inscription, follow-up was requested by the Committee.

As for the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007), the draft decisions prepared by the World Heritage Centre, in consultation 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 Committee (which this year reached the number of 127), providing States Parties, among other things, a more realistic timeframe to report on progress achieved on the recommendations by the Committee. Exceptions to this approach have been made when special circumstances demanded annual review.

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 (combined with the Periodic Reporting process). This would allow consideration of properties which have never been subjected to the reporting process, or which have not been considered for many years, and the possible "phasing-out" of others as appropriate.

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 Committee;



- Monitoring and advisory missions carried out by UNESCO staff or consultants in the framework of projects or requested by States Parties;
- Visits to World Heritage properties by UNESCO staff on the occasion of workshops or other events.

## II. NEW AND EMERGING ISSUES

During past sessions of the World Heritage Committee a number of new and emerging issues and threats were discussed, such as climate change, mining, introduced species, risk preparedness, fires and others. The results of the international expert meeting on World Heritage and Buffer Zones (Davos, Switzerland, 10-13 March 2008) requested by Decision **30 COM 9** is presented in Working Document *WHC-08/32 COM/7.1*. The establishment of buffer zones or the lack of the delineation of buffer zones in particular for properties inscribed during the first years of the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* has been taken up by the World Heritage Committee at many occasions.

During discussions between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in March 2008 a number of state of conservation cases were raised where **wind farms** were planned or **wind energy projects** emerged. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies referred to a number of natural and cultural heritage properties, including Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast (United Kingdom), Hadrian's Wall (United Kingdom), and the Cultural and Historic Ensemble of Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation), where projects became known in the past. The present state of conservation document reviews one specific case, the Heart of Neolithic Orkney (United Kingdom). However it is envisaged to further explore the issue, in particular for visual integrity considerations and the protection of important views, but also to take into account needs of sustainable development including sustainable energy provisions at World Heritage properties.

## III. 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,"

In line with this request, and taking also into account the increasing attention paid by the Committee to the review of state of conservation reports, and notably the provisions of Decision **29 COM 7C** concerning improved reporting standards, the World Heritage Centre had proposed in 2006 to introduce a new category for properties which are considered by the Committee (former Decisions) and/or the Advisory Bodies/World Heritage Centre for possible inclusion on List of World Heritage in Danger. This category is entitled "For consideration for in-Danger listing".

However, due to the increasing number of state of conservation reports to be examined each year, and due to the strong time constraints during Committee sessions, the World Heritage Centre proposes that only the properties considered for possible inclusion on List of World Heritage in Danger be discussed; World Heritage Committee members can still decide to discuss in detail the state of conservation reports which are submitted for adoption without discussion, providing a written request is made to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee in advance of the discussion of this agenda item.

An index of all the properties for consideration for in-danger listing is proposed in Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*.

To facilitate the work of the Committee, a standard format has been used for all state of conservation reports. This format has been adapted taking into account Decision **29 COM 7C** as well as Decision **27 COM 7B 106.4**:

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

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

Therefore the standard format includes:

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

The information contained in this document was prepared in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and other UNESCO Divisions and Field Offices.

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 reasons, as in previous years, each report will not start on a new page (127 reports are presented in this document). However, each region will start on a new page.

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

### NATURAL PROPERTIES

#### AFRICA

##### 1. Mount Kenya (Kenya) (N 800)

###### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

###### Criteria

(vii) (ix)

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

N/A

###### Previous Committee Decisions

**26 COM 21(b) 14; 27 COM 7B.4 ; 28 COM 15B.4**

###### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 25,000 for technical cooperation

###### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

###### Previous monitoring missions

January 2003: joint UNESCO / IUCN monitoring mission

###### Main threats identified in previous reports

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

###### Current conservation issues

IUCN, through its World Commission on Protected Areas (IUCN WCPA) received reports in October 2007 of fencing encroaching on the boundaries of the World Heritage property. Further investigation suggests that the fence would create a barrier through a portion of the property, estimated between 3,000 and 20,000 ha. The fence is understood to be unofficial and possibly illegal, and threatens the integrity of the property through the reduction in habitat and obstructing migration of wildlife. The fence also divides mature natural forest from

the property, threatens the current watershed protection services as landuse changes to agriculture would become possible. The hydrology of this property is an integral part of its landscape and ecosystem processes for which it has been inscribed on the World Heritage List. The new fence would also reduce elephant's access to 'salt licks' (mineral deposits) which could impact on elephant population health and growth as these areas provide essential minerals and would be outside the property.

Since the original reports of October 2007, IUCN has received further information suggesting that the construction of the fence has halted and remains incomplete. The current extent of the fence, and the reasons for the cessation of this work are unknown. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recognise that a fence can play an important role in reducing human-wildlife conflict but that it should be planned carefully through an independent environmental impact assessment (EIA). The EIA should be conducted to assess the risks of the fence to the outstanding universal value of the property and the recommendations of the EIA should support the objectives of the property's management plan. The State Party should also verify the location of the fence in relation to the official boundaries of the property, and recover any areas of the property that have been lost due to incorrect placement of the fence.

Reports were also received, indicating that the Hombe forest forms part of an area excised from the property in 2001 for settlements. However, it is learnt that the Hombe forest was never settled and could now be included once again as part of the property, under the provisions of the new Forests Act of 2005.

In its Decision **28 COM 15B.4**, the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to finalize the Mount Kenya National Park management plan and indicate the timeframe for the completion, adoption and implementation of the plan. In its report submitted to the World Heritage Centre in 2006, the State Party stated that the integrated management plan was in its final stages. No finalised plan has been received by the World Heritage Centre and reports received by IUCN indicate that the plan has not yet been finalised, adopted or implemented. The State Party is encouraged to complete the document and implement the plan as soon as possible. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN encourage the State Party to review the recommendations of the 2003 joint UNESCO / IUCN mission to assist the finalisation of the management plan. The State Party should also ensure that the relevant stakeholders, including government agencies and community groups, are given an opportunity to participate in this process.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that, in its 2006 state of conservation report, the State Party had identified that it had insufficient fire-fighting equipment, and therefore encourages the State Party to conduct a risk reduction review for the property, in line with the World Heritage Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that research points to the retreat of the glaciers of Mount Kenya and encourage the State Party to include adaptation to this trend in its management of the property.

In the state of conservation report presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004), The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reported on the challenges to maintaining wildlife migration corridors and managing human-wildlife conflict due to the freehold land tenure system which the State Party was addressing through the land acquisition and negotiations with landowners. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN encourage the State Party to report on progress in managing these issues and its activities on forest restoration.

**Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.1**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **28 COM 15B.4**, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),
3. Regrets that a management plan has not been finalized and urges the State Party to prioritise this activity;
4. Requests the State Party to conduct a review of the threats facing the property, including the following:
  - a) Fencing :
    - (i) Take the necessary measures to halt the current fence construction within and adjacent to the property;
    - (ii) Conduct an Environmental Impact Assessment study on existing and planned fences, including those under construction;
    - (iii) Ensure that any implementation of fencing respects the findings of an Environmental Impact Assessment study, and does not compromise the values of the World Heritage Property, including the routes of migratory species;
    - (iv) Assess the protection status of the Hombe forest and its potential for re-inclusion as part of the property;
  - b) Update, complete, adopt and implement the management plan;
  - c) Assess the threat to the values of the property from encroachment, deforestation, poaching, and human-wildlife conflict;
5. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property during the long dry season between December 2008 and February 2009;
6. Requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, to develop, prior to the arrival of the mission, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, three printed and electronic copies of the finalised management plan and a state of conservation report including the impact of the fence on wildlife and any other threats to the values of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

**2. Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N 1162)**

See Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

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

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

### 4. 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

**24 COM 8.27; 30 COM 7B.8 ; 31 COM 7B.4**

#### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 78,000 in 2001 and 2002 under technical cooperation and training, USD 16,500 in 2001 under training, and USD 30,000 in January 2007 under technical cooperation.

#### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

#### Previous monitoring missions

November 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN 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.

### Current conservation issues

On 1st February 2008, the States Parties of Zambia and Zimbabwe submitted a joint progress report on implementing the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee. It also included a joint draft Statement of outstanding universal value, a statement of integrity, status of management of the values of the property, ecosystem status and management, and cultural conservation policy.

Activities under the Institutional Framework and Legal Cooperation Programme have been largely implemented, with the remaining harmonisation of laws between the two States Parties planned for completion in 2008. The Tourism Development Programme is partially completed with outstanding activities including: upgrading of signage, implementation of visitor centre renovation plans, review of carrying capacities, rehabilitation of pathways, facilities improvement at the rainforest entrance and car park, and establishing entrance fees for the rainforest. In the Resource Conservation Programme, ongoing activities include: eradication of invasive species, updating the existing flora and fauna database and, for the cultural sites, preparation of an inventory of archaeological sites, controlling illegal activities, and controlling sewage. The States Parties have yet to ensure land use compatibility within the property therefore potential inappropriate tourism and other developments pose a threat.

The States Parties also described their progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2006 monitoring mission:

a) *Establishment of a Joint Ministerial Committee*

The States Parties have established a Joint Ministerial Committee which provides policy guidelines and direction to the Joint Technical Committee. The Joint Ministerial Committee comprises six ministries from Zambia and five from Zimbabwe and met once in 2007. The Joint Technical Committee reviews progress in implementation of the joint management plan, reports on the conservation status of the property, and identifies projects for implementation. There is a third committee, the Joint Site Management Committee, which addresses problems and the site level and supports the Joint Technical Committee.

b) *Implementation of the joint integrated management plan for the World Heritage property and secure funding for its implementation.*

The Victoria Falls World Heritage site joint management plan was approved by both States Parties in November 2007. In Zambia, the joint management plan is supported through the Mosi-oa-Tunya National Park general management plan. In Zimbabwe, the joint management plan is mainly supported by Victoria Falls / Zambezi National Park management plan. Efforts are still underway to secure adequate funding for its effective implementation.

c) *Moratorium on the construction and development of all tourism infrastructure, facilities or services within the World Heritage property*

As the Joint Ministerial Committee has been established and the joint management plan approved, the moratorium on development has now been lifted. Development of tourism facilities will be restricted to the Low Ecologically Sensitive Zone after going through an Environmental Impact Assessment. The States Parties did not provide any information on any new tourism developments. The States Parties also reported that planned developments include construction of ablution blocks, completion of a car park, extension of administration offices and the curio centre, and improved signage. However tourism planning continues to be a challenge due to rapidly increasing visitation over the last three years in Zambia.

d) *Development of a draft Desired state of conservation which can be assessed during the monitoring of the property's state of conservation and better address management and protection concerns*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN notes that guidelines for developing Statements of outstanding universal value will be made available after the 32nd session of the World

Heritage Committee in 2008 and so all statements should be reviewed and finalised by the State Party in collaboration with IUCN and the World Heritage Centre.

e) *Threats to the property*

- Urban development:

The States Parties did not report on the management of urban development. The State Party of Zambia reported its plans to resurface the road to the property to improve tourism in Livingstone, in Zambia, for which the State Party intends to keep the World Heritage Committee informed.

- Eradication of invasive species:

The State Party of Zambia noted that *Lantana Camara* continues to be a serious threat to the integrity of the property, displacing endemic multi-species plant communities with single species communities in the core and buffer zones of the property. *Lantana Camara* is also destabilizing the walls of the gorge, which poses a risk for visitor safety. The State Party of Zambia has cleared 50% of the areas affected and some regeneration of native plant species has been observed. However, restrictions on the number of visitors in certain areas are also being used to reduce the threat of introducing more invasive species. Furthermore, Global Environmental Facility (GEF) is funding a project through United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) and with technical support of IUCN and Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau International (CABI) of Nairobi to develop better methods of controlling invasive species. The two States Parties are collaborating and discussing using the same eradication methods.

- Control of pollution and extraction of water from the Zambezi :

The State Party of Zambia reported on plans for consolidation of sewerage oxidation ponds and that water supply organisations have conducted water quality tests. No information was provided on the frequency or results of these tests or on extraction of water from the Zambezi River.

The States Parties identified the following management challenges as emerging threats facing the property:

- a) Threats to fish population integrity from the fish disease Epizootic Ulcerative Syndrome;
- b) Inadequate capacity for research and monitoring;
- c) Expanding human population in Livingstone and Victoria Falls towns, as it impacts directly on the ecosystem. Furthermore, Livingstone and Victoria Falls infrastructure cannot adequately cope with the high population density, increasing the scope for pollution within the environs of the property;
- d) Uncontrolled influx of haulage trucks through the property affecting its aesthetic value;
- e) Control of the *Lantana camara* on the steep slopes remains a problem as these areas are difficult to access.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN notes efforts made by the States Parties to implement the World Heritage Committee Decisions, in particular by preparing and approving the Joint Management plan in November 2007. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note the progress of the States Parties to improve transboundary cooperation and are concerned that further progress is constrained by limited funding. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN urge the States Parties and international community to provide sufficient funding for the effective management of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note with concern that no information was provided on measures to control urban development and on management of water flows in the Zambezi River.



**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.4**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.4**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes the progress of the States Parties to improve the institutional arrangements for managing and protecting this transboundary property;
4. Also notes with concern the challenges and threats to the integrity of the property, in particular from urban development, increasing tourism numbers, invasive species, and insufficient funds to implement the joint management plan;
5. Calls upon the international community to offer financial and technical support for the implementation of the joint management plan and related programmes, including research and monitoring, and actions to ensure land use compatibility within the property;
6. Requests the States Parties to continue their joint efforts to implement the Institutional Framework and Legal Cooperation, Tourism Development, and Resource Conservation Programmes;
7. Also requests the States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress in identifying funding to implement the joint management plan and related programmes, and in addressing the threats and challenges facing the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

## ARAB STATES

### 5. Wadi Al-Hitan (Whale Valley) (Egypt) (N 1186)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

Criteria

(viii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 8B.5**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Current conservation issues

In December 2007, the World Heritage Centre, accompanied by site management staff and IUCN regional staff, carried out a short visit to Wadi Al-Hitan with the assistance of the State Party and the Egyptian-Italian Environmental Co-operation Programme (EIECP). The mission was able to discuss the follow-up to the recommendations adopted by the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription in 2005, in particular considerations on the boundaries of the property, extension of its buffer zone, strengthening visitor and traffic management, and management capacity. A report on the findings of the visit was submitted to the State Party.

The mission noted that important progress had been made in implementing the recommendations. In particular, the effort in developing appropriate management and visitor infrastructure which blends in the landscape is noted as a possible model for other natural properties. There has also been significant progress in regulation of vehicular traffic within much of the property, but here is a lack of effective control of vehicular access in the north of the property. The progress achieved has been facilitated by the support of the Italian Government, Gran Sasso National Park, and the University of Michigan, USA. IUCN's regional office has also played a key role in supporting the State Party in the development of capacity for management and planning.

The mission developed a number of recommendations as as an update to the earlier recommendations.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.5**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 8B.5**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes the significant progress achieved by the State Party in strengthening the management capacities and facilities in the property in line with the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription;*
4. *Reiterates the recommendation of the IUCN Evaluation to consider a nomination of the Gebel Qatrani area for natural criteria as an extension to the existing property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to implement the recommendations of the mission, to reinforce and complement the earlier recommendations of the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription:*
  - a) *Develop a proposal for changing the boundary of the property, taking into account recommendations at the time of inscription as well as recent additional fossil discoveries to the north of the property and the possibility to link the property with the Gebel Qatrani area;*
  - b) *Address the issue of uncontrolled vehicle access in the north of the property;*
  - c) *Ensure adequate funding for the property to ensure running costs and maintenance of infrastructure;*
  - d) *Finalize the current revision of the management plan and submit a copy to the World Heritage Centre;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010** a report on the state of conservation of the property, in particular on the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

**6. Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

**7. Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia) (N 8)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## ASIA-PACIFIC

### 8. Purnululu National Park (Australia) (N 1094)

#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2003

#### Criteria

(vii) (viii)

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

N/A

#### Previous Committee Decisions

**27 COM 8C.11, 29 COM 7B.11**

#### International Assistance

None

#### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

None

#### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

#### Main threats identified in previous reports

Mining

#### Current conservation issues

The State Party has provided a clear but relatively brief report (dated 23 January 2008) in relation to the issues requested in the World Heritage Committee's previous decision, which are as follows:

#### *Addition of areas to the World Heritage property*

The State Party reconfirms that 61,817 ha of land will be added to the Purnululu Conservation Reserve when the current pastoral leases expire in 2015. In addition the Western Australia (WA) Government took additional steps to protect the values of the World Heritage property by transferring responsibility for the management of the Ord River Regeneration Reserve (ORRR) which adjoins the property on its eastern and southern sides to the Western Australian (WA) Department of Environment and Conservation. These two commitments, together with the existing Purnululu Conservation Reserve will result in a total of 716,973 ha of land being managed adjacent to the inscribed property to protect the World Heritage values of the Park. A clear map has been provided which confirms that the nominated property is surrounded by conservation lands which effectively serve as a buffer zone for its values, (although they are not formally declared as a World Heritage buffer zone).

#### *Funding and staffing of the property*

The State Party reports in general terms on a number of different capital works that have been implemented through the WA Government (WAG), mainly for developing visitor use facilities and additional accommodation for staff and it does not provide specific information on the sustainable finance arrangements for the World Heritage property.

#### *Update of management plan*

The State Party reports that the Purnululu National Park Management Plan is being reviewed to address the needs of the WA Government and the indigenous peoples who claim traditional affiliation with the Park. The Government is also investigating the inclusion of a “cultural planning framework” into the process and describes this as a form of consultation to ensure traditional values are represented in the management of the property.

#### *Cultural and indigenous values*

The State Party notes the involvement of indigenous people in the decisions about the management of the property, and its staffing. However the State Party also notes that there is an ongoing legal process to determine native title over Purnululu National Park and consider that this would affect the information that the State Party would have to report on.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the process outlined by the State Party appears to provide a satisfactory way forward in relation to the principal issues identified. IUCN Australia will make contact with the State Party to confirm that the issues of sustainable finance are being addressed, and it is suggested that this be done in conjunction with input from ICOMOS in relation to the cultural values of the property. The State Party should also be asked to confirm when the issue of land tenure will be resolved. In this way IUCN considers that effective monitoring of this property can continue but without placing an ongoing burden on the agenda of the Committee. IUCN considers that the State Party should be asked to report on the State of Conservation of the property in three years time in order to keep track of progress.

#### **Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.8**

##### *The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **27 COM 8C.11** and **29 COM 7B.11**, adopted at its 27th (UNESCO, 2003) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the continued commitment of the State Party to address the conservation concerns of the property and its report on ongoing and planned measures;*
4. *Notes with satisfaction the transfer of management of the Ord River Regeneration Reserve to the Western Australia Department for Environment and Conservation, and the commitment to extend the Purnululu Conservation Area in 2015, as a means of providing enhanced wider protection of the World Heritage property;*
5. *Also notes the State Party's intentions in relation to the review of the Purnululu National Park Management Plan and requests the State Party, in consultation with IUCN and ICOMOS, to :*
  - a) *Confirm the adequacy of sustainable finance for the management of the property and its surrounding areas;*
  - b) *Pursue the on-going consideration of indigenous cultural values of the property;*

- c) *Facilitate a discussion over priority issues that should be brought to the attention of the World Heritage Committee;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre of the legal resolution of the native title to Purnululu National Park when these are known in order to establish an achievable schedule to report on these issues to the World Heritage Committee;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011, a report on progress made on the state of conservation of the property assessing the specific issues raised above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

## **9. Macquarie Island (Australia) (N 629 rev)**

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

### Criteria

(vii) (viii)

### Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 7B.14**

### International Assistance

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Main threats identified in previous reports

Invasive Species

### Current conservation issues

The State Party provided the requested copy of the Plan for the Eradication of Rabbits and Rodents on Sub Antarctic Macquarie Island to the World Heritage Centre in August 2007. The plan, which is based on New Zealand experience in successfully eradicating rabbits and rodents from similar sub Antarctic islands, recommends a two-phased approach: aerial application of poison baits, now planned for the southern winter 2010, followed by intensive ground hunting with hunting dogs for some years.

The State Party provided updated information on the state of conservation of the property in January 2008 indicating that, following the agreement on 4 June 2007 of the Australian and Tasmanian Governments to jointly fund the eradication of rabbits and rodents from the property, the implementation of the eradication plan has commenced, with governance arrangements established and key staff appointed. The State Party reports that the Steering Committee for the eradication project had met four times and a Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee was being appointed. A project manager and administrative assistant

have commenced duty, while an assistant project manager was expected to commence duty in March 2008.

The State Party further reports that the milestones in the planning phase have largely been completed, with the exception of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and a Workplace, Health and Safety Plan, which are part of the ongoing planning work of project staff. A biosecurity committee has also been established to ensure that appropriate biosecurity measures, including quarantine practices and protocols to protect the island from invasion and reinvasion by pest species, are implemented throughout the project and beyond.

Preparatory operations outlined in the eradication plan have commenced. A tender for the provision of trained hunting dogs was advertised, and it was anticipated that a provider would be appointed early in 2008. Field trials, including on the mitigation of impacts on non-target species, have continued to be carried out and work has commenced on the EIS which will fully assess potential impacts of the eradication project on the environment including non-target species as well as measures to avoid those impacts. To protect vulnerable plant species and samples of undisturbed vegetation, 23 enclosures have been constructed on the island, and a further 5 enclosures are to be constructed in 2008. To protect native wildlife during the eradication phase, poison baits will be dropped in winter when most of the native wildlife which might otherwise be at risk from poisoning has left the island. Information included in the State Party report indicates that most of the native wildlife present in winter is unlikely to be adversely affected by the poison baits and/or which measures will be taken to avoid their poisoning. The EIS is expected to be completed in 2008 and mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Operational Plan for the eradication project.

The State Party notes that rabbit numbers have stabilised in recent months; however, it is too early to determine whether this is a plateau in the population growth, or whether a decrease or increase may occur. Impacts due to the rabbits continue to vary in various localities across the island, with vegetation condition improving in some areas and deteriorating in others. As a temporary measure, the North Head locality has been fenced off from the rest of the island to protect vulnerable seabirds and retain vegetation in good condition.

The State Party further notes that there are currently three introduced plant species on the island, and that there is no evidence that any of these are displacing native plant species, nor that they are adversely affecting native species. One of the introduced species is expected to be rapidly displaced by a native species when the rabbit grazing pressure is reduced. To protect the island's values and prevent further species introductions, access to the island is restricted and authorised visitors must meet quarantine requirements.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the State Party has made important progress with the planning and preparation of the eradication of invasive rabbits and rodents. However, they note that a detailed Operational Plan was not included in the eradication plan submitted in August 2007, or in the plan published on the internet, contrary to statements in the State Party report. A plan has now been received from the State Party, and it appears from the State Party's Operational timelines that the aerial application of poison baits is planned for the southern winter 2010, not 2009 as originally hoped for, to allow for adequate planning and preparation including training of hunting dogs. It is now imperative that the State Party makes good progress and avoids further delays, as any further delays are likely to result in a slower recovery rate of the island's ecosystems.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN commend the Australian and Tasmanian Governments for jointly allocating AUD 24.6 million to the implementation of the eradication plan, and also commends WWF-Australia and Peregrine Adventures, an Australian tourism operator, for providing AUD 100,000 to set up some initial infrastructure that supports the planning and implementation of the eradication project. However, they stress the importance of securing and allocating sufficient financial and technical support for key pre and post eradication monitoring activities, such as vegetation and seabird monitoring on the island, which will help to demonstrate the benefits of the eradication project.



The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned about information on a potential new threat to albatrosses and petrels nesting on the island that arises from the State Party's approval in 2007 of a proposal for long-lining fishing trials in the waters around the property and its marine area. These trials were planned for 2008 and could potentially compromise any positive effects on seabird survival gained from the eradication project.

IUCN considers that Macquarie Island has been listed as a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve in 1977, although it is not a functional biosphere reserve as it lacks human residents and does not demonstrate sustainable development. In light of the discussions at the World Congress of Biosphere Reserves held in Madrid in February 2008 and the international efforts to revitalize the biosphere reserve concept and programme, IUCN therefore encourages the State Party to review again the status of the island as a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. This is also in line with the 2003 recommendation of the Bureau of the UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Programme that this site was not functional as a biosphere reserve, and that, due to the absence of human residents, there was no possibility of applying the concept. It recommended the Australian authorities to: (a) focus on the World Heritage status of this site, with its marine area; and (b) consider withdrawal of this site from the World Network of Biosphere Reserves.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.9**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.14**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Takes note with satisfaction of the progress made with the planning and preparation for the implementation of the plan for the eradication of invasive rabbits and rodents that adversely impact the property's values and integrity;*
4. *Requests the State Party to proceed swiftly with the implementation of the eradication plan and to secure and allocate sufficient financial and technical support for key pre and post eradication monitoring activities, such as vegetation and seabird monitoring on the island, which will help to demonstrate the benefits of the eradication project;*
5. *Recalls the 2003 recommendation of the Bureau of the UNESCO Man-and-Biosphere (MAB) Programme's International Coordinating Council to consider withdrawing Macquarie Island from the World Network of Biosphere Reserves and to focus on the World Heritage status of this property, considering that it is not a functional biosphere reserve as it lacks human residents and does not demonstrate sustainable development;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2010**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, including information on the progress made with the implementation of the eradication plan, the estimated size of the rabbit population on the island, and the potential impact on the island's seabirds of long-lining fishing trials in the waters around the island, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

## 10. The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) (N 798)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

### Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

N/A

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 75,000 post cyclone emergency assistance

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

2007: World Heritage Centre mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

### Current conservation issues

The property is comprised of three distinct components of roughly the same size, all part of, and located within, the larger Sundarbans Forest Reserve. The East Sundarbans component was subjected to the full force of the powerful cyclone Sidr on 5 November 2007. In response to the reported widespread damage to the property caused by the cyclone, UNESCO dispatched a mission in December 2007. The UNESCO mission consulted the IUCN Bangladesh office and had the following objectives:

- a) Assess the impact of cyclone Sidr on the Sundarbans ecosystem, and on the Forest Department's ability to fulfil its management mandate;
- b) Develop, in consultation with local and national authorities, a response strategy focusing on ensuring that the Forest Department maintains its capacity to effectively protect the ecosystem and manage resource use activities in the site;
- c) Assist the Forest Department authorities to prepare an emergency assistance proposal to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre;
- d) Ensure that the UN response effort is fully appraised of the situation, particularly with the link between an effectively managed ecosystem and the sustainable livelihoods of surrounding communities, so that consideration is given to allocating available support to ensuring the long term productivity of the site.

The observations of the mission fall into two categories: impacts on ecosystems and impacts on management capacity. The ecosystem impact included very extensive damage to the mangrove forests in over 30% of the property (e.g. the near totality of the East Sundarbans component and a small portion of the South Sundarbans component). In this zone, trees and

shrubs lost 75%-100% of their foliage while larger trees were blown down or suffered major crown damage. A clear measure of impacts on animal wildlife was impossible to obtain, though there is a strong likelihood, given the powerful winds and a flooding 3-4 metre storm surge, that significant mortality would have occurred (birdlife, other vertebrates including tigers). Fishermen reported reduced catches immediately following the cyclone but it is unclear if this was a temporary or more long-term impact on the aquatic species and habitat. The mission concluded that ecosystem recovery over the next several years was likely as long as no additional threats develop and if an appropriate management strategy designed to reduce ecosystem stress is adopted (e.g. such as temporary reductions in allowed human activities in certain areas).

Many fishermen and one forest guard perished in the cyclone. The impact on management capacity included severe damage to infrastructure such as water collection facilities for park staff, patrol posts and buildings which were rendered uninhabitable, having lost their roofing, windows, doors and furnishings. Jetties, critical for safe boat embarkation and disembarkation, and for mooring in tidal conditions, were also destroyed. According to Forest Department staff, all smaller motorized vessels have been lost, along with all communications and other office equipment.

The recommendations of the mission are to ensure that that no additional stresses be permitted to slow or prevent the recovery of the habitat and normal functioning of the ecosystem, and to monitoring the recovery. In particular, in response to the ecosystem impact: (1) avoid additional stressors: prevent fires and removal of deadwood; (2) monitor the ecosystem response to the cyclone and use this to help assess the post cyclone management actions and improve risk reduction planning for the future, and (3) clear the areas surrounding field stations to facilitate their operation. To aid the recovery of full management capacity the mission suggested short, medium and longer term strategies. The short term strategy focuses on restoring management capacity within the strict boundaries of the property, whereas the medium term strategy focuses on doing the same throughout the remaining areas of the Sundarbans Forest Reserve.

#### 1. Short Term (3-6 months)

- Survey all field stations within the property and the surrounding Forest Reserve in an effort to identify which can be fully restored, and which need to be replaced.
- Develop a complete and detailed restoration plan, including budget. Begin to seek financing to implement it.
- Restore the most strategic field stations with those located within the property as priority, to provide adequate housing facilities for Forest Department staff (e.g. clean up and remove debris, restore structures, and equip with necessary furnishings, rebuild mooring jetties, consideration should be given to the feasibility of acquiring solar powered reverse osmosis machines for drinking and cooking water).
- Acquire a minimum number of suitable motorized boats to ensure basic monitoring role of Forest Department staff.
- Acquire necessary communications equipment to allow for optimal coordination of Forest Department activities in the field.
- Remove debris from smaller water channels to ensure adequate water flow.

#### 2. Medium Term (6-18 months)

- Complete the restoration of field stations (as per short term strategy) and replace remaining lost motorized boats and communications equipment.
- Carry out an assessment of cyclone refuge needs (in terms of design, capacity, versatility, location, cost-benefit assessment and management requirements) to ensure that these serve effectively as occasional refuges of last resort (e.g.

evacuation of personnel and fishermen prior to cyclone landfall being the preferred response).

- Construct strategically located cyclone refuge complexes.
  - Support the restoration of eco-tourism facilities.
  - Develop a sustainable financing plan for the property to ensure continuous optimal management capacity.
3. Long Term (18 months – 4 years)
- Implement the sustainable financing plan for the property, including support for a permanent ecosystem monitoring programme.

The mission also acknowledged the risk of encroachment by local populations into the property. The managers of the property, while trying to recover their own capacity, will need to engage actively with the local communities to ensure strong and transparent communication on the importance of protecting the property while working together to help rebuild livelihoods.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN acknowledge the efforts of the State Party which has submitted a request for International Assistance for "Re-establishing essential management capacity in the Sundarbans World Heritage property following the passage of cyclone Sidr" and would encourage the State Party to report on its own activities to complement international assistance it is seeking. IUCN would encourage the State Party to carry out detailed ecological studies on wildlife and vegetation to determine the current populations of key and endangered species such as tiger, python, estuarine crocodile and marine turtles. The distribution and health of forest, mangrove and other habitat along with changes in the hydrology of the property, which affect salinity gradients, sediment load/ deposition and other factors affecting the distribution of flora and fauna should be monitored. Information so gathered will support risk assessment and cyclone recovery work.

The involvement of the international community is essential to ensure that the Forest Department quickly regains its capacity to manage the Sundarbans and avoid increasing impacts from uncontrolled exploitation – a risk which grows with the duration of the post-cyclone reduction in management capacity.

**Draft Decision:        32 COM 7B.10**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Offers its sympathy for the tragic loss of life as a result of cyclone Sidr;
3. Calls upon the international community to support the State Party in its efforts to re-establish full management capacity at the property as soon as possible:
4. Requests the State Party to implement the recommendations of the monitoring mission, and place particular emphasis on the following:
  - a) Produce a detailed restoration and recovery plan;
  - b) Restore management capacity to:
    - (i) Restore field stations and forest patrols;
    - (ii) Provide communication and transport equipment;

- (iii) *Implement ecological monitoring;*
  - c) *Support the revival of livelihood activities, including ecotourism;*
  - d) *Engage with local communities to communicate importance of the property to sustainable livelihoods and to determine alternatives to encroachment into the property;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2009, a detailed report on progress in implementing the recommendations of the mission and on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

## **11. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083)**

### 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

**29 COM 7B.7; 30 COM 7B.11; 31 COM 7B.15**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

April 2006: World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Proposed development of network of dams;
- b) Large copper mine adjacent to property;
- c) Boundary modifications;
- d) Future tourism development;
- e) Encroachment.

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report to the World Heritage Centre on 25 January 2008 which addresses the threats from dams and mining but does not clearly link this progress to the status of the outstanding universal value of the property. The key points are as follows:

#### a) *Proposed development of network of dams*

The State Party report noted that planning for the network of hydro-electric dams is still being discussed. The proposed dams will be adjacent rather than in the property and the Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) have not been completed but are being conducted and are under review. No mention was made in the State Party report of the request by the World Heritage Committee in previous State of Conservation reports (**31 COM 7B.15**) for full public consultation with all stakeholders in the EIA, or how the dams could affect the values for which the property was inscribed, in particular on the lower reaches of the Yangtze (Jinsha), Mekong (Lancang) and Salween (Nu Jiang), and the habitat and biodiversity.

IUCN notes that corridors between the serial components of the property are required to maintain the values of the property and to minimise potential negative impact of the dam development.

The State Party reported on its Environmental Impact Assessment Law, which has veto power over hydro-electric power plants and other infrastructure projects. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note the duration of planning, approval and construction for hydro-electric power plants will last several years.

The State Party report also provides information on its efforts in adopting river basin plans as part of its national Water Law to help prevent and control disasters caused by river flow and flooding. IUCN acknowledges the importance of Comprehensive River Basin plans, and emphasises the importance of maintaining functioning ecosystems, and associated biodiversity, in line with the World Heritage Strategy on Disaster Risk Reduction.

#### b) *Mining*

The State Party described the laws that prohibit mining operation in the property and the enforcement activities underway, including the closure of 146 small-scale mines. The State Party did not describe how mining outside but near to the property was managed or what procedures were in place to ensure that such activities have no negative effect on the values of the property. The aquatic biodiversity values within the property, for example, could be affected by mining outside the property, therefore plans for mines should specifically address such concerns.

#### c) *Boundaries*

The State Party presented the procedure for boundary modification and indicated that boundary modification is underway but has yet to be completed due to the need for consultation with stakeholders concerned. However, it was not clear if or how such modifications would address the World Heritage Committee's request to exclude major cleared encroachments and to add critical habitats for conservation, ensuring the establishment of linkage between different parts of the property via biological corridors or other options for ecological connectivity (Decision **31 COM 7B.15**). IUCN notes that any boundary modifications would require a proposal to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for evaluation by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Committee.

#### d) *Other threats*

In previous reports, tourism, encroachment and settlements of resident populations have been identified as posing threats to the property. The degree to which these threats have been addressed by the State Party is unclear. Information on the size of populations within and adjacent to the property, areas of encroachment in relation to the boundaries of the

property, and future tourism management plans would enable the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to better monitor the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN encourage the State Party to provide specific information on the status of the values of the property, particularly under criteria (ix) and (x), and to describe how minor boundary modifications, and mining and dam plans could affect the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property. In recognition of the work required to complete the plans, reports and provide monitoring data on the status of the values of the property, it is suggested that the State Party reports back to the World Heritage Committee in 2010.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.11**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.15**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Commends the State Party for consulting with stakeholders on the modification of the boundaries of the property; and for its Comprehensive River Basin Planning process and encourages it to extend this consultation with stakeholders, particularly the local communities, on its plans for dam building in the region;*
4. *Requests the State Party to provide the following documents and reports when complete and as soon as possible for review and comment by the World Heritage Committee before their finalisation and implementation:*
  - a) *Environmental Impact Assessments for Comprehensive River Basin Planning and Special Hydroelectric Dam Planning for the following rivers:*
    - (i) *Middle and lower reaches of the Nujiang River: The Report on Hydroelectric Dam Planning in the Middle and Lower Basins of Nujiang River for the 9-scalar dam;*
    - (ii) *Upper reaches of Lancang River: The Report on Hydroelectric Dam Planning in the Upper Reach Segment of Lancang River for the 5-scalar dam; and*
    - (iii) *Middle reaches of the Jinsha River: The Concise Report on the Comprehensive Planning for use of Yangtze River Basin for unspecified dams.*
  - b) *Environmental Impact Assessments or operation plans for planned or existing mines demonstrating environmental management practices to prevent negative effects on the property;*
  - c) *Plans and justification for the modification of boundaries, including how ecological connectivity issues are being addressed.*
5. *Also requests the State Party to highlight specific direct and indirect impacts of dam construction on the values of the property;*
6. *Further requests, in addition to the reporting on points above, the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including status of hydroelectric dam planning and*

*development and boundary modification, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

## **12. Kaziranga National Park (India) (N 337)**

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

### Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**26 COM 21B.10**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 100,000 (Technical co-operation, 1997 and 1998).

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

The property will benefit from the UNF funded World Heritage India programme. Implementation of field activities will start soon.

### Previous monitoring missions

1997: UNESCO mission; 2002: IUCN mission.

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Poaching of rhinos;
- b) Development of a railway adjacent to the property;
- c) Insufficient infrastructure, budget and staffing.

### Current conservation issues

The mission team which conducted the monitoring mission to Manas National Park was able to make a short visit to Kaziranga National Park (KNP) and discuss the state of conservation of the property with the park staff.

The mission noted that whilst KNP is probably one of the best managed World Heritage properties, it is faced with increasing pressures as a result of rapid changes in the surrounding landscape, related to increasing population pressure, agricultural development, infrastructure development and climate change. The mission was also informed about a recent increase in poaching incidents of one-horned rhino in and around the property. While the number of animals killed do not threaten the population, poaching within and adjacent to the property is a concern.



Park management also pointed to the lack of staffing and budget, in particular the unavailability of funds sanctioned under the central funding schemes, with funds held up at the level of the State Government.

Since the inscription of the property, the national park was extended several times, increasing its size from the original 42,996 ha to 85,942 ha today, including the river and floodplain areas, as well as strategic wildlife corridors to the Karbi Anglong hills. These extensions have not yet been added to the inscribed World Heritage property, as there are still some court cases contesting some of the additions and these have to be concluded before any proposal for extension can be submitted. The forest reserves in the Karbi Anglong hills provide critical habitat for many of the species in the national park, including for the rhino, during the annual flood season, when large parts of the park are inundated. The protection of these areas is thus critical for the conservation of the values for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Karbi Anglong hills have seen important habitat loss over the last 50 years, in particular due to the establishment of tea plantations, settlement, logging and shifting cultivation. While important areas of the hills are protected as forest reserves, plans to create a wildlife sanctuary and even to include some of these critical areas in the national park have not yet been implemented.

A potential threat to the integrity of the property is the planned upgrading of the national highway 37 (NH37), running along the southern boundary of the park and separating it from the above mentioned Karbi Anglong hills. Traffic load on the road has been increasing since the inscription of the property and there is now dense traffic 24 hours a day, as heavy traffic is only allowed at night. A speed limit is in force on the road stretch running along the park and numerous signs are notifying the drivers, but the mission was able to observe that the speed limit is not respected. The road is thus already a partial barrier to an important migration route of the wildlife and its upgrading could pose a threat to the integrity of the property, as it is understood that the new road would be a four-lane national highway. If constructed, this would transform the already problematic road crossing into an impossible barrier for the wildlife of the property. The mission was informed that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been conducted but neither the plans nor the EIA have been submitted to the World Heritage Centre, as required by the *Operational Guidelines*. It was suggested that the EIA outlines a number of options to mitigate the impact of the upgrading of the road, including building underpasses for the wildlife or a re-aligned route on the opposite bank of the Brahmaputra. It is considered that further information and clarification on the status of this project is required from the State Party.

Other management issues for the park include the problem of interbreeding of cattle with the wild buffalo population, habitat degradation, notably as a result of invasive species, and overgrazing, probably as a result of increasing buffalo populations.

**Draft Decision:        32 COM 7B.12**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **26 COM 21B.10**, adopted at its 26th session (Budapest, 2002),*
3. *Notes the important on-going efforts of the State Party to protect the property, in particular for the strategic extensions to the National Park in order to address issues of integrity affecting the existing property;*

4. Requests the State Party to continue its efforts to create a protected area in the Karbi Anglong hills and to ensure the connectivity with the existing National Park, in order to ensure long term integrity of the property;
5. Urges the State Party ensure that adequate funding and staffing is provided for the management of the property and that funds provided by the central Government are transferred in a timely manner to the property;
6. Expresses its concern about the planned upgrading of the NH37 national highway into a four- lane highway, which would block wildlife migrations and could threaten the values for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List and also requests the State Party to submit the plans for this development, including the Environmental Impact Assessment, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, before any decision on the upgrading of the road is taken;
7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, in particular on the management and planned upgrading of highway NH37, efforts to curb poaching and on funding and staffing for the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

### **13. Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)**

See Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

### **14. Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(viii) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7B.9; 30 COM 7B.12; 31 COM 7B.16**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 66,600 in July 2005 for Emergency Assistance on rehabilitation of management facilities of the Gunung Leuser National Park, which is a part of the property

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 1,800,000 for the 3-year UNF/UNFIP Project (2005-2007) - Partnership for the Conservation of Sumatra Natural Heritage.

### Previous monitoring missions

2006 and 2007: UNESCO / IUCN monitoring mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Agricultural encroachment;
- b) Illegal logging;
- c) Poaching;
- d) Road construction;
- e) Institutional and governance weaknesses.

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a Report on 1 February 2008 on the threats facing the property and on the progress made in addressing the recommendations of the 2006 and 2007 reactive monitoring missions. It acknowledged that extensive agricultural encroachment, illegal logging, poaching and plans for road construction seriously threaten the three components of the property: Gunung Leuser National Park (GLNP), Kerinci Seblat National Park (KSNP), and Bukit Barisan Selatan National Park (BBSNP). The State Party also noted that these threats existed before the inscription of the property, were included in the IUCN evaluation report, and that the financial commitment, action on the ground and good governance required to address them are difficult to achieve. Indeed, while some progress has been made in reducing threats from illegal logging, however agricultural encroachment and institutional and governance weaknesses remain a serious problem. Threats to the integrity of the property from poaching and illegal road construction also continue.

The State Party also reported limited progress in addressing the decisions of the World Heritage Committee:

#### a) *Emergency Action Plan (EAP)*

The completed EAP has not been received and the State Party has yet to specify the details of activities proposed with an estimated budget, sources of funding, and timeline for implementation. A workshop, planned for the first quarter of 2008, aims to address some of these issues. The State Party is encouraged to report on the outcomes of this workshop, especially the operational plans, and disseminate them with stakeholders, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN as soon as possible, as well as to complete the EAP in 2008.

Although partial implementation of the EAP began in 2007, further action is needed to increase stakeholder participation, establish widespread recognition and awareness of World Heritage values at local and national levels, and obtain sufficient funds and capacity for effective implementation of the plan. Only GLNP has held meetings and consultations with stakeholders on EAP programs. In KSNP and BBSNP no programs have been specifically designed to implement the EAP, however materials on the values of property have been disseminated. The State Party did not report on whether any of these activities have reduced the threats to the property or facilitated the recovery of its integrity.

#### b) *Monitoring and control of illegal logging, saw mills and road construction activities and restoration of degraded habitat*

The limited EAP implementation has included strengthening management capacity through the development of GIS mapping expertise for staff, improved management facilities, and

advisory support for law enforcement with financial assistance from the World Heritage Fund and Post Tsunami Assistance, and support from the Spanish Government. These activities are expected to improve monitoring and control of the property but they only target GLNP.

During 2007, many activities to combat illegal logging were carried out, including increased monitoring, establishment of an integrated inter-agency Task Force, and the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to halt human-induced degradation. Activities to combat illegal road construction include three cases under investigation, and the stopping of construction in five areas. On the coastline in Lampung Barat district, and within the property, the Minister of Forestry has been approached to allow the use of a road. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN encourage the State Party to assess the impact of this road on the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property and to present the results of an environmental impact assessment (EIA) to the World Heritage Committee.

As the State Party did not provide information on the extent of the area of the property which is being logged or encroached, the total number of species poached or the rates of other illegal activities, it is unclear whether the threat to the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property has changed since the reactive monitoring mission in 2007. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN encourage the State Party to include in its reports to the World Heritage Committee annual data and trends on the property, including habitat distribution, total area of encroached and logged land, status of wildlife populations, and extent of poaching.

c) *Effective enforcement on encroachment*

The Coordinating Minister of People's Welfare has drafted a decree to resolve encroachment. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome this decree and recommend that it be approved and enforced as soon as possible.

In KSNP, locations of encroachment in Renah Pemetik have been identified and a workshop on control took place in 2007. In Merangin district, the District Chief and Director General of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation have signed a MOU on encroachment. As a result of encroachment control activities in several districts, arrests have occurred and investigations are underway. Despite these enforcement activities, IUCN has received information that encroachment continues to escalate in Merangin and that funding has not been identified for activities planned to control encroachment.

The State Party has also noted in its Report that concessionaires of forest and oil palm plantations surrounding the property are involved in encroachment. IUCN has received reports that in some areas, villagers are working together with oil palm concession holders to clear forest within the boundaries of the property and in the buffer zone. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN therefore suggest that the State Party work more closely with private companies and local communities to check and prevent illegal activities.

IUCN has also received reports that the 14,000 ha of primary forest added to KSNP in 2004 has now been seriously degraded and reduced by encroachment and that no border markers exist in this region. The State Party is encouraged to investigate the activities in this area and identify the causes and remedial action necessary.

In BBSNP, encroachment is particularly difficult to reduce as the area is surrounded by human settlement. Large numbers of residential encroachment areas are also a problem in Bengkuntat and Suoh. In other areas, several hundred families have been encouraged to leave the property leading to the recovery of hundreds of hectares of encroached land.

In recognition of the severity of the problem in BBSNP, the authorities plan to develop a master plan to resolve encroachment in 2008. This will include alternative sources of income for squatters and the use of ecotourism and development in the buffer zone to facilitate relocation outside the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome this news and encourage the State Party to provide the necessary financial and technical assistance to

complete and implement this plan in 2008, in coordination with other management activities in the property.

IUCN also notes that the 2007 WWF report "Gone in an instant" details the extent of deforestation in BBSNP, showing almost 28% of the property had already been encroached upon and that 60% of this encroached land was being used for agriculture, with coffee plantations making up the major commodity grown in BBSNP.

d) *Strengthen boundaries and develop a zoning system*

The State Party reported that zoning in GLNP is under revision and will be completed in 2008. For KSNP's 2500km boundary, reconstruction and marking is prioritised for the most vulnerable points where conflict and disturbance occurs. A map of KSNP has been converted to GIS so that officers can use GPS and GIS to facilitate patrols and check the boundaries in the field. The boundary of BBSNP is shared with 115 villages in 23 sub districts where disputes with farmers are common. Boundary markers and boundary maintenance took place in August 2007 and zoning boundaries have been drafted and are under consideration. The establishment of clear signs is planned for 2008 in GLNP. Three signs have been erected at entrance to KNSP in 2007 and BBSNP plans to undertake signage activities in 2008.

e) *Establish and maintain coordination and cooperation between National Parks units and government agencies*

The State Party has not established any specific coordination mechanism for the implementation of the EAP in the three management units, as requested by the World Heritage Committee in its decision of 2007.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that without a coordination mechanism it is not possible for the patrols and enforcement teams to collaborate effectively. Such coordination should involve the agencies and organisations involved in the property and its surroundings. It is critical that the government agencies responsible for allocating land title, permits for construction such as road permits, concessions and permits for oil palm plantations, timber extraction and forestry activities, and other agricultural activities coordinate with the management authority to combat encroachment.

Of particular concern is the proposal of a new government regulation (GER) No2/2008 which would allow closed-pit mining within protected forests. This issue is of concern for the property because mineral reserves are known in KSNP. The National Forest Council of Indonesia has allegedly recommended the government to postpone legalising this regulation. On the positive side, the mining company PT Antam, whose exploration activities extended about 2000 ha into KSNP, advised it would immediately cease exploration activities within the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN urge the State Party to improve liaison and coordination between the government agencies issuing licences and the park managers to ensure that no mining licences are granted inside this or another World Heritage property.

h) *Other threats*

Also of concern is the limited capacity to ensure that tourism is sustainable and revenue benefits local communities. The Agency for Aceh Reconstruction is supporting the development of a tourism village and other community economic empowerment activities, but only until 2008. It is not clear how these activities are coordinated with the management priorities of the property and the needs of local communities.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN acknowledge that the State Party is making efforts to implement the programmes related to the EAP but note with concern that this is not yet operational and still lacks a clear workplan with responsibilities and budget. Lack of

coordination, moreover, make it difficult for the managers of the property to ensure that limited financial resources are being used effectively to restore habitat and to protect the property from further degradation.

IUCN has also received information that the KSNP operating budget has been cut for 2008 and more than 30 rangers have been seconded to the mobile forest police unit and therefore are not able to focus on poaching and encroachment prevention. IUCN is concerned that the State Party is not reacting sufficiently quickly to prevent permanent settlement on encroached lands, or to restore the habitat to allow the biodiversity values for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List to recover. IUCN considers that the outstanding universal value for which the site was inscribed is at serious risk and that the integrity of the park is being lost.

At the time of inscription IUCN recommended that the property be placed immediately on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This recommendation was repeated in the 2006 reactive monitoring mission report. The decision adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006) recommended a review of possible inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2007. The 2007 mission recommended that a mission in 2009 assess progress in implementation of the recommendations to determine if the property should be added to the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN considers, as previously noted in its evaluation report, that the current escalation in threats, combined with the lack of capacity by the park authorities to contain them, would appear to justify inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger as a signal for the international community to lend its support. This should be clarified in the proposed 2009 mission.

IUCN recommends that the reactive monitoring mission requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), to be carried out in 2009, coincide with a high level workshop with government agencies and relevant stakeholders including commercial organisations to raise awareness of threats and management problems and the need to take immediate action.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.14**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7B.12** and **31 COM 7B.16**, adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Recognises the efforts of the State Party to implement the draft Emergency Action Plan (EAP) and its efforts to combat illegal logging, and urges the State Party to complete and fully implement the EAP in 2008;*
4. *Regrets the escalation of threats, in particular the severity of encroachment, which have degraded the integrity of the property;*
5. *Calls upon the international community to provide technical and financial support for the implementation of the EAP;*
6. *Requests the State Party to address the key recommendations from the previous monitoring missions, and in particular to:*

- a) *Provide sufficient financial support to the park authorities for effective staffing, enforcement, prosecution and restoration and to identify alternative sources of income for local communities to help reduce illegal activities;*
  - b) *Communicate and collaborate with government agencies at all levels to ensure that policies, laws, enforcement, and private enterprise support and do not counter the efforts of the park authorities;*
  - c) *Halt all encroachment immediately, including by issuing the decree on encroachment, and monitor and remove settlements and plantations from encroached areas to facilitate their restoration;*
  - d) *Ensure legal protection from road building and mining, and establish legal exceptions for any laws that allow these activities in the property;*
  - e) *Enforce the boundaries of the property and maintain, patrol and communicate these boundaries to concessionaires, local authorities and other stakeholders.*
7. *Also requests the State Party to hold a coordination workshop, to coincide with the planned 2009 joint reactive monitoring mission, with government agencies and other stakeholders to ensure the harmonisation of policies for the protection of the values and integrity of the property;*
8. *Reiterates its request to the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, to develop a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a state of conservation report to include progress in implementing the EAP, the above recommendations of the previous monitoring missions, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*

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

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## **16. 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

**29 COM 8B.6**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

February 2008: joint UNESCO / IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Expedite development of a marine management plan;
- b) Develop a salmonid management plan;
- c) Address other management issues included in the IUCN evaluation report.

Current conservation issues

A comprehensive state of conservation report was received from the State Party on 31 January 2008, which reported progress on the following issues:

- a) The establishment of a Scientific Council, three Expert Working Groups, and a Regional Liaison Committee to guide the conservation and management of the property;
- b) Extension of the marine component of the property from 1 km to 3 km and submission of a revised map in December 2005;
- c) Development of a multiple use integrated marine management plan;
- d) Assessment of the impact of river constructions on salmonids and countermeasures taken;
- e) Proper management of Sika Deer in the property and on the Hokkaido Island;
- f) Strategies for promoting ecotourism and proper use of the site, as well as research and monitoring activities.

On the invitation of the State party, a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission visited the property from 18 to 22 February 2008 and the detailed mission report, responding to the various issues raised in the 2005 decision of the World Heritage Committee, is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008> . The key findings from the mission included:

*Management of marine resources*

The mission team reviewed the multiple use integrated marine management plan and noted that it provides a good framework for management of marine resources and builds on a good base of local involvement and the best science currently available. However, the Mission Team feels that further detail and elaboration is required, particularly in relation to the identification of priorities, responsibilities and time lines, and it should also include clear targets and indicators for the conservation of the key indicator species, including Walleye Pollock and the Steller Sea Lion. There is also a need to prepare one comprehensive



management plan which integrates the currently separate plans covering marine management, ecotourism, as well as other issues..

Additional measures are required for ensuring the long-term conservation of fish species, including adjustments to management practices, in consultation with local fishers. The Mission Team recommended the State Party consider identifying and designating locally relevant conservation zones, including no-take zones, and practices within the marine habitat to ensure sustainable productivity of the marine biodiversity. It is also observed that fisheries resources are affected by activities which occur outside of the property, in particular from fisheries activities in the wider Sea of Okhotsk. This requires action beyond the boundaries of the property and the need to continue the dialogue and consultation already initiated with relevant authorities and representatives of the fisheries sector from Russia. Effective measures are also required to minimise conflicts between fishers and the conservation of the threatened Steller Sea Lion.

#### *Management of Salmonids and river constructions*

Salmon species are an important element of the outstanding universal value of the property. Hence, providing for their unimpeded movement between the marine and riverine habitats is a crucial management strategy. The State Party has already started removing or modifying some of the structures that exist in 9 of the 44 streams within the property, but these efforts need to be intensified, particularly in key areas such as the Rusha River, to enable free movement of the salmonids. There is also need to carefully monitor the long-term impact of removal and modification of river structures on salmonid populations.

#### *Management of Sika Deer*

Proper management of Sika Deer populations is crucial to conserving the natural ecosystems and biodiversity of the property, as there is concern that they may be affecting the native vegetation through overgrazing. A management plan for this purpose has been developed and is being implemented, but impacts on both the ecosystems and the deer populations need to be carefully monitored and the management practices adapted accordingly.

#### *Management of ecotourism*

Several initiatives have been taken to develop responsible tourism activities and facilities within and adjacent to the property. The activities are guided by the working groups on proper use and ecotourism and are being undertaken in consultation and collaboration with local communities and the travel and tourism sector, and are based on the natural features and values of the property. They also aim to contribute to the development and diversification of the local economies.

#### *Climate change*

The outstanding universal value of Shiretoko is strongly related to the presence of sea ice at the lowest latitude in the Northern Hemisphere. This influences the productivity of the marine ecosystem, which in turn influences the productivity and diversity of the terrestrial ecosystem. The effects of long term climate change could have a significant impact on this property and hence, there is a need to carefully monitor the impacts and take appropriate adaptation strategies to deal with them.

The mission notes the good progress made by the State Party in addressing recommendations from the World Heritage Committee and the IUCN Evaluation Report. The mission was particularly impressed by the strong commitment of stakeholders at all levels to ensuring the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property is maintained. The mission also applauds the bottom-up approach to management through the involvement of local communities and stakeholders, and also the manner in which scientific knowledge has been effectively applied to the management of the property through the scientific Committee

and the specific Working Groups that have been set up. These provide an excellent model for the management of natural World Heritage properties elsewhere.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.16**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **29 COM 8B.6**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),
3. Commends the State Party for responding effectively to the recommendations made at the time of inscription of the property;
4. Takes note of the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission and requests the State Party to implement them, with particular emphasis on the following:
  - a) Explore with the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) the obtaining of the Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas (PSSA) designation for the marine component of the property, with a view to giving it an added layer of protection;
  - b) Integrate the marine management plan with the overall management plan of the property and clearly identify activities, results and objectively verifiable indicators, assign clear roles and responsibilities and elaborate a budget and time-frame for its implementation;
  - c) Complete the revision of the overall management plan for the property and integrate all the other individual plans, including the one for the marine component, salmonids, sika deer, and for ecotourism and proper use;
  - d) Consider identifying and designating locally relevant conservation zones, including no-take zones and practices, within the marine habitat, to ensure sustainable productivity of the marine biodiversity, including of the fishery resource;
  - e) Continue the cooperation which has been initiated with the Russian Federation to find long-term solutions to resource use problems, particularly the unsustainable harvesting of the Walleye Pollock, and for regular exchange of scientific information;
  - f) Continue and accelerate measures to promote the free movement of salmon within the property and also to increase salmon escapement, giving priority attention to the removal and/or modification of structures on the Rusha River, and monitor impacts on salmon populations;
  - g) Develop clear indicators to help define acceptable limits for the impact of grazing on natural vegetation, and monitor the impacts of control measures on sika deer populations and the biodiversity and ecosystems of the property;
  - h) Develop a consolidated ecotourism strategy for the property and ensure that it is closely linked and integrated with regional strategies for tourism and economic development within Shiretoko;
  - i) Develop a Climate Change Strategy for Shiretoko which includes:
    - (i) a monitoring programme; and

(ii) *adaptive management strategies to minimise any impacts of climate change on its values;*

5. *Also requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed regularly on the progress made with the implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 monitoring mission and submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, a report on the above issues for examination by World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

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

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

### Criteria

(x)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 8B.11 ; 31 COM 7B.22**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Roads;
- b) Forest fragmentation and need for ecological corridors.

### Current conservation issues

The State Party report received on 1 February 2008 summarises progress with the implementation of previous World Heritage Committee recommendations, including an update on management and staffing, and the results of the feasibility study of options for increasing connectivity through ecological corridors across Highway 304 to enable the movement of wildlife. The World Heritage Centre also received a detailed report on the status of the Dong Phrayayen – Khao Yai Forest Complex in June 2007, which provided an update on biodiversity conservation initiatives in the property.

1.1.1.1.1.1.1.

*Roads*

Although no new roads have been built recently or are planned, the existing roads have fragmented the forest ecosystem and plans to enlarge Highway 304 from two to four lanes have been noted with concern by the World Heritage Committee in 2007. The expansion of this highway, which runs north-south through the property, could exacerbate forest fragmentation and create increased disturbance to wildlife caused by noise and road kills. Indeed, at the time of inscription, the Committee requested the State Party to control traffic speed on the major roads that bisect the complex, especially before ecological corridors are established. A study on wildlife diversity in the area surrounding Highway 304 showed that mammal diversity was less close to the Highway, and species diversity increases with distance from the highway. However, large mammal and other wildlife tracks are found near the highway; these findings provide support for the need to establish wildlife corridors.

The State Party has carried out an initial environmental assessment of the widening of the highway. This proposes mitigation measures for 12 issues: wildlife, fish and fish habitat, hydrology, air quality, terrain/soils/vegetation, recreation, socio-economics, other land uses, and cultural heritage resources. The report notes that as traffic volumes have been increasing continuously and are predicted to continue to do so, many of the negative effects on wildlife would continue to increase regardless of highway enlargement. Therefore, the feasibility study recommended the Environmental Impact Assessment to focus the need to ensure wildlife movement through corridors, reduce human-wildlife conflict, and wildlife mortality from road kills.

#### *1.1.1.1.1.2.*

#### *Connectivity and wildlife corridors*

At the time of inscription, the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to carry out a study for the establishment of ecologically effective wildlife corridors to link the western and eastern sectors of the property, in recognition of the fragmentation of the forest ecosystem caused by roads. This study has been completed and the State Party has been presented with four locations (at 27 km+400, 29 km+200, 42 km, and 69-70 km marks) where connectivity measures would be beneficial and four options to connect Khao Yai National Park to Thap Lan National Park, across Highway 304. Such wildlife corridors are particularly important to the integrity of the property and could help to minimise increased pressure to wildlife from changing landuse in the neighbouring forests outside the property.

The State Party reports that the Department of Highways is conducting the construction design for the connectivity between 27-29 km and that the EIA for the wildlife corridor at the 42-47 km section of the highway was expected to have been approved in March 2008. The existing studies guide the selection for the most suitable construction methods. The process of EIA and construction design for the wildlife corridor will take about 1 year. In the mean time, the Department of Highways has agreed to increase the number of speed restrictions in the two zones where wildlife traffic mortality is particularly high.

#### *1.1.1.1.1.3.*

#### *Management*

At the time of inscription the World Heritage Committee requested that the State Party implement management planning and appoint a manager responsible for the entire protected area complex. A manager has now been appointed and the State Party intends to integrate the management plans for the five component protected areas of the property during implementation. In its report, the State Party sets its own 10 recommendations which include implementation, scheduling and budgeting for the implementation of the management plan. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN support these and the other recommendations on wildlife monitoring, cooperation programmes with local communities and national and international organisations, training, and conservation awareness rising.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note a study on legal and management institutional arrangements in the property published as collaboration between Birdlife International, IUCN WCPA, and the Australian Government's Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts. This study provides useful guidance on improving the management effectiveness in the property, and better use of existing financial resources.

The State Party 2007 status report also noted that tourist visits have doubled over the past five years from 700,000 to 1.4 million in 2006. Such high visitor levels could affect the integrity of the property and should be managed through tourism and visitation planning, based on the carrying-capacity of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN would like to commend the State Party on providing useful and detailed information on the values and integrity of the property and encourage the State Party to implement its wildlife monitoring programme and other proposed recommendations as soon as possible.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.17**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.22**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the efforts made by the State Party to implement the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to manage the high visitor levels by integrating visitor and tourism planning into the overall management of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to complete as soon as possible the Environmental Impact Assessments for the widening of Highway 304 and for the design of the wildlife corridors and to allocate the required financial resources to proceed urgently with the consideration of these corridors;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to continue its efforts to implement all recommendations and plans that have been recently developed to enhance the conservation and management of the property;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on progress achieved on the implementation of these recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

## EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

### 18. Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands) (Italy) (N 908)

#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2000

#### Criteria

(viii)

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

N/A

#### Previous Committee Decisions

**28 COM 15B.26; 30 COM 7B.23; 31 COM 7B.24**

#### International Assistance

N/A

#### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

#### Previous monitoring missions

21 to 28 March 2007: joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission

#### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of overall management plan;
- b) Excessive tourism development;
- c) Pumice-pit mining.

#### Current conservation issues

Decision **31 COM 7B.24** noted with concern the conservation and management issues affecting the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property as assessed by the March 2007 World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission, in particular the lack of a management plan and management structure, continued mining activity and the PUMEX exploitation within the property, the lack of a deadline for completion of stockpiled material removal, as well as the lack of regulatory and other mechanisms to control port developments and coastal infrastructure.

The State Party report, provided on 31 January 2008, has been reviewed within the limitations of the translation provided and the following responses are noted in relation to Decision **31 COM 7B.24**.

- a) *Mining extractive activity in areas within and adjacent to the World Heritage property, and prohibit new mines:*

All mining is reported to have been halted, and the seizure of infrastructure for exploitation and exportation as of August 2007 would seem to guarantee this.

b) *Deadline for removal of stockpiled pumice material :*

While no deadline has been set for removal of stockpiled material, there apparently exists a plan for the use of this material along the coast for erosion reduction and beach maintenance. Such a plan should be subject to environmental assessment as this may result in impacts on the values of the marine environment of the Islands.

c) *Management plan using updated scientific data available and including the identification of funding, staffing, monitoring, and awareness-raising:*

Although the State Party has submitted a management plan, this is mainly descriptive, and has little information on site specific policies, strategies and action items to guarantee the protection of the World Heritage values for which it was nominated. There is a good elaboration of an awareness-raising programme, as called for, however the plan as submitted is not adequate for the protection of the natural values of the property.

d) *Designate an appropriate management entity and ensure appropriate funding:*

The response speaks to the issue of management entity but it is not clear how this is proposed to function in any detail. Funding is not mentioned.

e) *Comprehensive environmental impact assessment of the proposed enlargement of the port of Lipari:*

The response states that the proposed expansion plan was unduly large, but does not indicate that an environmental impact assessment was carried out.

f) *Science-based project of vegetation restoration and plan for conversion of the mining infrastructure to serve educational and ecotourism needs, in conjunction with a programme of reemployment:*

The response partially addresses this recommendation, but contains no specific proposals for vegetation restoration.

g) *Redraw boundaries for the proposed Lipari Reserve and submit a proposal for a boundary modification of the property:*

The promised Lipari Reserve World Heritage property boundary has apparently still not been formally adopted. The response appears to indicate that there will be no airport development, but it would be fitting to see a Landscape Territorial Plan amendment to this effect. A boundary modification has not been proposed for review by the World Heritage Committee.

h) *Creation of a Regional Park for all the Aeolian Islands:*

The response states that the National Financial Law of 2008 “anticipates” designating a National Park by Italy. It does include the marine sites recommended by the UNESCO/IUCN mission of March 2007.

i) *Re-nomination of the property to include additional natural criteria and to protect important coastal and marine habitats:*

The response outlines a fuller discussion of the other natural values, and the cultural values of the property but does not represent a re-nomination and does not include coastal and marine areas.

In summary, whilst the response gives a written assurance regarding major threats to the property, there has not yet been an adequate response to or action on the majority of issues raised in Decision **31 COM 7B.24**. There is still no substantive management plan in evidence that provides adequate stewardship of the natural values for which the property was inscribed. IUCN concludes that, whilst on the evidence provided by the State Party the property may no longer be in imminent danger, decisive action is required by the State Party

to address the large number of recommendations from the mission and Decision **31 COM 7B.24**.

**Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.18**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.24**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the detailed report by the State Party addressing major threats identified by the 2007 joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission;*
4. *Welcomes that all new mining that could affect the property has been stopped, and requests the State Party, in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, to ensure that these mining plans will not be reopened in the future;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to take action, by **1 February 2009** to fully implement items b) to i) of Decision **31 COM 7B.24**;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a detailed and updated report, on the issues mentioned above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

**19. Durmitor National Park (Montenegro) (N 100)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(vii) (viii) (ix)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**20 COM p. 9-10; 29 COM 7B.21 ; 31 COM 7B.29**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 117,000 for equipment and technical expertise.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 40,000 by UNESCO Venice Office; USD 50,000 under the Participation Programme.



### Previous monitoring missions

1996 and 2005: joint UNESCO / IUCN missions

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Proposed dam development on the Tara River;
- b) Ski development in the Zabljak area;
- c) Boundary issues;
- d) Illegal logging and hunting.

### Current conservation issues

In its Decision (**31 COM 7B.29**), the World Heritage Committee noted the State Party's progress in addressing the recommendations of the 2005 reactive monitoring mission. However, in 2007 the World Heritage Centre received reports of a public tender for three small hydroelectric dams on the Tara River, issued in November 2007. A letter was sent to the State Party for clarification but no response was received. During a mission to Montenegro in February 2008, a representative of the World Heritage Centre met with the Ministers for Economic Development and for Environment and Tourism of Montenegro and raised the issue of the hydroelectric dams and potential impact on the property. The State Party was asked to provide further information.

In August 2007, fires occurred around Durmitor National Park although they did not affect the strictly protected zones within the World Heritage property. IUCN recommends that the State Party assess the risks to the values of the property in line with the Risk Reduction Strategy (Decision **31 COM 7.2**) with particular emphasis on reducing the risks from fire.

### Draft Decision:      **32 COM 7B.19**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.29**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Regrets the fires which occurred in August 2007 in the vicinity of the property;
4. Encourages the State Party to include risk reduction in its management of the property, particularly in relation to the impact of fires on the outstanding universal value of the property;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a clarification on the status and exact location of the hydro-electric dams for which tenders were issued in November 2007, a report on its management of risks to the values of the property, and a report on the overall state of conservation of the property, for review by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN.

## **20. Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Białowieża Forest (Belarus / Poland) (N 33-627)**

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979; extension 1992

### Criteria

(vii)

### Years of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7B.15; 30 COM 7B.20; 31 COM 7B.30**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

1999 and 2004: World Heritage Centre / IUCN missions

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal logging;
- b) Excess commercial logging;
- c) Bark beetle infestation of forest;
- d) Alterations of the hydrological regime;
- e) Border fence impeding mammal movements;
- f) Lack of transboundary cooperation;
- g) Ambiguity regarding the boundaries of the property.

### Current conservation issues

The State Party of Belarus submitted a state of conservation report on 18 February 2008. From the report it is evident that the State Party considered that only the strictly protected 5,235 ha of the Belovezhskaya Pushcha National Park were inscribed on the World Heritage List, not the 87,606 ha of the national park. The State Party notes that the territory surrounding the strictly protected 5,235 ha also has the protective status of a national park and its management regime is therefore strongly limited by national legislation, with no significant influence on the value and integrity on the strictly protected zone. The State Party further notes that a 10-year management plan for the national park is in preparation and will be finalised in 2008, and that an initiative will be launched in 2009 to improve the conservation and environmental education activities in the national park. In the recreational and economic zones of the national park, a new administrative building, natural museum and centre for environmental education will be built, existing wildlife enclosures will be brought up to international standards, and tourist routes and tracks will be supplemented with a viewing tower. The State Party also notes that the functional zoning of the national park is currently

being revised and that the revision will result in a significant increase in the strictly protected zone where any human activity is forbidden. Assuming that only this zone forms the World Heritage property, the State Party was planning to explore options to enlarge the property in this process.

The State Party of Belarus also submitted a map on 12 February 2008 which did not comply with the boundaries of the property. The State Party understood the World Heritage property to include only the 5,235 ha strictly protected area and not the entire 87,606 ha of the national park which was inscribed. The State Party therefore proposed in a letter dated 31 March 2008 to hold consultations with experts from the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, in order to discuss the boundary issue, and the zoning of the national park, and the possibility to extend and/or re-nominate the property under additional criteria.

The State Party of Poland submitted a state of conservation report on 7 February 2008. On 1 February 2008, in response to a request from the Retrospective Inventory, it also submitted a map showing the exact boundaries of the Polish part of the World Heritage property. The State Party also notes that it plans to create a buffer zone for the World Heritage property in the extension process.

The State Party further reports on a number of developments that improve the integrity and management of the property and the surroundings forests. The national park and surrounding State Forest districts partner in an EU-funded LIFE project aiming to improve bison conservation and management. The national park is also a partner in a multinational EU-funded LIFE-Nature project aiming to develop monitoring principles and a conservation plan for the European pond terrapin and amphibian species listed in Annex II of the Habitats Directive of Natura 2000. The national park has also been implementing three projects in cooperation with the Polish Society for the Protection of Birds (PTOP): a small water retention project that has benefited target bird species; a project, implemented in cooperation with Belarusian partners, on habitat conservation for the Western capercaillie; and a project aiming to rebuild a weir on Narewka River to prevent contamination of the river with bottom sediments.

Both States Parties also report on transboundary cooperation including the bilateral cooperation agreement concluded on 15 November 2006 between the Białowieża and Belovezhskaya Pushcha National Parks. The agreement notes as a priority for cooperation the conservation of the faunistic and floristic biodiversity of the forests and the use of the forests for educational and recreational purposes.

The State Party of Poland indicates, however, that there has been no or little progress in implementing other recommendations concerning the transboundary cooperation with Belarus and that Poland's entry into the Schengen Zone may pose a new problem for progress in this area. Poland notes, however, that the 20-year conservation plan in preparation for Białowieża National Park will include a section, agreed with Belarus, on priority measures for the management of the transboundary World Heritage property. The State Party also notes that there are no fences which prevent free movement of wildlife in the Polish part of the property, and that the concept for gradual removal of the existing fence in the Belarusian part, which was developed within the framework of the joint "Forest of Hope" project, was to be discussed with all project partners in a public presentation in February 2008. A Polish research project conducts currently, in cooperation with Belarusian researchers, a viability analysis of the bison population and is expected to support the case for removing the existing fence.

IUCN notes that the renewal of the European Diploma of Protected Areas for both national parks was discussed in November 2007 as well as March 2008, and that it has been further postponed to the November 2008 meeting of the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention as earlier recommendations had not yet been adequately addressed. The European Diploma Group of Specialists recommended not to renew the European Diplomas until Belarus has established and implemented, before the end of 2008, a peer-reviewed 10-

year management plan for the national park; and until Poland has established and implemented a peer-reviewed 10-year management plan for the national park by the end of 2009 and designated and fully protected all primeval forest stands and functional corridors linking the various reserves of the Białowieża Forest. The Group of Specialists also made a number of other recommendations relating to forestry policy and practices, ecosystem and species management, tourism management and transboundary cooperation. IUCN considers that adequately addressing these recommendations is also critical for improving the integrity of the World Heritage property.

IUCN encourages the States Parties of Poland and Belarus to continue their efforts to extend the national parks and/or strictly protected zones and to ban logging, including so called sanitary cuttings, in all reserve areas and especially in old-growth forest stands of Białowieża / Belovezhskaya Pushcha Forest as it appears to compromise the proposed extension of the World Heritage property. IUCN also urges the State Party of Belarus to accelerate progress with the gradual removal of the existing fence that prevents free cross-border movements of large mammals.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN fully support the Belarusian proposal to hold consultations at the property and recommends that a monitoring mission take place to the property during 2008. The mission should a) assess the state of conservation of the property and surrounding areas that are intended to be proposed as extensions to the property; b) resolve the boundary issue on the Belarusian side before the revision of the functional zoning of the national park is completed; c) review progress made with the management plans for the national parks and make recommendations on the consideration of World Heritage requirements in them; and d) advise the States Parties on the possibility to re-nominate the property under additional criteria with extended and consolidated boundaries and with appropriate buffer zones.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.20**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7B.20** and **31 COM 7B.30**, adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes with concern that a large part of the property on the Belarusian side might not have been managed according to World Heritage standards given that the State Party considered that only the strictly protected zone of the Belovezhskaya Pushcha National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List, not the whole National Park;*
4. *Reiterates its request to both States Parties to ensure that the management of the property and surrounding areas does not adversely impact on the values and integrity of the property, and to continue their efforts to implement the recommendations of the joint 2004 World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission, as confirmed by the 2007 recommendations of the European Diploma Group of Specialists;*
5. *Requests both States Parties to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property, preferably in September or October 2008, in order to:*
  - a) *Assess the state of conservation of the property and surrounding areas that are intended to be proposed as extensions to the property;*

- b) *Resolve the boundary issue on the Belarusian side before the revision of the functional zoning of the national park is completed and obtain a map of the whole transboundary property;*
  - c) *Review progress made with the management plans for the national parks and make recommendations on the consideration of World Heritage requirements in them; and*
  - d) *Advise the States Parties on the possibility to re-nominate the property under additional criteria, with extended and consolidated boundaries and with appropriate buffer zones;*
  - e) *Assist in reviewing the draft Statement for outstanding universal value for the property prepared by the Periodic Reporting Meeting held in Wroclaw, Poland (September 2007)*
6. *Also requests both States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2009, updated reports on the state of conservation of the property and on further progress made in implementing pending recommendations from the 2004 World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

## **21. Danube Delta (Romania) (N 588)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## **22. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768 rev)**

### 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

**25 COM III.120-121; 30 COM 7B.19; 31 COM 7B.25**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

2001: UNESCO / UNDP mission; 2007: joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Impacts of a road project across the property;
- b) Gas pipeline construction plans

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted its report on the state of conservation of the property on 15 February 2008, which reported on progress in responding to the recommendations of the 2007 joint reactive monitoring mission.

From 3 to 8 September 2007 a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission visited the property as requested by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **31 COM 7B.25** at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007). The mission was requested in response to reports of the planned construction of a natural gas pipeline from Russia to China, passing through the Ukok highland of the property. The mission met State Party representatives, a variety of stakeholders and protected area staff, an indigenous organisation and Gazprom and its subsidiary Tomsktransgaz, and a joint stock company Giprospeftgaz. The mission was able to visit the five protected areas of this serial property, and participated in a round table meeting at Ust-Koksa on 7 September which discussed the condition of the World Heritage property within the sustainable development system of the Altai mountain region. The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008/>

The mission team found that the property is well managed but several existing and potential threats could affect its outstanding universal value and integrity, the most significant of these threats being the transboundary gas pipeline to China planned to pass through the Ukok Quiet Zone Nature Park. The mission team identified nine recommendations to address these threats:

#### *Recommendation 1:*

The construction of any gas pipeline passing through the property would constitute a threat to the outstanding universal value and integrity and would represent a clear case for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Therefore alternative routes outside its boundaries should be explored.

The State Party noted the construction of any gas pipeline would not occur until investments and the signing of an intergovernmental agreement have been secured. For the moment the project is still not confirmed. However, the State Party reported that it would inform the World Heritage Committee, including on the possible impact of the construction, as soon as any decisions had been taken.

#### *Recommendation 2:*

There is a need to complete the management plans for all individual components of the property and prepare an overall management framework for the property as a whole, setting out a common vision and objectives.

Through its project "Biodiversity conservation in the Russian part of the Altai-Sayan region", the State Party is providing management personnel to the property and will establish a development plan 2008-2012. A management plan is also being prepared through broad

interdisciplinary collaboration but no information on deadlines for its finalisation and approval was provided.

*Recommendation 3:*

A sustainable tourism strategy for the property should be developed as soon as possible, in partnership with the tourism industry, local communities and other stakeholders. This is essential in order to manage tourism in a manner that is sustainable and consistent with the values of the property.

The State Party has prohibited any activity in the 26,800 ha preservation zone where most threatened and endemic wildlife and plant species are located. Visitors are strictly regulated in the 39,200 ha Limited Management Zone. In the 186,904 ha Recreation Zone, activities including campsites are limited to those which do not contravene the aims and goals of the property. However no information was provided on progress achieved on the development of an overall tourism strategy for the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN believe that these isolated measures are not sufficient to address potential threats from tourism development.

*Recommendation 4:*

A coherent monitoring system for collection of tourism information should be established, including on tourist arrivals and activities in order to create reliable baseline data.

The State Party reported that it has begun monitoring programmes, but did not specify details on the programmes or their results.

*Recommendation 5:*

Management between the two systems of protected areas (federal and regional) needs to be better integrated. There is a need to clarify the legal status of Lake Teletskoe and to ensure that all legal provisions are in place for coherent control and inspection, including the legal provisions allowing nature reserve staff to act against infringements in the adjoining areas of Lake Teletskoye Natural Monument and Mt. Belukha Nature Park.

*Recommendation 6:*

The number of staff in Ukok Nature Park should be increased from the present level of five to at least eleven in order to effectively control and manage the area. A similar increase in staff should also be considered for the Belukha Mountain Nature Park. The staff should be provided with adequate equipment and other means to carry out their duties effectively.

*Recommendation 7:*

A joint World Heritage environmental education programme should be developed for all five protected areas and information on the World Heritage property as a whole should be disseminated, as well as a joint research strategy including streamlined and coordinated monitoring system in order to complement activities and avoid duplication.

*Recommendation 8:*

Transboundary cooperation between the different protected areas should be strengthened and provisions should be made for the Directors of the Nature Parks to attend the meetings of the Association of the Altai-Sayan Mountain Range.

The State Party reported that it is beginning to cooperate with the Mongolian State Party within the framework of the international Russian-Mongolian-Kazakh-Chinese project for creation of a transboundary biosphere reserve.

*Recommendation 9:*

To foster and expand the dialogue and cooperation with representatives from civil society, thereby taking advantage of their knowledge and abilities in the conservation and management of the property.

Overall none of the recommendations from the 2007 reactive monitoring mission have been fully implemented despite the urgency to address them. IUCN would like to stress that building a gas pipeline through this property would represent a clear case for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It further notes the importance of integrating the legal and management structures within the component units of the property and the need to complete and implement the management plans as soon as possible. The State Party is encouraged to ensure that its monitoring programmes specifically include the monitoring of the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property.

**Draft Decision:        32 COM 7B.22**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.25**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes with concern that the State Party has not rejected plans to construct a gas pipeline which, if it were to pass through the property, would constitute a threat to its outstanding universal value and integrity and would represent a clear case for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
4. *Reiterates its requests to the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide full details of the feasibility study for the gas pipeline project including results of the Environmental Impact Assessment (considering both environmental and social/cultural impacts) to the World Heritage Centre, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to fully consider and effectively implement the recommendations of the 2007 World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission to strengthen the protection and management of the property;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 mission for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

**23. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765 bis)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996; extension 2001



Criteria

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**30 COM 7B.25; 31 COM 7B.26**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1997: IUCN fact-finding mission; 2004: World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal salmon fishing;
- b) Gold mining;
- c) Gas pipeline;
- d) Development of a geothermal power station;
- e) Forest fires;
- f) Boundary changes;
- g) Construction of the Esso-Palana road.

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted its report on the state of conservation of the property on 15 February 2008.

From 30 August to 7 September 2007 a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission visited the property as requested by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **30 COM 7B.25**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006). The mission met State Party representatives, a variety of stakeholders and protected area staff and was able to visit four of the six components of the serial property, the Kronotsky Biosphere Reserve, a federal protected area, and South Kamchatka, Bystrinsky and Nalychevo Nature Parks, which are regional protected areas. The mission report is available online at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008>

The mission team found that the outstanding universal value of the property is still present and not subject to immediate threat. Nevertheless, the mission identified some important issues, which, if not addressed within the next 2-3 years, may jeopardize its outstanding universal value in the future and the fulfilment of the condition of integrity. The main concerns relate to the legal protection and management of the property, potential threats from possible mining development and salmon poaching.

a) *Legal protection and Management*

The mission considered that the protection status of the Nature Parks is insufficient to guarantee an optimal conservation of the biodiversity values of the property.

Ownership over the federal lands in the Nature Parks has not been transferred to the regional administration, and they are subject to a complex jurisdiction, resulting in different federal agencies being in charge of different natural resources in the parks. The mission considered that current management arrangements prevent the Nature Park agencies managing the property in accordance with their conservation objectives and this is a major obstacle to the effective management of the property.

The mission noted substantive progress since the previous mission in 2004 in increasing the staffing and budget of the four Nature Parks within the property, but that the budget of the two federal protected areas had decreased slightly and was not adequate to meet the management requirements of the property.

b) *Mining*

While the mission was satisfied with the assurance given by the State Party that no mining exploitation is currently planned within the property, plans for future mining development remain of concern. During the mission, State Party representatives explained that if important mineral, oil and gas deposits were found in one of the parks, it might decide in the future to seek an approval of a boundary change of the property by the World Heritage Committee but emphasized that for the moment this was not under discussion. The recent State Party report affirmed no exploration or mining activities are carried out within the property. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received information that, shortly after the mission, the regional administration decided to alter the regulations of Bystrinsky Nature Park to allow for geological prospecting in two districts where gold deposits are located in the park. However, at the time of preparation of this report, the World Heritage Centre had not received any official confirmation from the State Party on these issues.

c) *Salmon poaching*

The mission further noted continued reports on declining salmon populations as a result of poaching, but was unable to evaluate its impact on the outstanding universal value, due to a lack of data. The mission requested the State Party to report on salmon populations in Kamchatka as a whole and in particular as they relate to the property. In response, the State Party report notes that no salmon fishing is allowed in the two federal protected areas, but that increased poaching activities have been observed in the South-Kamchatka Wildlife Refuge, the major spawning area for the sockeye salmon. In response, protection measures have been strengthened. However, the report states that salmon populations are stable in both protected areas. In the Nature Parks, commercial fishing is allowed in designated fishing areas under license and is limited by quota. In particular South Kamchatka and Nalychevo Nature parks include important spawning rivers, but the report notes that salmon populations in both parks are satisfactory. However, no detailed scientific data on the status of salmon populations is provided.

d) *Other issues*

The mission assessed the specific effects of a massive landslide of June 2007 in the Valley of Geysers in Kronotsky Biosphere Reserve and concluded that this is a normal phenomenon in the natural geological and ecological dynamics of the property, and thus intrinsically part of its outstanding universal value. A policy of non-intervention is recommended to allow the natural restoration process to take its course.

The mission noted concerns by indigenous people over the decline of populations of snow sheep and sable and a lack of transparency in the attribution of hunting blocks in some parts of the property, in particular Bystrinsky Nature Park. It commended efforts to rationalize bear hunting quotas for the Kamchatka peninsula.

The mission also reviewed the issues of logging and forest fires and the construction of the Mutnovsky geothermal power plant but concluded that these had no significant impact on the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property. The planned construction of the gas pipeline, which will not cross the property, will also have no direct impacts on the property,

but as it is crossing several salmon spawning areas, might affect salmon populations in the peninsula.

The mission developed a number of recommendations to strengthen the management of the World Heritage property, and the most important are included in the relevant sections of the proposed draft decision.

**Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.23**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7B.25** and **31 COM 7B.26** adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Also recalling Decision **24 COM VIII.44-49** (Cairns, 2000) on World Heritage and mining and the subsequent commitment by major stakeholders in the mining industry (International Council on Minerals and Metals, 2003) not to mine in World Heritage properties,*
4. *Notes that the outstanding universal value of the property remains intact and is not subject to immediate threat but that important issues related to the integrity and management of the property exist which, if not addressed, could jeopardize the outstanding universal value and integrity;*
5. *Urges the State Party to implement the following recommendations of the 2007 mission in order to strengthen the protection and management of the property:*
  - a) *Upgrade the protection regime of the regional Nature Parks, either by upgrading them to National Park status, as originally foreseen by the State Party, or by revising their zonation to better conserve the outstanding universal value of the property, and in particular its biodiversity values;*
  - b) *Establish a management structure and institutional strategy for the property, which can ensure that all resources in the property are managed with the objective of conserving the outstanding universal value of the property and its integrity;*
    - a. *Develop an integrated management plan for the entire property, defining its management objectives based on its outstanding universal value and associated conditions of integrity, setting common standards for management to maintain the World Heritage values across the property and define planning and management responsibilities for the different management entities;*
    - c) *Develop or revise the management plans for each of the six components of the property as part of the integrated management plan that detail how each will be managed to maintain the values for which the whole property was inscribed as well as how these plans will be resourced to ensure their implementation;*
    - d) *Precisely set the boundaries of the property within the management plan, by translating the boundaries identified at the time of inscription into geographical coordinates;*
6. *Requests the State Party to implement the other recommendations of the 2007 mission to address key conservation issues, in particular:*

- a) *Submit to the World Heritage Committee, the environmental impact assessments for existing and planned mineral mining geothermal exploitation as well as exploration projects situated near the boundaries of the property;*
  - b) *Monitor closely on-going mining, gas pipeline, and mineral or geothermal exploration activities close to the boundaries of the property to avoid adverse impacts on the property and to ensure that the highest environmental standards are met;*
  - c) *Submit an additional scientific report on the state of conservation of the salmon populations in the property, showing the trends since the time of inscription;.*
  - d) *As part of an overall management framework, establish an access policy for the entire property, based on establishing an overall framework for access control and limiting accessibility.*
7. *Also urges the State Party to provide, by **1 November 2008**, information on the alleged changes in the regulations of Bystrinsky Nature Park to allow geological prospecting and reported plans to change the boundaries of the park to accommodate mining activities;*
  8. *Invites the State Party to consider addressing the issue of joint management plans, management frameworks and management standards for all natural World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation composed of federal and regional protected areas through a national law for the management of natural World Heritage properties that meets the State Party's obligations to the Convention;*
  9. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

#### **24. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

#### **25. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## 26. 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

**28 COM 14B.14**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Main threats identified in previous reports

Lack of management plan

### Current conservation issues

When the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2004, the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to urgently prepare a management plan and implementation strategy, and requested the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to undertake a mission, in co-operation with the State Party, in 2006/2007 to report on the status of the management plan and review its implementation. The World Heritage Committee also encouraged the State Party to consider the extension of the marine component of this property by a further 12 nautical miles to strengthen protection of the marine biodiversity of the Wrangel Island Reserve.

There is no reported progress on these issues since the inscription of the property. The World Heritage Centre has requested the State Party to prepare and forward a copy of the necessary management plan, and provide a translation of it in French or English for review by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN. The State Party has not yet done this, nor indicated the date the plan will be completed. IUCN and the World Heritage Centre consider that the management plan should be urgently completed.

The potential marine extension of the property should also be addressed through the management planning process as a high priority. It is therefore suggested that the State Party should be requested to complete a plan, and to then invite the requested monitoring mission by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN. Given the seasonal constraints in arranging such a mission, it is suggested that this should take place in July or August 2009.

**Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.26**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **28 COM 14B.14**, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),
3. Regrets that there has been no reported progress made by the State Party in implementing the World Heritage Committee's decision at the time of inscription;
4. Requests the State Party to take the necessary steps to complete the management plan for the property as soon as possible, and send it in three copies to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review, before the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee in 2009;
5. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission to review progress on the implementation of the management plan;
6. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a progress report on the above issues, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

**27. 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

**28 COM 15B.30; 29 COM 7B.26; 31 COM 7B.34**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Absence of a management plan;
- b) Invasive Species

### Current conservation issues

At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party provide a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including on the status of all objectives of the management plan together with information on the status of the bids for funding for bird monitoring and rat eradication and a copy of the Environmental Strategy for the Pitcairn Islands. The World Heritage Committee noted that the State Party had not previously reported on the following aspects of the management plan: alien fauna and flora, miro and tou (sustainable use of timber), turtle nesting beaches and the reef, extinctions, and ex-situ conservation and translocation.

The State Party provided a letter dated 31 January 2008 reporting on these points. This discusses the issue of rat eradication in some detail as this is considered to be the principal threat to the values of the Island. The other aspects requested are discussed in brief. The State Party focal point is currently seeking a copy of the Environment Strategy for the Pitcairn Islands.

The State Party notes that the main threats to the wildlife of the Island have not increased, and that there are no plans to increase visitor numbers, nor changes with regard to turtle nesting and timber extraction. The appointment of a ranger is still being considered and the State Party considers that the views of the Pitcairn Islanders should drive the creation of this position. The State Party reports that a visitor guide on the ecology and conservation status of Henderson was published in late 2007, which promoted a Code of Conduct to minimize impact and prevent introduction of alien species. This is a positive move, although a copy has not been reviewed directly.

The principal and relatively long-standing threat to the natural values of Henderson is predation by the Polynesian rat on Gadfly Petrel and Henderson Petrel chicks. A recent study implies that such predation represents a threat of extinction of Henderson Petrels, as their breeding success is not sufficient to sustain the population. A feasibility study has concluded that eradication of the rat population is probably feasible and a proposal has been made to the United Kingdom's Overseas Territories Environment Programme to resolve outstanding design issues for the eradication programme and to finalize the operational plan. The State Party has not confirmed the timescale for action. The inscription of the property strongly emphasized undisturbed ecology as the key distinctive value of Henderson and the World Heritage Committee should encourage decisive action to safeguard the values for which the property was inscribed.

The information provided by the State Party does not answer all of the questions noted in the previous state of conservation report. There is clearly a need to require continued priority by the State Party and the Pitcairn authorities to finalize operational plans and ensure adequate resourcing. The State Party also needs to clarify its intentions in relation to the ongoing management of the natural values of the Island, including the conclusion of an eradication programme for the Polynesian rat, and the points noted in the previous state of conservation report as indicated above. In addition to this threat to Henderson Island, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre have also received information on a similar issue of a substantial threat to seabird colonies from invasive species on a different UK island World Heritage property in the Southern Hemisphere, Gough Island. In this case the threat is from predation by mice on the globally important seabird colonies of Gough.

In summary, on the basis of the State Party report, the principal management issues at Henderson Island appear to be addressed, but recent research has established that these values are threatened and require more emphatic attention.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.27**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.34**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Welcomes the completion and dissemination of a visitor code of conduct;
4. Notes the importance of decisive action in relation to threats to the property and requests the State Party to finalise plans for rapid implementation of eradication of the invasive Polynesian rat and to consider the appointment of a ranger for Henderson Island;
5. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the overall state of conservation of the property, including reference to alien fauna and flora, sustainable use of timber, turtle nesting beaches, extinctions, ex situ conservation and translocation as well as the planned ranger appointment and rat eradication scheme, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, and further requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a copy of the Environmental Strategy for the Pitcairn Islands, when it is available.

**28. Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast (United Kingdom) (N 369)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986

Criteria

(vii) (viii)

Previous Committee Decisions

**26 COM 21B. 24, 27 COM 7B.21, 29 COM 7B.27**

International Assistance

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

16 to 19 February 2003: World Heritage Centre/ IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Visitor centre developments;
- b) Lack of a management plan and management system.



### Current conservation issues

At its 29th session (Durban, 2005) the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to expedite efforts to finalize the redevelopment of the visitor centre, which was partially demolished after a fire in 2000, and report to the World Heritage Centre on progress made. On 30 January 2008, the State Party provided a detailed report on the property following an interim report dated 10 September 2007 by the Department of the Environment of Northern Ireland (DOE-NI).

The report deals with a number of issues raised by the 2003 joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission and subsequent World Heritage Committee decisions (**27 COM 7B.21, 29 COM 7B.27**).

#### *Visitor Centre:*

The report informs that planning application by a private developer to build a new visitor centre for the property was considered and that the Northern Ireland Minister for the Environment announced on 29 January 2008 that this planning permission was not to be granted. As the site is Northern Ireland's premier tourist attraction and the visitor numbers reach 450,000 per year, the visitor centre is an important factor in the tourism management of the property. It is expected that the National Trust and other stakeholders will submit a proposal for planning permission in 2008 in line with Decision **27 COM 7B.21**.

#### *Planning and Management:*

The report provides details of the Planning Strategy, the different plans and instruments (North East Area Plan, 2002, draft Northern Area Plan 2016 and Nature conservation planning) and the Causeway Coast Area of outstanding natural beauty management plan. Following the completion of the World Heritage site management plan in 2005, DOE-NI established a coordinating Management Group chaired by Environment and Heritage Services and including key stakeholders. The appointment of a site manager is also imminent.

### **Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.28**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.27**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),
3. Takes notes of the detailed report provided by the State Party on the developments concerning the visitor centre and improved planning processes and management of the property;
4. Welcomes the involvement with stakeholders in implementing the decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 27th (UNESCO, 2003) and 29th (Durban 2005) sessions and the recommendations of the 2003 joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission to build a new visitor centre and notes that planning permission was not granted for a private investor development proposal;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, an update report on the situation of the planning and design for the visitor centre, for review.

## 29. 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

**28 COM 15B.122 ; 29 COM 7B.22 ; 30 COM 7B.28**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

1995: World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission

### Main threats 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 impact on noise and air quality;
- g) Visitor numbers.

### Current conservation issues

In its report submitted on 30 January 2008, the State Party documented progress in addressing the threats already identified in 1995 which led to its inclusion in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

#### *Mining*

The State Party reported on progress in carrying out the New World Mining District Response and Restoration project. Measures have been taken to reduce mine water discharge, and discussions are underway for long-term monitoring and maintenance of the waste repository.

#### *Bison*

The State Party noted that the pathogen agent *Brucella abortus* poses an economic threat to the livestock industry in the region neighbouring the property. As a result, some of the bison migrating out of the park are killed. Bison are managed through the 2000 joint bison

management plan (BMP). The State Party reported that Bison numbers had been maintained between 3,000 and 5,000 over the last 5 years. The State Party is also conducting research to determine how to eliminate brucellosis while maintaining wild and free roaming herds in the Greater Yellowstone Area.

Though the State Party did not provide a copy of the BMP or data on bison migration or numbers killed for disease prevention, NGOs, media and experts report that the evidence for the role of bison in transmitting *Brucella abortus* is not definitive. There are no confirmed cases of brucellosis transmission from bison to cattle under natural conditions and reports note that other ungulates also carry the disease but are managed differently. In addition, a number of independent experts have noted that the BMP needs to be reviewed to adapt to changed circumstances. For example, cattle no longer graze in a number of areas which could allow wild bison more room to roam on their native range.

There are also increased opportunities to plan and manage corridors to support migration, such as through the Yellowstone Yukon Corridor, and increased support from local communities towards conservation efforts. At the time of inscription of the property, the forest lands surrounding it were considered to add value in protecting the integrity of the landscape required for wildlife, in particular bison, to migrate. Changing land use and competition with development and cattle farmers has affected the freedom of movement of the bison changing its natural behaviour and reducing the natural processes for which the property was inscribed. Thus increased attention to the implementation of the BMP is justifiable due to its strong link with the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that a detailed disease transmission risk analysis, incorporating new scientific information in particular related to the genetically distinct bison subpopulations and the changing risks for disease transmission, be conducted for all ungulates which should take part in parallel with a review of the BMP. Acknowledging that managing the bison population as migratory species is a complex and medium-long term task, it is noted that the BMP should be consistent with the protection and maintenance of the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property. Funding should support migration corridors outside the property.

#### *Cutthroat Trout*

The non-native lake trout continues to pose a grave threat to the rare and endemic cutthroat trout and 42 other native birds and mammals that depend on this species, to varying extents, for their survival. The State Party reported that despite intensive efforts to remove the invasive lake trout, research suggests that the population of lake trout is continuing to expand. The State Party believes that improved removal methods are slowing the rate of expansion of the lake trout. The consequences for the cutthroat trout are that only modest improvements since 2006 have been observed in spawning-age size classes, first-time spawning fish and fish stream counts. Media reports suggest that low water levels in Yellowstone Lake caused by drought and whirling disease are further putting stress on cutthroat trout populations.

#### *Water quality*

Water quality in the property has been threatened by old, outdated waste water treatment plants, lift stations and underground lines, and old single wall fuel tanks. This inadequate waste water and fuel infrastructure lead to accidental overflows, ruptures and spills affecting soil, ground and surface water and degradation of the land in some areas of the property. These threats have been partially addressed by a USD 22 million fund, but a significant amount of outstanding investment is still required.

#### *Roads*

The roads in the property were not designed for the very high visitor pressures which currently exist. This has contributed to resource degradation. Investment and reconstruction

is underway and is due to continue into the 2020s. The State Party reported that construction processes comply with the measures set out by the National Environmental Policy Act.

#### *Visitor use impact*

Winter visitation continues to be particularly controversial due to the use of snowmobiles, banned during 2000-2003, but allowed since. The final Environmental Impact Statement for the winter use plan proposed reducing snowmobile numbers from 720 to a maximum of 540 snowmobiles per day. However, in the opinion of experts, this figure should be further reduced to 250 snowmobiles per day to limit noise and atmospheric pollution affecting the values and integrity of the property, particularly in relation to criterion (vii), as well as to increase the quality of visitor experiences. Several solid waste management initiatives are underway to improve the sustainability of visitor use by encouraging recycling and composting of organic materials. Partnerships have been established to promote alternative fuel for transportation and reduced emissions transport such as through the use of hybrid vehicles. Visitation in 2007 equalled the former peak in 1995 and media reports noted that there were 3.15 million visitors to Yellowstone in 2007 which represents a 9.8% increase since 2006. Visitation reached its highest in July with an average in 2007 of 26,542 visitors per day.

#### *Emerging concerns and threats*

A number of experts, NGOs and media reports noted increasing human-wildlife conflict, and the loss of whitebark pine due to multiple factors including the bark pine beetle, and warming weather trends. Whitebark pine is important for grizzly bears and helps to regulate water flow during spring snow melt. The Greater Yellowstone area is also facing increasing development pressures causing landscape fragmentation, which reduces opportunities for the property to cope with predicted effects from climate change and maintain traditional migration routes for species, including bison.

#### *Management and policy*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the property is being managed through a number of detailed and targeted plans on specific issues. Whilst implementation of these specific plans is welcome, they consider that a general management plan for the properties would help to ensure that management is carried out in a cohesive and effective manner to protect its outstanding universal values and integrity. Updating the 1973 plan would provide an opportunity to assess changes and align the various policies and management affecting migratory species in particular. It would also help in assessing risk associated with the potential impacts from climate change on the integrity of this property thus helping to identify and further implement climate change mitigation and adaptation measures.

#### **Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.29**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.28**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),
3. Acknowledges progress in implementing the New World Mining District Response and Restoration project, restoring the roads within the guidelines of the National Environment Act, and in implementing water quality improvement measures;
4. Requests the State Party to continue to address the threats identified in this and previous reports in particular:

- a) *Revise the Bison management plan including:*
    - (i) *Carry out a risk analysis for disease transmission from bison to cattle and include other ungulates by including a review of scientific knowledge on disease transmission, bison behaviour and genetics, and seasonal factors;*
    - (ii) *Consider changing cattle management practices so that bison can migrate naturally, and;*
    - (iii) *Promote and enhance stakeholders' participation and accountability and transparency on the implementation of this plan.*
  - b) *Increase efforts to understand the causes for the slow recovery of cutthroat trout:*
    - (i) *Increase efforts to remove the lake trout invasive species;*
    - (ii) *Investigate the effects of reduced lake levels and drought on cutthroat and consider the potential role of climate change in further affecting the recovery of this species;*
  - c) *Assess the risk to grizzly bears from declining whitebark pine and investigate the severity of bark pine beetle infestation and the role of changing temperatures;*
5. *Notes the continued pressures from high visitor use and calls on the State Party to:*
- a) *Develop a sustainable visitor use plan to ensure that the outstanding universal values of the property can be transmitted to future generations;*
  - b) *Continue assessing visitor numbers and consider setting maximum limits based on carrying capacity assessment of areas which are particularly heavily visited;*
  - c) *Continue assessing winter visitation and the effects from snowmobiles;*
6. *Encourages the State Party to produce a general management plan to ensure that the various management activities and strategies are better integrated within an overall management framework to better protect the outstanding universal values and integrity of the property;*
7. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission in 2010 to review progress in implementing the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on progress made in addressing the different issues above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

### **30. Everglades National Park (United States of America) (N 76)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(viii) (ix) (x)

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

1993-2007

Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7A.10 ; 30 COM 7A.14 ; 31 COM 7A.12**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

April 2006: IUCN participation in a technical workshop to identify benchmarks and corrective measures

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Quantity and quality of water entering the property;
- b) Urban encroachment;
- c) Agricultural fertiliser pollution;
- d) Mercury contamination of fish and wildlife;
- e) Lowered water levels due to flood control measures;
- f) Damage from hurricanes.

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on 30 January 2008, describing progress in implementing the corrective measures developed while the property was on the List of World Heritage List in Danger. These nine corrective measures, referred to as benchmarks by the State Party, addressed four threats: water flow and other aspects of hydrology, flood protection and water supply for urban and agricultural growth, nutrient pollution from agricultural activities, and protection and management of Florida Bay. These nine corrective measures and the progress reported against each of them are as follows:

- 1 A Complete all East Everglades Land Acquisition (approximately 44,000 hectares).  
Only 1% of land acquisition is still needed, however, without this acquisition the much needed water depth increase will not be possible.
- 1B Complete Water Control Plan (CSOP Final Environmental Impact Study) and completion of 8.5 Square Mile Area Construction.

The State Party reports that the preliminary draft plan will 'likely' be replaced by a new revised water control plan to be assessed in a new Engineering Documentation Report and Environmental Impact Study (EIS) which is planned in 2009. The cause and justification for these delays and changes is unclear from the State Party report.

- 1C Construction projects for the L-67A & L-67C and L-29 water conveyance structures, Tamiami Trail Bridges, and road modifications.

Of particular concern are the delays and funding shortfalls, highlighted in media and NGO reports, relating to the Tamiami Trail component of the restoration plan. In its 2006 report, the State Party stated that the US Army Corps of Engineers was re-

evaluating this component of the project to “maximize environmental benefits for the Park in a cost effective manner, consistent with future projects to be undertaken as part of the long-range Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan.” However, the design and construction of the roadway improvements and water conveyance structures are on hold pending a re-evaluation report due in 2008. This delay in the completion of the WCA 3 De-compartmentalization and Sheetflow Enhancement Project means that the benefits of major flow restoration for Shark Slough will not be achieved for many years.

Considering the above issues, the State Party acknowledged that the full extent of flow improvements will be deferred until implementation of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (or another restoration funding strategy is adopted). The State Party also stated that the ecological benefits from the Modified Water Deliveries Project will be substantially less than originally planned because of limited Tamiami Trail roadway improvements and the very limited water depth/hydroperiod improvements which are expected.

- 2A Complete C-111 land exchange between the South Florida Water Management District and the US Government.

Only this one of the nine corrective measures set while the property was on the List of World Heritage in Danger has been fully implemented.

- 2B Complete Water Control Plan (CSOP Final EIS). The preliminary draft CSOP is being replaced by a new C-111 Project Engineering Documentation Report and EIS, which should be completed by 2009.

The preliminary draft Complete Water Control Plan is being replaced by a new C-111 Project Engineering Documentation Report and Environmental Impact Statement at least in part due to the unintended negative impact of introduced new exotic fish species (six new exotic fish species observed), elevated soil/plan phosphorus levels, and marsh vegetation changes.

- 2C Complete the construction of the C-111 detention area features from the 8.5 Square Mile Area to the Frog Pond.

The change in plan noted in 2B above has resulted in a delay also for 2C whose schedule for completion has been delayed from 2009 to 2012.

- 3A Meet or exceed long-term phosphorus reduction limits for water flowing into Shark Slough and the long-term phosphorus reduction limits for water flowing into the Taylor Slough/Coastal Basins in Everglades National Park.

Though phosphorus loads were within limits on a flow-weighted annual average for Shark Slough, phosphorus values equalled or exceeded these limits for 4 months, suggesting that additional work and long-term effort is required to ensure that phosphorus levels are being effectively controlled.

- 4A Complete the construction of the C-111 Detention Area features from the 8.5 Square Mile Area to the Frog Pond and implement CSOP operations.
- 4B Complete the C-111N Spreader Canal and revised operations.

4A and 4B aim to aid the protection and management of Florida Bay, however, due to the delays in the C-111 Detention Area, CSOP operations, the completion dates for the C-111N Spreader Canal and the second phase of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan have yet to be determined. The State Party reports that the Florida Bay ecosystem remains stressed from persistent, chronic hypersaline conditions and wide-spread algal blooms. These algal blooms recently contributed to mass sponge mortality in the south western part of Florida Bay.

In its report, the State Party also highlighted that certain early phase activities are not expected to have any benefits for the property including the WCA 3 DECOMP phase 1 and 2. Only with phase 3 in 2018 will there be increased flows into Northeast Shark Slough and Big Cypress National Park. The State Party reported that benefits of substantial new water to the property to reduce near shore embayment salinity during the dry season and associated expected increased diversity of submerged aquatic vegetation and increased fish biomass are not expected within 'several decades.'

*Population growth, urban development, and increasing water demands*

The State Party also reported on the challenges from projected growth in Miami-Dade County. While the existing Urban Development Boundaries are projected to contain growth until 2015, adjustments to these boundaries have occurred and future growth will pose serious strains on the protection and integrity of the property. A new 20-year consumptive use permit for Miami-Dade County does limit the withdrawals from the Everglades and requires off-sets from alternative water sources but these will have to be carefully monitored and plans (after 20 years) are unclear. Storm water management continues to pose a problem for water quality.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are very concerned with the current failure to complete the implementation of eight of the nine benchmarks and notes the threat to the values of the property continue to be serious. The statements on the unintended negative consequences of 2B, and the information provided on algal blooms, sponge deaths, and delays to achieve expected ecological benefits from the restoration projects are an indication of the on going degradation of the values and integrity of the property. They reiterate IUCN's views expressed to the World Heritage Committee in 2007, where IUCN noted that many threats still exist at this property and that IUCN considers the property is still in danger.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the State Party continue to provide the World Heritage Committee detailed progress report on the implementation of the corrective measures; as well as information on key habitats and species listed in its 2006 statement of significance. This should include the status of freshwater marshes, tropical hardwood hammocks, pine rocklands, mangrove forests, saltwater marshes, and seagrass ecosystems. The state of conservation report should also report on the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in relation to criterion (x), such as the status of populations of the 20 rare, endangered or threatened species including alligator, crocodile, Florida panther, snail kite and manatee, as well as the status of key bird species. Such information would allow improved consideration by the World Heritage Committee on the values for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List and the effectiveness and status of the corrective measures.

Finally, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that a number of expert opinions, based on climate models, points to serious risk from sea-level rise for the property. They encourage the State Party to carry out a vulnerability assessment and develop a risk reduction strategy so that the high levels of investment required by the State Party to restore the property are appropriate, given potential future environmental and social changes for maintaining the values of the property and its integrity.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.30**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,



2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7A.12**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Acknowledges the extensive on-going efforts of the Everglades National Park and the considerable funding of the State Party to protect and restore the property;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to continue providing sufficient funding to ensure the corrective measures are implemented as effectively and as quickly as possible;*
5. *Also encourages the State Party to conduct a vulnerability assessment and develop a risk reduction strategy for climate change, including effective solutions to restoring the water flow and functioning of the Everglades ecosystem that will allow it to adapt to projected sea-level rise;*
6. *Notes that previous state of conservation reports have not provided data and information on the status of many of the values for which the property was inscribed;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a detailed state of conservation report, including information on species and ecosystems, and progress in implementing the corrective measures and achieving the desired state of conservation, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

### 31. Iguazu National Park (Argentina) (N 303)

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

### 32. Iguçu National Park (Brazil) (N 355)

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

### 33. Belize Barrier Reef System (Belize) (N 764)

#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

#### Criteria

(vii) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

#### Previous Committee Decisions

N/A

#### International Assistance

N/A

#### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 80,000

#### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

#### Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

### Current conservation issues

There is a great demand for land on which to carry out tourism related real estate development projects in the Caribbean. The many islands of the Belize Barrier Reef have not escaped global investor attention and in this regard, projects are already being aggressively pursued (see for example: <http://www.treasurecovebelize.com>).

In late 2007, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received many reports of impending land sales and development near and within Bacalar Chico National Park (one of the seven components of this serial property), involving the changing of protection status of part of the property. In a response to a letter sent by the World Heritage Centre, the State Party explained that no decision had been made for changing the protection status of any area within the property.

In early 2008, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received new and detailed information on another portion of the property, including aerial photographs plainly illustrating significant parts of the reef system at Pelican Cays (a group of mangrove islands and coral reefs located within the South Water Caye component of this serial property) having been cleared of mangrove forests and filled with sand and coral rubble extracted from shallow waters adjacent to these Cays. The reports received on these actions claimed that the ecosystem on large parts of two mangrove islands, nearby coral patch reef and sea bottom ecosystems, all located within the property, have been completely destroyed. The information indicated that government departments had not issued mangrove clearing or dredging permits in that area. In a letter to the State Party dated March 5th 2008, the World Heritage Centre requested information on these reports and has not yet received a reply.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that such uncontrolled developments are not compatible with World Heritage status and further, stress that healthy and well conserved mangrove forests and coral reefs are essential to maintain the resilience of the property in the face of predicted impacts from climate change. This is an important issue to consider in the context of previous petitions to inscribe this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger based on the predicted impacts from climate change.

Given the apparent lack of control over development activity within the property, development projects are underway within its boundaries, resulting in the incremental destruction of its outstanding universal value and associated conditions of integrity of the property.

### **Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.33**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Expresses its serious concern at the reported destruction of mangrove and coral reef ecosystems within the property with accompanying adverse impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value and the integrity of the property, which are grounds for potential inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
3. *Requests the State Party to urgently ensure that these destructive activities cease immediately and that the affected areas be ecologically rehabilitated; and to inform the World Heritage Committee on any existing or proposed development plans in waters / cays within or adjacent to the property as required under Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*

4. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission to assess the extent of the reported damage and the state of conservation of the property;
5. Further requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, to develop, prior to the arrival of the mission, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
6. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including measures taken to stop the destruction of mangroves and coral reefs and a description of progress in rehabilitating the reported damage to the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009

#### **34. Los Katios National Park (Colombia) (N 1083)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**22 COM VII.27, 23 COM X.28, 26 COM 25.2.3**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 43,000 for natural heritage Technical Co-operation in 2002 used for the preparation of a management plan

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Armed conflict;
- b) Illegal extraction of natural resources;
- c) Lack of control of management agency.

### Current conservation issues

Based on information gathered during exchanges with the State Party over the past year and on several site visits carried out by experts from the Colombian Parks Agency during the last two years, The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that although armed conflict is still an issue of concern at this property, the overall state of conservation of the property remains satisfactory in relation to forest coverage and its conservation as well as integrity of the boundaries.

IUCN has received reports on the review and assessment process under implementation by the State Party. This process focuses on assessing the conservation and social challenges to which the property is subjected, and on developing clear directions for management actions. IUCN has also been providing information to the State Party with an emphasis on using the *World Heritage Convention* as a means of engaging local and national stakeholders in a broad effort to strengthen conservation and management of this property.

In this context it is important to note that the State Party has initiated an assessment of key environmental, social and governance factors related to the management of Los Katios. Whilst the existing situation in the property is still complicated by armed conflicts, a number of actions have been identified with the objective of:

- a) Increasing management capacity at the local level;
- b) Promoting sustainable management practices, such as sustainable fisheries, and to reduce illegal logging;
- c) Assessing capacity building needs for the park managers and local communities, developing innovative participatory management and governance arrangements and assessing overall management effectiveness.

### **Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.34**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Notes with satisfaction the review and assessment process initiated by the State Party to strengthen the conservation and management of this property;*
3. *Invites the State Party to consider requesting International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund to support the review and assessment process;*
4. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2009, a report on the state of conservation of the property and progress made on the implementation of the above mentioned review and assessment process for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

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

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

### **36. Alexander von Humboldt National Park (Cuba) (N 839 rev)**

#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2001

#### Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

#### Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 7B.37**

#### International Assistance

N/A

#### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

#### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

#### Main threats identified in previous reports

Mining

#### Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2007, the State Party provided the World Heritage Centre with a report on the state of conservation of the property, including clarification on the status of the proposed reactivation of mining concessions. This very general report noted:

- a) A number of forest areas within and close to the boundaries of the property that were affected in the past by mining and agricultural activities are showing some increasing level of recovery; however the rate of ecological recovery is generally slow;
- b) The conservation and management of the property has been enhanced since its inscription on the World Heritage List due to the efforts of the State Party supported by a number of projects funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), WWF-Canada and other international NGOs. These actions strengthened management capacity at the field level; and targeted control and prevention of forest fires, eradication of exotic species, and public use and environmental education.
- c) In relation to the status of the proposed reactivation of the mining concessions the State Report is unclear.

The State Party notes that a mining concession for exploration in the area of *Pilotos* (a large concession located in the heart of the property) was approved in 1996 for a Cuban-Canadian

joint venture between Moa Nickel S.A (Cuba) with Sherrit International (Canada). No activities have been implemented in this area since 1997 due to the fact that Sherrit International has communicated its position not to explore or exploit this concession in line with the international policy statement of the International Council of Mining and Metals (ICMM) of not mining in World Heritage properties. However the State Party report does not provide any information on whether or not this concession would be handed over to other mining companies.

The Cuban mining company Moa Nickel S.A expressed in 2004 its interest to undertaking exploration activities in the concessions of *Las Iberias and of Cupeyal*; however no information is provided on the status of proposed development of these concessions.

Another four mining concessions in the areas of *Camariocas Sur, Camariocas Este, Santa Teresita and La Delta* have been granted to Moa Nickel S.A in the year 2000 and 2006. These concessions are mainly located in the periphery of the property; however small portions of them are within the boundaries of the property.

In Annex 6 of the State Party report, a huge potential concession for exploration, the *La Fangosa* concession, is shown; however no information is provided on its status.

Finally, the letter supporting the State Party report notes two important issues. Firstly, the Cuban government foresees implementing all necessary studies to determine the mining potential of the region where the property is located. Secondly, and critically, whilst the Ministry of the Environment of Cuba recognizes the incompatibility of developing open mining activities with the conservation objectives of the World Heritage property, it proposes to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to minimise impacts on the values of this property by using the best available technology.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN would like to note, based on the report submitted by the State Party and additional information received, the following issues:

- a) Based on the maps provided by the State Party the granted concessions of *Pilotos and Camariocas Sur* will affect the eastern part of the core zone of *Cupeyal-Ojito de Agua* Sector; thus impacting the area of *El Toldo* within this core zone. The concessions include the *El Toldo* peak and the *El Toldo* plateau, which reportedly boast most of the endemism in Cuba and are important centres of global endemism.
- b) The proposed extension of the *Camariocas Sur* concession into the park borders only covers approximately 3 square kilometres of the protected area, the implications of surface mining (including collateral road building and human access) are potentially catastrophic to the outstanding universal value and integrity of this property. In addition, the proposed concession of *La Fangosa* is covering close to two-thirds of this core zone while the proposed concession of *Las Iberias* is covering over half of the core zone of the *Jaguani* Sector; in fact these two concessions represent approximately 40% of the property.
- c) The granted concession of *Santa Teresita* covers areas included in the north-eastern part of the property with high potential to affect the marine areas of the property. Mining in the area would create potentially damaging levels of toxic run-off associated with the erosion of acid lateritic soils that could easily impact the local waterways and the coastal mangrove ecosystems in the property's marine area. Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN believe that extending the concession into the park will imply a change in the boundaries that will set a dangerous precedent; particularly keeping in mind recent issues associated with the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary and the deletion of this property from the World Heritage List. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN stress that these two core zones (*Cupeyal-Ojito de Agua* Sector and the *Jaguani* Sector) include the key values which are crucial for the outstanding universal value of the property; thus any mining impact on these core zones will affect the key values for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List.

- d) As recognized by the State Party in its letter of 16 January 2008 and as confirmed by independent advice from IUCN experts the only way to exploit the mineral deposits in this region is through open mining. Ore extraction in the concessions needs to be done by surface mining – approximately 150 cm of the vegetation and soil cover is completely removed to allow off-site processing of the minerals. The result of such operations is a complete, irreversible destruction of the natural ecosystems in the affected areas. While prospecting does not produce the same level of impact, its main problem resides in the need to build a network of roads in order to allow systematic sampling of the area, generally using heavy trucks and drilling equipment. Therefore, as noted in the letter from the State Party and confirmed by expert advice, such activity and associated infrastructure, is incompatible with the conservation objectives of this World Heritage property. It is of great concern that some of these concessions have been granted in the period when the property was originally nominated for World Heritage listing as well as just few years after its inscription in the World Heritage List. In this context it is imperative for the State Party to recall the World Heritage Committee's position that mining and oil/gas exploration and exploitation should not occur within the boundaries of a property, and this position has been endorsed by the International Council on Mining and Metals in its Position Statement on Mining and Protected Areas (2003).
- e) Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN would like to stress that the values for which this property was inscribed on the World Heritage List under criteria (ix) and (x) are intrinsically linked to the maintenance of the existing ecosystems and of the varied topography and complex underlying geology that have given rise to one of the most biologically diverse tropical islands sites on Earth. The letter from the State Party keeps open the possibility of authorizing mining development in this World Heritage property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that, exploration and open mining in this property, will lead to the loss of the outstanding universal value of this property thus making a clear case for the delisting of this property from the World Heritage List.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.36**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.37**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not provide a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property as requested, particularly covering the proposed reactivation of mining concessions;*
4. *Notes with concern that the letter from the State Party leaves open the possibility of authorizing mining development at the heart of this property;*
5. *Also notes that open mining development affecting the property's core zones, and/or in areas ecologically linked to these core zones, is incompatible with its conservation objectives and its World Heritage status and would lead to the loss of the outstanding universal value, which would constitute a case for deletion of this property from the World Heritage List;*
6. *Acknowledges with appreciation the commitment from Sherrit International (Canada) to abstain from exploring or exploiting the mining concession granted within this property*



*in line with the international policy statement of the International Council of Mining and Metals (ICMM) of not undertaking these activities in World Heritage properties;*

7. *Requests the State Party to make a clear and unequivocal commitment to close down the mining concessions granted within the boundaries of the property, or those in its periphery that could affect the core zones of the property;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and a statement on its commitment to refrain from all mining activities within the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

**37. Sangay National Park (Ecuador) (N 250)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

**38. Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

**39. Manú National Park (Peru) (N 402)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

**40. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## **MIXED PROPERTIES**

### **ASIA-PACIFIC**

#### **41. Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181 bis)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

### 42. 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

**29 COM 7B.31 ; 30 COM 7B.33 ; 31 COM 7B.44**

#### International Assistance

N/A

#### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

#### Previous monitoring missions

1998: UNESCO visit; July 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

#### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Impacts of the Gavarnie Festival (France) and request for its permanent transfer;
- b) Insufficient transboundary cooperation on pastoral activities

#### Current conservation issues

As requested by the World Heritage Committee (Decision **31 COM 7B.44**), the State Party invited a joint UNESCO/IUCN/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in July 2007 to witness the Gavarnie Festival and discuss further the threats to the property. The joint reactive monitoring mission (full report available at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008>) aimed to address the issues that have been discussed since the inscription to enable efforts to focus on the conservation of values and comprehensive transboundary management of the property. The mission identified a variety of threats to the integrity of the property relating to the efficacy of management, and to specific issues relating to the relocation of the Gavarnie Festival, and access, roads and parking at Col de Boucharo the Troumouse cirque road. In February 2008, the State Party of France submitted a progress report covering the following 9 areas: Gavarnie Festival, management plan, creation of a management structure, status of the property (cultural and natural landscape), the Troumouse road, buffer zones, pastoral activities, response to recommendations and conclusions of the mission, and the status of transboundary cooperation. The report responded to several key recommendations of the 2007 mission.

- a) *Gavarnie Festival*

The issues surrounding the Gavarnie Festival, roads, access and parking have been ongoing since the time of the evaluation of the property in 1997. At the time of inscription the State Party of France indicated that the Festival would be removed from the property based on the recommendations of the IUCN field evaluation, which considered that it was inconsistent with the outstanding universal value of the property. However, the Gavarnie Festival continues to take place on the property despite repeated discussions during missions (1997, 1999, and 2007) and previous World Heritage Committee's decisions requesting the removal of the Festival (2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007).

The mission report makes clear that the Cirque de Gavarnie is at the heart of the World Heritage property and an iconic feature within the inscribed site. The location of the Festival within the property is therefore clearly incompatible with the basis of the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, and this point is also acknowledged in the last periodic report submission by the State Party which describes it as "unacceptable desecration" and a "real provocation against the cultural landscape of the property". Whilst the impacts are temporary, they are nevertheless entirely avoidable through the relocation of the Festival. The State Party has indicated a number of potential measures that could be taken to reduce the impacts of the Festival, but these stop short of relocation and therefore do not address the central concern regarding the outstanding universal value of the property.

The continuation of the Gavarnie Festival in the heart of the property therefore represents an ascertained danger to the property as defined in Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and also conforms to the requirements of Paragraph 181. They therefore meet the requirements for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Were the World Heritage Committee so minded the situation is also such that the application of Paragraph 192b of the *Operational Guidelines* should be considered, as the threat to the property at the time of inscription was known and the State Party has not taken action on the timescale understood at the time.

#### b) *Management*

There has also been progress in relation to the improvement of the management of the property, but further work is required. The States Parties of France and Spain do not currently have a common vision for the management of the property (5-10 years). This should be defined based on a common Statement of outstanding universal value, setting out the values of the property related to its inscription as a cultural landscape shaped by pastoralism and as a natural site for its geology and natural beauty; in relation to the relevant criteria, the conditions of authenticity and integrity, and the management requirements. There remains a need to establish a defined management structure for the French side of the property and integrate this within the management structures of the Pyrenees National Park; and to establish an appropriate level of coordination of management with the State Party of Spain. These arrangements should consider mechanisms for regular exchange and harmonisation of transboundary activities with a priority on the facilitation of transboundary grazing and a joint action plan involving stakeholders in both France and Spain (national parks, communes, mixed syndicates, Comarca etc.) in order to set management priorities for the next 2-3 years, to sustain and support the increasingly fragile farming systems. Although the World Heritage Committee's focus has been on the Gavarnie Festival in the past, the threats to the farming and pastoralism systems could prove to have a much more significant impact on the outstanding universal value of the property. The property would benefit from integrated and coordinated planning, implementation and monitoring; which would lead to joint reporting. It is suggested that the States Parties of France and Spain might also consider a joint corporate identity for the transboundary property, in order to promote the values for which the property was inscribed, as these are hardly acknowledged by many visitors.

#### c) *Roads and parking*

The State Party has made progress on road closures and on the issue of parking, with some actions underway, remaining to be completed. The road to Boucharo has been closed and the commune of Gèdre has agreed to close the last section of the Troumouse. The road at Coles de Tentes should be closed completely in summer and the cable car used as an alternative. The parking should also be reduced.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that it is regrettable that the State Party of France has not fulfilled all its commitments to address integrity and management issues within the property. In order to ensure the long-term conservation of its outstanding universal value and especially the property's conditions of integrity, it is essential that the States Parties improve their collaboration and that the State Party of France honours its commitments to implement the recommendations of the 2007 monitoring mission and past World Heritage Committee's decisions, including the relocation of the Gavarnie Festival. It is also considered that it is essential that the Gavarnie Festival is refocused to reinforce the values of the property and restructured to benefit the local community.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies suggest a workshop is held to address these issues and would be willing to work with the States Parties on the preparation of the Statement of outstanding universal value, the development of a coordinated management system, harmonised management plans and supporting a participatory process in highlighting ways to sustain transboundary pastoralism. This might open a dialogue on possible alternative location for the Gavarnie Festival and on how it might support the agricultural economy.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.42**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.44**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes progress achieved on the implementation of some of the recommendations of the 2007 reactive monitoring mission and encourages further work to implement the remaining recommendations;*
4. *Regrets the relocation of the Gavarnie Festival has not occurred, despite the commitment from the State Party of France at the time of the inscription of the property, considers that the continuation of the Gavarnie Festival within the inscribed property represents an ascertained danger to the outstanding universal value of the property, as defined by Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines; and requests the State Party of France to take the necessary steps to relocate the Festival in line with its previous commitments and past decisions of the World Heritage Committee;*
5. *Also requests the States Parties to implement a participatory process involving all key stakeholders associated with the conservation and management of the property, in order to raise the profile of the agropastoralism system and consider ways of sustaining and supporting it as a key part of the outstanding universal value of the cultural landscape;*
6. *Acknowledges a number of new cross-border initiatives underway or planned and further requests the States Parties to ensure more effective and coordinated management and monitoring of this property and, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, to develop a joint draft Statement of outstanding*

*universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, to guide management activities;*

7. *Requests moreover the State Party of France to define the management structure for its part of the property, finalise and implement the interim management plan, and agree on a process to harmonise this with the State Party of Spain;*
8. *Requests furthermore the two States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2010, a report on progress in addressing the above recommendations and in particular on the relocation of the Gavarnie Festival, the coordinated management of the property and the completion and implementation of the interim management plan for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010, with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.*

#### **43. Mount Athos (Greece) (C/N 454)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv) (v) (vi) (vii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**28 COM 15B.37; 29 COM 7B.32; 30 COM 7B.34**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

30 January – 4 February 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of overall management plan covering both the natural and cultural values of the property;
- b) Risk preparedness study, including seismic preparedness;
- c) Fire damage to Chilandar Monastery;
- d) Excessive road construction;
- e) Timber extraction.

### Current conservation issues

As requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006), two reports were submitted by the State Party. The first report on the state of conservation of the site, transmitted on 8 February 2008, provides details on the conservation works carried out in 16 Monasteries and in the Church of the Protaton, by the 10th Ephorate of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Antiquities of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture during the period of 2004-2007 and in the framework of a ongoing 10 million Euros project. The work covers the conservation of wall painted immovable properties, movable antiquities as well as excavation and restoration in the monasteries. Concerning the Chilandar Monastery, damaged by the fire of March 2004, the works include the supervision of the collection of the debris from the Transepts, preventive conservation and consolidation at the three wall-painted chapels and the northern conch of the refectory. The report also provides information on the methodology used for the above works.

In a letter dated 14 February 2008, the Permanent Delegate of Greece to UNESCO recognises that the abovementioned report does not refer to all the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN 2006 mission and highlighted the traditional strong element of self-governance by the 20 monasteries in the area.

Furthermore, on 3 March 2008 the Delegation transmitted an additional report on the state of conservation of Mount Athos provided by the Centre for the Preservation of the Holy Mount (Mount Athos) Heritage (KEDAK), the competent authority, since 1975, exercising on behalf of the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works and the Ministry of Agriculture in the region of Mount Athos. The report provides substantial information on the activities carried out both by KEDAK, the Holy Community and the Monasteries of Mount Athos and in particular mentions that:

- The concentration of different competencies in one institution (KEDAK), offers the possibility for timely action and application of integrated conservation principles at a property which benefits from traditional administrative privileges;
- KEDAK, with a 52 person highly qualified staff, decides on the content and approval of specialised studies necessary for the execution of rehabilitation works. Each study concerning a specific monastery is only approved if it ensures the scientific and technical integrity of the property. Particular attention is paid to the obligatory research phase and to the protection of the constructions against fire and seismic risks. KEDAK accomplishes all works requiring high scientific standards in applying best practice restoration and in taking into consideration the particularity of each case, its current state of conservation, historical, architectural, religious values, as well as the needs of the monasteries. KEDAK also supervises the execution of works to be accomplished by the monasteries;
- In addition to rehabilitations, KEDAK carried out important infrastructural works for the protection of the monuments in case of landslide, earthquakes or fires.

The rehabilitation processes of Chilandar Monastery (damaged by the fire of March 2004), according to an established list of priorities, are also described in the report. A "principle framework" has been established for the rehabilitation of the damaged zones of this monastery. However no clear indication is given on the timeframe of the executed and future works.

The report concludes by pointing out that works conducted in Mount Athos comply with the international standards in conservation as well as with the rules concerning the administrative autonomy of the region, and that the common action between KEDAK and the Monastic community may lead to the elaboration of a framework in the future, responding to the particular needs of Mount Athos and its heritage.

IUCN would welcome additional information on the Environmental and Forest Board of the Holy Mountain activities and strategy of this board and would be happy to provide any technical assistance as needed.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the special status of Mount Athos and its traditional self-governance and commend the authorities for their sensitive handling of these issues. Respecting this sensitivity, there is a need for a management framework which promotes greater integration between the agencies and the Monastic communities. This would be the most effective way to address the World Heritage Committee's request for an overall management plan for the property covering both the natural and cultural values, as recommended by the joint mission and endorsed by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006). IUCN notes that a woodland conservation project, jointly funded by the EU LIFE programme and the Greek Ministry of Development and Food. This project would be better conducted under the umbrella of a management framework. Joint reporting from the State Party and the self-governing community of Mount Athos on its various activities and landscape management practices would be welcome.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.43**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.34**, adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006) session,*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the continuous efforts between national authorities responsible for heritage conservation and the leadership of the monastic community, the Holy Community of Mount Athos, to collaborate fruitfully and effectively to ensure the long term conservation of the property;*
4. *Also notes that the submitted reports do not address the key issue concerning the development of an overall management framework for the property covering both the natural and cultural values, as recommended by the joint mission and endorsed by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006);*
5. *Urges the State Party and competent authorities to continue to implement all recommendations of the 2006 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN mission;*
6. *Requests the State Party, in collaboration with the Monastic communities, to provide to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2010** a report on progress made with the management framework and in implementing the recommendations of the joint 2006 World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*



## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

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

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## **CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

### **AFRICA**

#### **45. Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323)**

##### 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

**28 COM 15A.14; 29 COM 7A.13; 30 COM 7A.1; 31 COM 7A.14**

##### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 60,000 in 2000 and USD 17,000 in 2005.

##### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 400,000 was granted by the Government of Japan in 1998 ; USD 50,000 granted 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.

##### Main threats 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.

##### Current conservation issues

The report submitted by the State Party on 15 January 2008 provides information on progress achieved to date :

- a) *Finalisation of the legislative and administrative mechanism for the protection of cultural heritage and natural heritage of a cultural character in Benin:*

The proposed Law transmitted to the National Assembly by Decree N° 2006-425 of 28 August 2006, was voted by the National Assembly on 17 August 2007 under the title « Law 2007-20 of 17 August 2007 concerning the protection of cultural heritage and natural heritage of a cultural character in the Republic of Benin ». Promulgation by the President of the Republic is still outstanding.

- b) *Progress in conservation work undertaken on the remaining components still under threat:*

Safeguarding work continues at a steady pace since 2007. All the structural components for which safeguarding work has been undertaken are fully completed, totalling almost 80% of all the structural components safeguarded to date. Recent work is concentrated on the *Houegbadja* royal area, and this thanks to funding from the Federal Republic of Germany. The following reconstruction work has been carried out :

- a) Four buildings in ruin (*tassinoho*, *logodo* accessing the inner courtyard of the Palace, *logodo* accessing the women's courtyard, waiting room) ;
- b) Three *djebo* (temples) spirit houses of the King, and the cabin of the guardian of the Adonon Tomb ;
- c) More than 250 linear metres of surrounding wall.

The report indicates that drainage work for pluvial waters will also be carried out in this royal area.

Mention is also made of preparations for reconstruction work and presentation of the Agadja Royal area, work which will begin in April 2007, thanks to funding from the Norwegian Cultural Heritage Directorate, the city of Albi (France) in the framework of its decentralised cooperation with the city of Abomey, and the Public Investment Plan (PIP).

Finally, the report indicates that in the framework of the overall management for the World Heritage property, and in particular the improvement of its state of conservation, all maintenance work is documented by means of daily inspection forms, systematically filed. Studies are also being elaborated for landscape maintenance and interpretation for the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note with satisfaction that the dynamic set in motion by the State Party for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger has continued without respite. However, they wish to draw the attention of the State Party to the risks of a systematic reconstruction of all the palaces that could, in the end, be negative to the outstanding universal value of the property and create management and conservation difficulties. This systematic reconstruction strategy, based on a reconstruction policy, should be examined by the Advisory Bodies, and included in the framework of a global reflection on the future reuse of the palaces and their capacity to generate income to cover their permanent daily maintenance.

**Draft Decision : 32 COM 7B.45**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7A.14**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes with satisfaction that the safeguarding work for the totality of the structural elements of the property has been progressing since July 2007 in the framework of the implementation of the 2007-2011 management plan ;
4. Draws the attention of the State Party of the need to integrate its entire reconstruction activities concerning the royal areas in the framework of a global reflection on their future reuse and their capacity to generate income to cover their daily maintenance ;

5. Requests the State Party to submit, no later than **31 October 2008**, a reconstruction policy document for the palaces, that takes into consideration the objectives of the management and conservation plan, for examination by ICOMOS, ICCROM and World Heritage Centre;
6. Encourages the State Party to pursue its funding strategy for conservation activities and presentation of the property thanks to income generated by the entrance fees to the property;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, no later than **1 February 2010**, a report on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

**46. Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

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

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

**48. 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

**29 COM 7B.35; 30 COM 7B.41; 31 COM 7B.50**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: Technical co-operation for the rehabilitation of the Lamu Waterfront, 2004: USD 6,932

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

22 to 27 March 2004: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of management plan;
- b) Lack of risk preparedness, especially in the case of fire;
- c) Sewerage situation;
- d) Lack of resources.

### Current Conservation issues

On 27 February 2008, the State Party provided to the World Heritage Centre a progress report on the implementation of the Decision adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007).

#### *Management plan*

In regard to the management plan, the report states that it still only has a draft status, and that a "Third Consultative Forum on the adoption of the Lamu management plan" is to take place in mid 2008. While it is extremely positive that the State Party has developed a thorough participatory framework within which the management plan is being developed, it is desirable that this meeting take place as soon as possible to finalize the plan and ensure its adoption by the relevant authorities so that it will come into force. It should also be noted that the Action Plan requested by the World Heritage Committee has yet to be developed. This step is perhaps waiting for the finalization of the management plan itself. The report also mentions the creation of a regional development plan for Lamu District. This plan, which is set to be published in 2008, covers overall development in the district, and is said to take into account the management plan prepared by the National Museums of Kenya and Lamu County Council.

#### *b) Buffer zone*

In regard to the gazettment of the Manda – Ras Kitau area as an extension to the buffer zone, this is considered a very important step in protecting the outstanding universal value of the property. The State Party indicates that there are some difficulties being encountered due to the multiple responsibilities of various state institutions. This overlapping authority requires careful discussions with all interested parties to ensure proper protection. The State Party indicates that a concept paper has been prepared and negotiations are ongoing with the other government authorities regarding the extension of the buffer zone.

The report also notes that a concept paper has been developed for improved risk management in the property, which is currently awaiting donor funding.

#### *c) Infrastructure*

The report indicates that the Lamu County Council has been overwhelmed by the amount of solid waste generated by the increasing development of the island. The report indicates that a local community based organization has stepped in to provide additional vehicles for waste transport and has undertaken other initiatives. These efforts need to be consolidated and institutionalized in order to ensure their ongoing sustainability. The report also indicates that a total of 30,000,000 Kenyan Shillings has been allocated by the State Party for upgrading of the water supply in and around the World Heritage property. In regard to sanitation, the Lamu County Council has agreed to fund the costs for sanitation engineer to draft a proposal

for improved sewage and drainage. This proposal will then be sent to an already identified donor for possible funding.

*d) Documentation*

Other activities undertaken by the State Party to improve the conservation and management of the Lamu Old Town include the beginning of a new documentation project to update the building inventory and computerize all of the records (including introducing GIS). The National Museums of Kenya is also currently developing a project to restore one of the Grade One buildings that collapsed in 2005 (using public funds). Improved heritage mapping of archaeological assets within the World Heritage property and surrounding areas is also being carried out as are improvements to the presentation of the property.

*e) Other development issues*

The State Party also pointed out several development issues that may have a potential effect on the property. The Ministry of Energy and the National Oil Corporation have inaugurated exploration of oil along some part of the Kenyan coastline and on several off-shore beds. Preliminary reports indicate however that there may not be sufficient oil reserve for commercial exploitation. The National Museums of Kenya has indicated that a comprehensive cultural impact study will be necessary if exploration continues.

The State Party also reports the possibility of developing a new port facility within the Lamu district. A comprehensive cultural impact study will be necessary if this project continues to be developed.

The report also indicates that climate change may also be an issue in the future due to rising sea levels but indicates that currently, no changes have been detected.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies view in a positive manner the various steps being undertaken by the State Party to improve the conservation and management of the property. Nevertheless, they are concerned that rapid, uncontrolled development is still occurring within the relatively fragile urban fabric of the property and its buffer zone. Even though the report calls attention to this continued development as economically positive, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre strongly recommend that the development be carried out with great attention to the heritage values of the property.

**Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.48**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.50**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the State Party's continued work on the management plan, which involved stakeholders and the local community, as well as its progress on the extension of the buffer zone and improvement of the property's infrastructure;*
4. *Reiterates its concern about the ongoing uncontrolled development at the property;*
5. *Also notes with concern oil exploration near the property and the possible construction of the new port facility and requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Committee informed of any potential impacts on the property;*
6. *Strongly urges the State Party to continue work on the extension of the buffer zone and the protection of the property;*

7. *Also urges the State Party to continue its efforts to improve the infrastructure in order to sustain the progress already made;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to finalize and approve the management plan as soon as possible so that it may be implemented;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to prepare the supplementary action plan as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) to include the identification of the key stakeholders for various actions as well as the necessary timeframe for carrying them out;*
10. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit the published regional development plan and the final management plan in three copies for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
11. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a progress report on the implementation of these recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

#### **49. Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

#### **50. 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

**29 COM 7B.36; 30 COM 7B.38; 31 COM 7B.51**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the *property*: 2007, USD 30,000, Technical Cooperation;

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

2002 ; 2005: World Heritage Centre missions; 2006: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission ;

### Main threats 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.

### Current conservation issues :

The State Party submitted its report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage property on 27 February 2008. This report provided information on the alterations observed to the built and non-built components, drainage problems, the state of the archaeological sites and progress in the preparation of the management plan.

#### a) *Alterations to buildings*

Important alterations continue with regard to the buildings in the Town of Djenné. Several houses are no longer maintained and become dilapidated, creating abandoned plots that become rubbish tips. In the long term, these ruins could cause structural problems to the neighboring houses because of the effects of water stagnation, often causing deterioration of the dividing walls. The abandonment of these houses is due to the impoverishment of the local population, lack of income-generating activities – which in turn causes an exodus – problems of joint possession provoking tension and regular conflict. Acceleration in new constructions along the river banks may be noted, as well as the construction of public buildings in the town centre. Regulatory tools for the allocation of building permits are not yet in place, and the Djenné Cultural Mission does not have the means to exercise alternative controls to limit the current densification observed. The Town is also subject to bad rehabilitation practices. Indeed, the owners, in order to adapt their houses to new requirements, modify the original plan to the extent that the street alignment no longer exists; the façades are simplified and lose their architectural characteristics. According to a census carried out by the Djenné Heritage Association in February 2008, 154 façades are today covered in part or completely, with cement or baked bricks, and this phenomenon could intensify if no action is undertaken. The State Party is aware that all these uncontrolled modifications could compromise the coherence of the earthen built town. It envisages reviewing the legislation in force and to define a framework for close cooperation between the Cultural Mission and the Town Hall authorities, for the issuance of building permits and inspection of work. It also envisages continuing awareness raising activities for the populations concerning the World Heritage status of the Town.

The report furthermore indicates that an Urban Master Plan (UMP) for the period 2006-2025, proposing a response to urban development, is being prepared. But a certain number of orientations have already been identified in the present version of the UMP that, if applied, could be prejudicial to the property. Among others, these are :

- intensive densification of the Old Town, that could accelerate the morphological transformation of the houses and complicate drainage issues, contravening regulations in force ;
- construction of administrative buildings on the archaeological site of Tonomba, that could affect its outstanding universal value ;



- construction of a ring road that would cross the archaeological site of Hambarketelo, and modify the present morphology of the flood areas and cause heavy use of the river banks.

b) *Sanitation problems*

The 750 water fountains that have been established in the Old Town have led to the stagnation of water around them. This accumulation of water, aggravated by the poor management of refuse, has provoked an insalubrious situation, detrimental to the health of the population, the earthen architecture and cultural tourism. So far, no satisfactory solution has been found to alleviate this problem. The report also recognizes that the multiplicity of the different methods for the evacuation of water greatly complicates the management of the Town's drainage system. Nevertheless, of all the evacuation systems, the one that to date appears to be the most suited and best accepted by the population is the one tested in 2000, with support from The Netherlands Government. With regard to waste water, the open air sewage system proposed by the World Bank in 2005 was not retained because of the narrowness and irregularity of the streets. Finally, the report notes that considerable efforts have been made by the Municipal authorities. Even though no public dustbins exist and the open areas caused by collapsing houses are used as rubbish tips, the establishment of associative structures responsible for the collection of refuse gives hope for an improvement in the state of salubrity of the Town. With regard to the excreta, an economic interest group has been made responsible by the Town Hall authorities for weekly collection from all the houses; it is then either buried in trenches alongside the houses, or disposed of by the river banks. The State Party acknowledges that this traditional practice must be reconsidered, as it affects the health of the population, the crops and fisheries. However, the report indicates that the solutions proposed in the strategic drainage plan for Djenné in 2003, could be the key to the problem. This plan proposes :

- networks of open air masonry rainwater collectors for the wider streets and others adapted to the narrower streets ;
- the creation of latrines for the houses and purification basins for waste water alongside the banks of the River Bani ;
- the collection of domestic solid waste and its evacuation to temporary sites on the outskirts of the town, then to a permanent dump.

c) *State of conservation of the archaeological sites*

The report indicates the construction of a public building in the Tonomba archaeological site. Mention is also made of natural erosion problems that create deep ravines in the rainy season and consequently threaten the integrity of the archaeological sites, in particular the site of Djene-Djéno. To limit the adverse effects observed by the 2006 World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS joint mission, stone cordons and a green belt began to be built in Djene-Djéno. The Cultural Mission is also attempting to halt the use of the archaeological site of Kaniana as a dump by the populations, and to prevent acts of looting that have also been observed by the joint mission, by means of awareness raising radio programmes.

d) *Preparation of a management and conservation plan*

With financial support from the World Heritage Fund, the preparation of a management and conservation plan is underway. Several sectoral meetings have been organized by the World Heritage Centre. A public meeting with the entire population was organized on 29 November 2007. These meetings have led to the identification of priority areas of stakeholders and to the outline of initial activities for an action plan. Among the problems raised were drainage questions, the scarcity of wood and rice peelings, the deterioration of houses, the lack of technical knowledge for the installation of sanitary equipment in the houses, the absence of economic and tourist activities. In this framework, a cartographical geo-referenced work of

the property is being prepared. This cartography will define the exact boundaries of the property, determine the buffer zone and propose an urban and construction regulation to the Town Hall authorities.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the detailed report provided by the State Party gives a fair picture of the socio-economic difficulties facing the property and the lack of real progress in addressing the severe problems of waste disposal, lack of repair for houses and new building over archaeologically sensitive areas.

The elaboration of the management and conservation plan and in particular the preparation of a concise cartography, in view of an urban and construction regulation applicable to the property, would pave the way for significant progress with regard to reducing the present difficulties.

Nevertheless, it is also urgent to modify the orientations of the UMP that have an impact on the outstanding universal value of the property. In its Decision **30 COM 7B.38**, the World Heritage Committee encouraged the State Party to define a project aimed at identifying and promoting best practice for the rehabilitation of houses so as to adapt the local earthen architecture to the new use of living space. This pilot project should be carried out in the framework of activities for Phase II of the World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme foreseen in Africa, in order to encourage the sustainable use of traditional buildings. Such a programme could also help focus on ways of using traditional buildings as accommodation for the increasing numbers of tourists.

**Draft Decision : 32 COM 7B.50**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.51**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction that the preparation of the management and conservation plan has begun with the involvement of a large number of stakeholders, and encourages the State Party to finalize this work as soon as possible;*
4. *Reiterates its concern that few satisfactory solutions have been found concerning alterations to buildings, drainage problems, and problems being faced by the archaeological sites;*
5. *Requests the World Heritage Centre, in the framework of the World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme to initiate a pilot project for conservation in the Old Towns of Djenné;*
6. *Calls upon the international donor community and conservation specialists to provide technical assistance and/or funding for the implementation of a pilot project for the conservation of earthen architecture in Djenné;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and progress achieved with regard to the resorption of changes made on the built environment,, drainage problems, and problems facing the archaeological sites, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

## **51. Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599)**

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1991

### Criteria

(iv) (vi)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**24 COM III.2(iii); 30 COM 7B.42; 31 COM 7B.48**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 150,000 for preparatory assistance, emergency assistance and technical cooperation.

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: Japan Funds in Trust: USD 1,108,078; UCCLA: USD 526,015 and Portugal/IPAD: USD 102,900.

### Previous monitoring missions

2005: World Heritage Centre missions; 2006: World Heritage Centre missions; February 2007: ICOMOS mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Delay in implementing rehabilitation of the San Sebastian Fortress;
- b) Management plan not yet finalised;
- c) Buildings threatened with collapse;
- d) Lack of development control and threats to authenticity;
- e) Lack of adequate sewage system.

### Current conservation issues

In its report submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 1 February 2008, the State Party presented the progress in implementing the decisions of the World Heritage Committee:

#### *Emergency Action Plan*

An Emergency Plan has been prepared for the Cabinet of Conservation of Mozambique Island and it includes the following major activities:

1. An inventory of immovable properties existing in the Island. The inventory indicates that there are 1,192 immovable properties in Macuti town, 557 in the Stone town and 42 ruins;
2. A letter directed to the owners of the ruins to sensitize them about their obligations to restore and make use of them.

As a result, the report states that many ruins have been now properly maintained with a better appearance. No further details are provided for the Plan or for any short-term remedial actions.

### *Management plan*

A request has been made to the Africa 2009 Programme to assist with the preparation of a conservation and management plan. This request will be considered by the Africa 2009 steering committee at its next meeting.

The State Party also reported that in 2007, the Portuguese Government allocated USD 250,000 to the African Development Bank for the preparation of a Master Plan to be started in 2008. No further information has been received on this allocation. There is clearly a need, if this project goes ahead, for the Master Plan to be strongly linked to the proposed management plan.

### *Timetable for the restoration of the San Sebastian Fortress*

Based on an architectural survey, an implementation strategy has been devised for 2007-8 and for a budget of USD 1 million. This includes:

- a) removal of all invasive vegetation;
- b) structural consolidation and repair;
- c) rehabilitation of the original water collection and storage system;
- d) construction of a new cistern to provide a source of water for use by the local population;
- e) provision of basic infrastructural services and facilities;
- f) restoration of one building to accommodate facilities, to set restoration standards and to provide on-the-job training for local craftsmen.
- g) appointment of a site manager in January 2008, the letting of a main contract in January 2008 and fund-raising for a subsequent phase II. Phase I is due for completion in December 2008.

### *Raising awareness on World Heritage values*

No progress has yet been made on this but a project to sensitise stakeholders on the value and significance of the Island of Mozambique, and on the Convention, has been included as part of an International Assistance request.

The State Party also reported on the completion of the restoration project for Casa Girassol one of the main monuments on the island. This has been accomplished with the support of the City of Bergen and will act as an exemplar for conservation work on the Island.

Overall progress has been made in addressing the conservation of the San Sebastian Fortress and in applying for assistance for finalizing the conservation and management plan and these, together with the work on Casa Girassol are to be welcomed.

At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee reaffirmed its great concern "that the Island of Mozambique continues to be threatened by serious degradation of its historical monuments and urban structure and is in danger of losing its authenticity". The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned that very little progress has been made in addressing the fundamental problems affecting the outstanding universal value of the property. They consider that there is a need to raise the profile of this property in order

to mobilize support for a coordinated action from the international community. They recommend a reactive monitoring mission from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in order to assess the extent of the degradation of the property and the threats affecting its outstanding universal value. The mission would also identify, in consultation with the relevant authorities, a Desired state of conservation, the corrective measures needed and the timeframe for implementation.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.51**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.48**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the progress made in phase 1 of a project for the rehabilitation of the San Sebastian Fortress, and the completion of the restoration of Casa Girassol;*
4. *Expresses its concern that no progress has been made with the Conservation and management plan but acknowledges that an application for help in finalizing the Plan has been submitted to the Africa 2009 Programme for promoting a better understanding of World Heritage values;*
5. *Also expresses its serious concern that there has been little progress in addressing the serious degradation of historical monuments and urban structures, which is threatening the outstanding universal value of the property;*
6. *Urges the State Party to address the most severe degradation and put in place short-term remedial actions, including capacity building, in collaboration with all the stakeholders;*
7. *Calls upon the international community, in collaboration with UNESCO, to support the creation of partnerships to allow an integrated approach to the sustainable development of the property;*
8. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to examine the state of conservation of the property and determine if it is under ascertained or potential threats, as defined by Paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines;*
9. *Also requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, to develop, prior to the arrival of the mission, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*
10. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the progress made in implementing the Emergency Action Plan and in undertaking short-term remedial actions, and on the preparation of the Conservation and management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

## 52. Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape (South Africa) (C 1265)

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

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

### 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

**29 COM 7B.38; 30 COM 7B.37; 31 COM 8B.56**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

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

### Previous monitoring missions

2006: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM mission; 2007: France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of implementation of the Action Plan, including the Safeguarding and Enhancement Plan (SEP), and establishment of a heritage bureau;
- b) The lack of a management and conservation plan;
- c) New construction and Architectural modification and urban projects affecting authenticity and integrity;
- d) Inappropriate housing restoration;
- e) Environmental disorder due to the modification of the mouth of the Senegal River;
- f) Extremely poor state of conservation of numerous derelict buildings endangering occupants.

### Current conservation issues

On 15 January 2008, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party requesting an update on the state of implementation of Decision **30 COM 7B.37**. The same letter requested also clarification on a series uncontrolled rehabilitation and new construction being

conducted which were noted by the missions undertaken in 2007. As a response to the letter, the State Party submitted on 29 January 2008 a report on the state of conservation of the property from the State Party. This report contains the following information:

- a) Approval of the SEP is still in process, after scrutiny by the relevant technical services, and is awaiting the necessary legislative implementation;
- b) The boundaries of the property had been revised and approved by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) as defined in the SEP;
- c) The appointment of a site manager presented some difficulties, since posts of this type were not provided for in Senegalese legislation. However, a ministerial decree had been promulgated which created the required post. A second problem was that of defining the appropriate professional profile. Several officials were at present undergoing appropriate professional training; pending their completing their training, collaboration with the Regional Directorate of Planning was supplying the necessary expertise to cover most aspects of the eventual appointment.
- d) Efforts are being made to enhance conservation practice through a craft training programme linked to a rehabilitation project for the “Assemblée territoriale du fleuve” building.
- e) Work on the Action Plan had been delayed while efforts were concentrated on completion of an agreement on objectives with UNESCO. This document, seen as a “road map” for the preservation and conservation of Saint-Louis, had recently been approved by the two parties and is to be signed, when it would then constitute the reference document for the SEP.

The World Heritage Centre was also informed that the action plan 2006-2012 drafted in December 2006 at a Heritage seminar in Saint-Louis is still to be implemented through an Agreement between the State Party and UNESCO. This agreement which foresees the implementation of the SEP, the establishment of a management and conservation mechanism and the coordination of the bilateral cooperation is in the process to be signed by both parties. The World Heritage Centre was also informed of a number of existing cooperation projects with authorities at various levels in Belgium, France and Spain.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned that, in spite of specific restoration projects, there is a lack of coordination and a lack of progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2006 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM mission. Indeed, apart from the issue of boundaries, the other recommendations of Decision **30 COM 7B.37** have not been implemented. Furthermore the World Heritage Centre has received further information on continued and serious uncontrolled new construction and inappropriate rehabilitation that are seriously affecting the outstanding universal value of the property. Although submitting a report on the state of conservation of the property, the State Party has not addressed this important issue.

It should be noted that although efforts have been made in preparing an inventory of the architectural heritage of the property and drafting the SEP, the lack of human institutional and financial resources, as well as the lack of a coordinated approach to conservation and management noted in the previous reports, are likely to have a negative impact on the outstanding universal value. It becomes urgent to recruit a professional expertise to implement the SEP.

▪ **Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.53**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.37**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),
3. Takes note of the actions taken by the State Party to improve the state of conservation of the property;
4. Expresses its concern that little progress has been made in the implementation of recommendations of the 2006 World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM mission as set out in Decision **30 COM 7B.37**;
5. Also expresses its concern that the property continues to be seriously threaten by inappropriate rehabilitation and new constructions which may affect its outstanding universal value;
6. Urges the State Party to approve and implement the Action Plan, including the Safeguarding and Enhancement Plan (SEP) as soon as possible, and to prepare a management plan for the property;
7. Encourages the State Party to coordinate the support of international partners in order to address the key recommendations of the World Heritage Committee;
8. Requests the State Party to urgently appoint a site manager for the property;
9. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to examine the state of conservation of the property and determine if it is under ascertained or potential threats, as defined by Paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines;
10. Further requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, to develop, prior to the arrival of the mission, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
11. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2009**, a report on the progress made to improve the property's state of conservation, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

**54. Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173 rev)**

See Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add



## ARAB STATES

### 55. M'Zab Valley (Algeria) (C 188)

#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

#### Criteria

(ii) (iii) (v)

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

N/A

#### Previous Committee Decisions

**26 COM 25.2.2 ; 28 COM 15 B.44; 30 COM 7B.48**

#### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 60,000 for Preparatory Assistance and Technical Cooperation.

#### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 25,000 in the framework of the France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement in 2003-2004.

#### Previous monitoring missions

September 2001 : World Heritage Centre mission; December 2003 : World Heritage Centre and expert mission in the framework of the France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement.

#### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Development linked to socio-economic changes and population growth causing major urban pressure;
- b) Degradation of the environment, uncontrolled urban growth in the palm groves and the bed of the oued, visual impact of new buildings on the surrounding hills;
- c) Lack of a Safeguarding Plan ;
- d) Loss of craftsmanship and knowledge of traditional materials for rehabilitation of the vernacular architecture ;
- e) Loss of the traditional network for the management and distribution of water;
- f) Risk of flooding and pollution of the water table.

#### Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2008, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre a report on the state of conservation and management of the property.

A vast operation for the restoration and enhancement of the cultural heritage of the M'Zab Valley has been established, also involving the restoration of the old hydraulic network, the

restoration of historic monuments, and the restoration and rehabilitation of traditional dwellings. This was a successful operation, despite the lack of skilled work force.

A policy for the rehabilitation of the vernacular architecture has been carried out and new Ksours were built based on ancient techniques.

This report is accompanied by a draft request for international assistance following encouragement by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006). This draft request is for technical assistance for an approximate amount of USD 75,000 up to 2010, for capacity building in the preparation of a safeguarding and management plan for the Valley.

An international seminar was organized by the State Party in December 2007, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the inscription of the property, to which the World Heritage Centre was invited.

The following conservation problems have been raised by the State Party:

- a) Alteration to the palm groves due to accelerated urbanisation, as well as the saturation and rising of the level of the water table that is causing damage to the palm trees;
- b) Lack of human and material means for the integrated preservation of the M'Zab Valley, due to the vast area of this property;
- c) The overpopulation of the Valley (150 000 inhabitants) causing a saturation of mechanical vehicles with adverse affect to the ecological balance;
- d) The presence of old industrial areas dating back to the 1970s that have not been relocated beyond the safeguarded sector.

The establishment of a Permanent Safeguarding Plan is underway, with a call for tender to be submitted by 9 February 2008. A budget has been allocated by the Ministry of Culture for this purpose.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have taken note of the efforts made by the State Party in the restoration of the traditional hydraulic system and its intention to establish a safeguarding and management plan for the property.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.55**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.48**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the State Party's indication to prepare a safeguarding and management plan foreseen for 2010; and encourages it to submit a revised international assistance request for experts to assist local authorities in the preparation of this plan;*
4. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, three printed and electronic copies of the safeguarding and management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.*

## 56. Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

### Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

2002–2006

### Previous Committee Decisions

**30 COM 7A.18; 30 COM 8C.3; 31 COM 7B.54**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 99,231 for emergency assistance, technical cooperation and training.

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 9,564 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust.

### Previous monitoring missions

2002: World Heritage Centre and experts missions; March 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Natural degradation caused by littoral erosion, marine salt and vegetation covering part of the inscribed sectors;
- b) Deterioration of the remains due to vandalism, theft and uncontrolled visitation causing accumulation of rubbish;
- c) Urbanisation on the outskirts of the property where, in the absence of a defined buffer zone, illegal construction provokes land disputes;
- d) Lack of capacities for site conservation, unsuitable restoration techniques, and poor conservation conditions for the archaeological remains;
- e) Proposed port development.

### Current conservation issues

The State Party's report was received by the World Heritage Centre on 31 January 2008, including a document entitled *Plan de Protection et de Mise en valeur des sites archéologiques de Tipasa et de sa zone de protection (PPMVSA): Méthodologie d'approche et contenu de l'étude* [Protection and management plan for the Archaeological Site of Tipasa and its Buffer Zone: Methodology and content], dated December 2007.

This document constitutes the terms of reference for developing the protection and management plan. It integrates this plan into the overall statutory protection and planning structure and identifies those aspects which are already in force or being planned. A work plan is outlined, in four phases:

- a) Diagnosis and urgent actions;

Topographic and archaeological survey and outline of the PPMVSA;

Finalization of the PPMVSA;

Development of the overall management plan for the archaeological site, the town, and the countryside;

It is estimated that the first three phases will require 300 days for completion, up to 20 November 2008. The State Party submitted as well a « Fiche technique du projet de réaménagement du port de pêche et de plaisance de Tipasa » (Direction des travaux publics et de la Culture- Tipasa, janvier 2008), and the « Fiche technique de la station d'épuration et de traitement des eaux usées de la Wilaya de Tipasa » (Direction de l'hydraulique et de la Culture – Tipasa, janvier 2008). Indeed, within the framework of the sanitization of the Wilaya and the protection of the heritage of the archaeological site of Tipasa, a wastewater treatment plant was established and is operational since December 2007.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies express concern that a more detailed plan with geographic coordinates delineating the property and its buffer zone has not been provided as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007).

The information provided in the document related to the port does not allow an evaluation of the visual and archaeological impact of the proposed structures on the outstanding universal value of the property.

**Draft Decision:        32 COM 7B.56**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.54**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Expresses its satisfaction at receiving the well structured and comprehensive terms of reference for the preparation of the Protection and management plan ;*
4. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the progress made with the completion and implementation of the Protection and management plan ;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2008**, a map clearly displaying the delimitation of all components of this serial property, and its buffer zone, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009 ;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, as soon as possible and prior to carrying out the work, the detailed design of the proposed port development showing its impact on the property ;*
7. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a progress report on the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

## **57. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## **58. Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)**

### 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

**29 COM 7B.42; 30 COM 7B.50; 31 COM 7B.56**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 503,849

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

August 2002, March 2005: ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions; April and December 2007: World Heritage Centre missions for the Cairo Financial Centre

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Rise of the underground water level ;
- b) Dilapidated infrastructure ;
- c) Neglect and lack of maintenance ;
- d) Overcrowded areas and buildings ;
- e) Uncontrolled development ;
- f) Absence of a comprehensive urban conservation plan ;
- g) Absence of an integrated socio-economic revitalization plan linking the urban and the socio-cultural fabric of the city core.

### Current conservation issues

The State Party addressed to the World Heritage Centre, on 25 January 2008, a letter summarizing the activities carried out at four Egyptian World Heritage properties. As regards Historic Cairo, the letter indicated the change of name that was endorsed by the World

Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), but did not make any reference to the request to implement the 2002 symposium recommendations, namely:

- a) To designate Historic Cairo as a Special Planning District, and
- b) To prepare a comprehensive Urban Plan for the Conservation and Development of the Old City, whereby the conservation of historic buildings would be accompanied by appropriate development regulations.

As regards the construction of the Cairo Financial Centre complex close to the Citadel, the report by the State Party indicates “*that plans, models, and a report were sent to UNESCO and that a decision from UNESCO on the Citadel project was pending*”. The report of the mission that took place from 9 to 12 December 2007, at the request of the Supreme Council of Antiquities, was officially transmitted to the Egyptian authorities on 11 January 2008. The aim of this mission was to assess the evolution of the project and make further recommendations to mitigate its impact on the urban landscape, in light of the new scheme prepared by the developer following the Decision of the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007).

Despite the reduction of maximum building heights, the mission considered that the new scheme would still have a significant adverse impact on the visual integrity of the Citadel and its setting. The mission considered that, at this stage, the only possible action was to introduce further modifications to the project in order to reduce the most serious threats to the visual integrity of the Citadel and the urban landscape.

Hence, the mission recommended that the following measures should be taken into consideration, as they constitute the minimum requirements in order to not jeopardize the values of the Citadel:

- c) The height of the complex should be further reduced and shaped to allow the building to rise progressively from the level of the Salah Salem highway to approximately 31, metres in the eastern part of the site (at a distance of 500 metres from the Citadel wall). This would reduce the visual impact of the new buildings on the Citadel;
- d) The volume of the complex, now appearing as a huge mass of high rise buildings, should be broken up into several parts which would better balance the urban form and volumes of the Citadel;
- e) The building elevations, now projected as continuous homogeneous horizontal glass strips, should be revised in order to harmonise with the surroundings and minimise visual disturbance.

On 24 April 2008; the World Heritage Centre received a letter from the Supreme Council of Antiquities informing that the ministers of Culture and of Construction had agreed to request definitive guidelines and decisions from UNESCO, that would be followed by the owner.

In addition, in response to the request expressed in the framework of the *Retrospective Inventory*, the State Party transmitted to the World Heritage Centre, a topographical map and a cadastral map representing the five components of the property. It is to be highlighted that the State Party has carried out considerable cartographic work in order to respond to the requirements of the Retrospective Inventory for all its World Heritage properties.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.58**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,

2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.56**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes the State Party's commitment in revising the Cairo Financial Centre project so as to mitigate its impact on the urban landscape of the Citadel and requests that an alternative design be adopted and submitted, as soon as possible, to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for review ;
4. Urges the State Party to implement the main recommendations of the 2002 Symposium report, subsequently endorsed by the World Heritage Committee, in particular to prepare a comprehensive Urban Plan for the Conservation and Development of the Old City, whereby the conservation of historic buildings would be accompanied by appropriate development regulations ;
5. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

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

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

**60. Tyr (Lebanon) (C 299)**

Year of inscription on the List of World Heritage

1984

Criteria

(i) (iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7B.102; 30 COM 7B.52; 31 COM 7B.62**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20,000 for Technical Assistance in 2001

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 19,173 from 1997 to 2001 for the International Safeguarding Campaign

### Previous monitoring missions

2004: Evaluation mission by the UNESCO Beirut Office; September 2006: UNESCO mission following the 2006 summer conflict

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Major, and often illegal, urban development;
- b) Public works, tourism development;
- c) No management and conservation plan;
- d) Insufficient maintenance.

### Current conservation problems

At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee examined the state of conservation report on the property by the State Party that provided information on the fact that many of the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee at its 30th session had not been implemented, notably due to the 2006 conflict in the country.

On 5 November 2007, the International Association for the Safeguarding of Tyre convened an international seminar in Paris, under the auspices of UNESCO and of the Permanent Delegation of Lebanon to UNESCO. Several experts attended the seminar which presented an update of the scientific research and of projects.

At the time of preparing this document, the report requested of the State Party by the World Heritage Committee had not been received. In addition, the reactive monitoring mission foreseen in Decision **31 COM 7B.62** could not take place due to the UN restrictions on missions to Lebanon. Therefore, no recent information on the state of conservation of the property is available.

### **Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.60**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7B.52**, and **31 COM 7B.62** adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Regrets that the State Party has not submitted the report requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), without which it is not possible to assess the progress of activities at the property;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to evaluate the progress and the impact of the projects in progress and envisaged ;*
5. *Requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop, prior to the arrival of the mission, a project of Statement of outstanding universal value, including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009 ;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to provide a detailed topographical map with geographic coordinates indicating the boundaries of the property, and if possible those of its buffer*



zone by **1 December 2008**, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009 ;

7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a progress report on the implementation of its recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

## **61. Medina of Essaouira (Ancient Mogador) (Morocco) (C 753 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

**28 COM 15B.45; 29 COM 7B.47; 30 COM 7B.47**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 52,500

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

September 2003 : reactive monitoring mission; February, 2005 : Rabat Office mission; April 2006 : joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Progressive deterioration of the built area ;
- b) Lack of a rehabilitation policy for the Mellah Quarter (deposit of untreated refuse, overflow of sewers along the outside walls of the houses, continuous collapse of buildings);
- c) Major deterioration of the maritime part of the fortifications of the Medina ;
- d) Construction of two commercial centres in the buffer zone.

### Current conservation issues

In accordance with the World Heritage Committee's request at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006), the State Party submitted on 29 January 2008 a report providing information on the conservation and management of the property. A notable improvement was indicated in the state of conservation of the Mellah Quarter. The report made mention of « *clean-up operations and the demolition of buildings threatening collapse.* » The inhabitants were

relocated. The streets and alleys of the quarter were paved as well as a five-metre strip along the intramuros ramparts.

The Essaouira Urban Agency was recently created. Together with other ministerial institutions and services, it should facilitate the coordination of efforts and follow the progress and implementation of construction projects already in progress or foreseen. The elaboration of a management plan is underway.

A recent study was undertaken by the Ministry of Housing and Urbanism, entitled: « *Study and identification of the type of intervention for the rehabilitation of the Medina of Essaouira using houses threatening collapse and re-use of dilapidated sites.* » The study was submitted to the different services concerned for suggestions and approval. The main comments are listed below :

- a) Safeguarding the security of citizens : consolidation of the wall, intervention regarding the buildings threatening collapse;
- b) Improvement of the living conditions of the inhabitants: dedensification (operation underway), opening up of the closed passages (between Koweit Street and Quaraouiyne Street), opening of a passage at the end of the Kaouss cul-de-sac (between Mellah Street and Zerkouni Avenue) and opening of the access to the Artists' Square and the ocean;
- c) Improvement of facilities and infrastructures, improvement of visitor centres : paving, lighting, clean-up operations, etc.;
- d) Enhancement of the heritage and rehabilitation of places of memory : such as the restoration of the Haïm Pinto Synagogue, and the restoration of the Menzah Pavillion that is part of the Dar el Makhzen complex (Royal Palace).

The cleaning up operation and consolidation was carried out during 2007. It concentrated on the areas immediately surrounding the Mellah quarter, especially the ramparts on the Atlantic side.

In the framework of the improvement of the visitor centre and enhancement of the ramparts, the shops that were located along the ramparts (buffer zone, at the level of Bab Doukkala) were relocated. This operation has permitted access to the beach and reconciled the traditional urban tissue with the maritime seascape.

The Borj de Bab Marrakech is undergoing restoration. A cultural polyfunctional area for artists is intended to be located here.

The Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah Museum, situated in the Kasbah quarter was rehabilitated and equipped.

According to the report of the State Party, the state of conservation of the property has much improved thanks to the joint efforts of private individuals (houses restored), services concerned with the conservation and the enhancement of the Medina and local authorities (repair of the waste water system).

However, the report indicates the construction of a café-restaurant in the north-west part of the Place Moulay Hassan. This project had obtained the necessary authorizations when it was implemented a decade ago. At present there is a legal dispute opposing the owner with the local authorities. The administrative tribunal ruled in favour of the contractor. The location of the building opposite the sea risks changing the maritime seascape.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to recall that any demolition and any intervention on the property must be preceded by an overall rehabilitation plan as well as an impact and value study. They also recall that the securing of a building does not necessarily indicate its demolition.

**Draft Decision : 32 COM 7B.61**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.47**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),
3. Takes note of the encouraging measures taken by the State Party and requests that the actions undertaken be continued with a view to cleaning, securing and restoring the Mellah quarter, and restoring the wall that faces the Atlantic ;
4. Invites the State Party to remain vigilant and carry out continued monitoring of the property, especially the control of demolitions and new constructions to preserve its outstanding universal value ;
5. Also requests the State Party to complete a management plan adopting an integrated approach and to submit it in three printed and electronic copies to the World Heritage Centre before its implementation, for examination by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

**62. Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

Criteria

(iv)

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

1988-2004

Previous Committee Decisions:

**29 COM 7B.46; 30 COM 7B.56; 31 COM 7B.67**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 66,772 for technical co-operation.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 25,000 (private funding).

Previous monitoring missions

2001, 2002 and 2003: World Heritage Centre expert missions

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Deterioration of the earthen structures of the Fort;
- b) Lack of appropriate conservation techniques;

- c) Urban pressure due to the project for a new market near the Fort and proposals for the urban development of the area;
- d) Lack of a management plan and appropriate legislation.

#### Current conservation issues

At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee reviewed the status of rehabilitation works at the property, and reminded the State Party that the ongoing restoration works should respect international standards for conservation, notably for the rehabilitation of the ancient souk.

With regard to management, a draft management plan was prepared in 2003 and was resubmitted in 2005, but without taking into account the comments of the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre. The World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to finalize and adopt a management plan taking into account these comments and to establish the necessary legal and administrative frameworks for the protection of the property.

At the time of the drafting of this document, the report of the State Party requested by the World Heritage Committee had not been received; and no additional information is available.

#### **Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.62**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7B.56** and **31 COM 7B.67** adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006), and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Regrets that the State Party has not submitted the report requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), and notes that assessing progress of activities at the property is not possible without such report;*
5. *Strongly urges the State Party, if it has not already done so, to finalise and adopt the management plan taking into account the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, and to establish the necessary legal and administrative framework for its implementation;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2009**, the adopted management plan in three printed and electronic copies and a detailed progress report on its implementation, the legal framework and administrative structure, as well as the souk project, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

#### **63. Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## ASIA-PACIFIC

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

#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

#### Criteria

(i) (ii) (vi)

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

N/A

#### Previous Committee Decisions

**28 COM 15B.53; 29 COM 7B.48; 31 COM 7B.76**

#### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 200,000

#### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 390,000 from UNDP, UNESCO, Japan Funds-in-Trust and NORAD

#### Previous monitoring missions

October 2002 and February 2003: UNESCO missions

#### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of an effective management system;
- b) Lack of adequate human and financial resources;
- c) Property and buffer zone boundaries not clearly defined;
- d) Drainage and internal moisture contents problem.

#### Current conservation issues

The State Party's report, received on 6 March 2008, provides information on the implementation of the decisions by the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007) as follows:

3. The project to define the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, which was planned as part of the long term programme, has not been carried out by the Department of Archaeology because of the lack of human resources and skills required for the mapping. The State Party underlines that it would require International Assistance to be able to undertake this activity;
4. The heritage management plan as well as the study of the drainage problems are in progress and will be implemented as soon as the final report of international experts on drainage problems has been received;

5. On the basis of recommendations made following meetings between the Department of Archaeology and international experts, the removal of earth from the temple area as well as excavations to open the staircase of the temple on its northern side are being carried out. In addition, maintenance repairs to address the drainage problems as well as the preservation of some of the temple walls are also being implemented.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge that there is a long history of study and interventions on the drainage issue but reasonable solutions to control the damage caused by water and humidity are still to be elaborated. In this context, the World Heritage Committee approved a sum of USD 45,000 in 2005 for a study of remedial actions for the drainage problems, and for the monitoring of the internal moisture conditions. It is understood that this project has started and that a seminar on the study is scheduled for May 2008. Some of the recommendations from the expert missions are being implemented by the Department of Archaeology.

The lack of a Statement of outstanding universal value and proper boundaries are issues that have been raised by the World Heritage Committee since 2005 but no progress appears to have been made so far.

On 22 April 2008, the UNESCO Office in Dhaka provided updated information concerning the study of the drainage problems. The considerable delay in its implementation, which has only started, is apparently caused by insufficient staffing in the Department of Archaeology, whose capacity would need to be strengthened if the above-mentioned activity is to be carried out successfully. Based on this assessment, it would seem unlikely that this activity can be completed within the given timeframe. For this reason, an additional one year extension of the deadline is proposed.

In view of the fact that this project was launched in 2005 and the deadline for its completion already extended, and taking into account the above-mentioned weakness of the Department of Archaeology, the World Heritage Centre considers that no further prolongations of this project should be made under the current circumstances. Should the activity not be carried out by the end of 2008, as currently foreseen, the World Heritage Centre recommends that the project be terminated and the overall situation reassessed in close consultation with the State Party and the UNESCO Office in Dhaka.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.64**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.76**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the lack of progress in the implementation of the activity concerning the drainage problems and the development of a management plan;*
4. *Urges the State Party to strengthen the capacity of the Department of Archaeology by providing it with adequate human and financial resources;*
5. *Requests the State Party to continue its efforts towards the definition of the boundaries, the solution of the drainage problems and the overall strengthening of the management system at the property;*

6. *Further requests the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, and to submit it to the World Heritage Centre for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*
7. ***Requests moreover** the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, the proposed delimitation of the property and its buffer zone, as well as the management plan for the property in three copies for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
8. ***Also requests** the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009** a progress report on the above issues, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

## **65. Angkor (Cambodia) (C 668)**

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1992

### Criteria

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

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

1992–2004

### Previous Committee Decisions

**27 COM 7A.22; 28 COM 15A.23; 30 COM 7B.61**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD142,193, up to 2007.

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: Approximately USD 52 million, up to 2006.

### Previous monitoring missions

September 2005: technical advisory mission concerning the protection of Zones 1 and 2 of Angkor; In addition, the *ad hoc* experts of the International Coordinating Committee (ICC) carry out monitoring of the property and of ongoing projects in the complex of Angkor, twice per year, on the occasion of the ICC technical and plenary sessions.

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Uncontrolled urban expansion;
- b) Lack of an appropriate management system.

### Current conservation issues

On 28 January 2008, the State Party submitted an extensive report on the World Heritage property of Angkor, describing the set of actions carried out at Angkor since the early 1990s and containing copies of all the presentations delivered at the December 2006 and July 2007 ICC sessions. The report includes as well two documents concerning ongoing and planned initiatives funded by the New Zealand and Australian Agencies for International Development.

With regard to the issue of land management and governance within zones 1 and 2 of the property, a study conducted in 2006, in the context of a project funded by the New Zealand Agency for International Development, has confirmed the worrying conclusions of the 2005 mission. This project, called “Angkor management plan”, focuses mostly on “organisational development and appropriate resource allocation” within the Agency for the Protection and Safeguarding of Angkor (APSARA). In this sense, it has a broader, if somewhat different scope from the management plan for the property of Angkor that the World Heritage Committee had requested the State Party to develop and implement (see below).

According to this study prepared in close cooperation with APSARA, “*land use and occupation and development within the boundaries of the protected zones is not being administered according to the intention of the legislation*”, the most significant issue being “*the inability over the succeeding years to limit urban development to the outer boundary of zone 2 (buffer zone), north of Siem Reap*”, resulting from the extraordinary growth in tourism and population. The resulting maps show that a major and irreversible negative impact to the integrity of the property will take place unless the authorities are able to exert effective control on land management as a matter of urgency. Significant threats to the property appear to be associated to the excessive consumption of groundwater to cater for the tourism sector, which might destabilise the monuments of Angkor, as well as to the related waste and pollution management.

Noting that the same “*disorderly urban expansion*” affected the entire urban area of Siem Reap, a 2005 Study for an “Integrated Master Plan for the Sustainable Development of Siem Reap/Angkor Town”, funded by the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA), sets out a vision for an urban development approach and proposed provisions for coordinated planning. Although this Master Plan does not cover zones 1 and 2 of the property, its implementation would be beneficial for the safeguarding of Angkor, since it would reduce considerably the pressure on the protected areas. APSARA and the Siem Reap authorities have gradually started some concrete realisations, through infrastructural projects outside of zone 2.

With regard to these issues, it appears that a number of measures have been taken by APSARA. In 2006, the boundaries of zones 1 and 2 were finally demarcated on the ground. According to the Director of APSARA's Department of Monuments and Archaeology, new procedures were also established for obtaining building permits, while brochures were prepared and distributed on appropriate building standards based on traditional Khmer architecture. A new Department for Order and Cooperation has also been created to enforce the existing land use regulations within zones 1 and 2. To reduce pressure within the protected areas, moreover, APSARA has identified a 1000-hectare plot of land to the east of zone 2 where a new residential programme will be launched. APSARA believes that if this pilot initiative proves successful, it could be replicated elsewhere.

The New Zealand Aid funded study, however, considers that in order to ensure the safeguarding of Angkor it would still be necessary for the Cambodian authorities to pass urgent legislation to bring certainty to the rights of community members living in the Park area, further clarify the planning provisions within the protected zones and allocate the necessary resources to strengthen the institutional capacity of APSARA. These recommendations are very similar to those made by the 2005 mission, endorsed by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **30 COM 7B.61** in 2006.



With respect to the requested management plan focused on the conservation of the outstanding universal value of the property, a proposal for its development has been put together by the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Office in Phnom Penh, in consultation with APSARA, and has been submitted to the Australian Government for its consideration. This project is meant to complement and integrate the above-mentioned “Angkor management plan” programme funded by New Zealand. To avoid any possible ambiguity, the project submitted to Australia for funding has been entitled “Heritage Management Framework: World Heritage Site of Angkor”.

If funded and implemented, this three-year initiative would finally provide Angkor with the comprehensive management framework that the World Heritage Committee recommended on various occasions. It is important to note that the scope of this initiative is larger than the actual area inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Greater Angkor Project, undertaken by the University of Sydney, in conjunction with the École Française d'Extrême-Orient and APSARA, has indeed identified the extent of Angkor as a medieval urban complex, covering about 1000 sq km. An important implication of this new research might be the need to reconsider appropriate boundaries for the property and related management zones, in due time.

Finally, as concerns the establishment of an *ad hoc* group of experts on sustainable development, three experts, designated in 2007, have already attended, and contributed to, the last technical session of the ICC Angkor in July 2007.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.65**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.61**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction that a new *ad hoc* group of experts for sustainable development has been established and has become operational during 2007;*
4. *Welcomes the progress achieved through the project entitled “Angkor management plan”, in clarifying the challenges facing APSARA for the management and conservation of the property, as well as in defining the actions required to address them satisfactorily;*
5. *Also welcomes the proposal for the development of a “Heritage Management Framework”, which would complement the “Angkor management plan” project by focussing specifically on the conservation of the heritage values of the property, and strongly encourages the State Party to take this project forward as soon as possible;*
6. *Reiterates its serious concern for the continuing and increasing threats posed to the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property by the ongoing uncontrolled urban expansion in its core and buffer zones, despite the efforts made by the Cambodian authorities;*
7. *Requests the State Party to address these threats by ensuring swift and full implementation of the recommendations of the 2005 mission, and in particular to:*
  - a) *Clarify, including by passing new legislation if necessary, the rules regarding property rights, ownership and building codes applicable to zones 1 and 2;*

- b) *Enforce existing laws regarding illegal occupation, unauthorised construction and development and park-land appropriation/alienation;*
  - c) *Strengthen the capacities of APSARA to enable effective land use planning and management, including by providing it with the necessary resources;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2009, a report on the progress made on the issues mentioned above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

## **66. Classical Gardens of Suzhou (China) (C 813 bis)**

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997; 2000

### Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**28 COM 15B.56 ; 30 COM 7B.62**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

3-6 June 2004: ICOMOS monitoring mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressures;
- b) Lack of an adequate management framework set out in a plan to address the development pressures.

### Current conservation issues

The State Party provided to the World Heritage Centre, on 28 January 2008, a report on the developments of the *Planning for the Integrated Management of the World Heritage property in Suzhou*. The State Party report provides information on the updating and revision of the Master Plan for the City of Suzhou (2007–2020) and the Plan for the Protection of the Historic and Cultural City (Site management plan). Furthermore, a Special Plan for the Protection of the Classical Gardens and Cultural Heritage Properties under National Protection has been formulated.

The revised Master Plan for the City of Suzhou reiterates “the protection of the rich natural and cultural landscape of Suzhou, the tangible and intangible heritage as well as traditional landscapes of the historic and cultural city, towns and villages, and the revival and development of local culture”. It was elaborated around conservation principles and guidelines applied to the particular specificity of World Heritage status of Suzhou. The revised Master Plan is now being processed for legal review and approval by the State Council of China. According to the State Party report, the Site management plan, which embodies the basic principles of protection, will provide guidance for the protection of historic neighborhood and areas of traditional landscapes designated in the revised Master Plan.

The State Party report sets out that, according to the revised Master Plan, protection has been extended to the entire area of the ancient City of Suzhou, seven other ancient towns (four protected at national level and three at regional level), twelve ancient villages, five traditional neighborhoods, 38 historic sites, three areas of cultural landscape, and a number of cultural heritage sites. In the future, detailed plans for the protection of historic neighborhood of Pingjiang and the Humble Administrator’s Garden (Zhuzheng) will be formulated.

However, the report does not describe the contents or provide a summary of the said revised Master Plan, nor does it link to the development of a comprehensive and integrated management plan for the World Heritage property which would ensure a harmonized approach to new development and renovation, fully integrating the application of all existing heritage laws and regulatory measures, and ensure that the historic villages maintain their living character as per the request by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **30 COM 7B.62**.

Regarding the possible extension of the World Heritage property to include the entire historic town of Suzhou, and other historical canal towns within the same geo-cultural area in China, the work is in progress and a revised national Tentative List, including the extension of the Classical Gardens of Suzhou, has been submitted to the World Heritage Centre in March 2008.

The State Party report also provides information on the use of an early warning system to monitor the state of conservation of four Classical Gardens in Suzhou. This system will be introduced in 2008 to all nine gardens designated as World Heritage. Meanwhile, an information management system collecting scientific data of the four heritage gardens has been established.

**Draft Decision:        32 COM 7B.66**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.62**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),*
3. *Welcomes the progress made in the development of an updated Plan for the Protection of the Historic and Cultural City (site management plan), as requested at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006);*

4. *Takes note of the State Party's intention to prepare a proposal for extension of the existing World Heritage property to include the entire historic town of Suzhou, and other historical canal towns within the same geo-cultural area in China;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2009, the approved revised Master Plan for the City of Suzhou (2007–2020) and the Site management plan, as well as an English summary of their contents, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.*

## **67. Old Town of Lijiang (China) (C 811)**

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

### Criteria

(ii) (iv) (v)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 7B.69**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20.000 Conservation and Management assistance

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions:

11-18 January 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Inappropriate tourism and other development projects;
- b) No clearly defined boundary;
- c) Lack of a comprehensive Conservation Master Plan for the property and its surroundings

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 30 January 2008, providing information on the actions taken to address the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **31 COM 7B.69**, as well as "preliminary responses" to some of the recommendations of the January 2008 mission.

The State Party report notes that the Shanghai Tongji Urban Planning and Design Institute and its National Research Centre of Historic Cities are preparing a draft Conservation Master Plan for the property, and an updated management plan for the Old Town of Lijiang, and that these will soon be entering legal review and approval processes.

Concerning the provision of support to *“local homeowners in their efforts to maintain their houses in accordance with traditional building practices”*, the State Party notes the publication in 2002 of a Manual on Conservation and Maintenance of Local-style Dwelling Houses of the Old Town of Lijiang which provides guidelines for *“maintenance, repair, renovation and re-building”* of traditional houses, and as may be required, their adaptive re-use. Since 2003, the Global Heritage Fund, in agreement with the Administration of Conservation of the Old Town of Lijiang, has funded work on 299 traditional dwelling houses and 236 courtyards, in accordance with the above mentioned manual. The excellence of this project has been recognized by the UNESCO Bangkok Office Asia-Pacific Cultural Heritage Conservation awards programme of August 2007.

The report also documents a series of current major planning and infrastructure projects in the buffer zone and surrounding areas, focussed on *“environmental improvement, scientific research and tourism”*.

Finally, the State Party report comments on measures undertaken to address the stresses coming with a three fold increase in tourism since inscription in 1997. These measures have included accurate monitoring of tourism characteristics, behaviour and numbers, efforts through an *“assessment system for business operations”* to limit and control numbers, types and image of commercial outlets in the Old Town of Lijiang. In the context of a scientific research initiative, a *“Special Plan on the Management of Traditional Business Culture Conservation in the Old Town of Lijiang”* has been prepared which focuses on the location and presentation of Old Town businesses and formulates standards for their operations.

However the State Party report does not make clear the links between these planning efforts and the overall *conservation master plan and management plan* mentioned above.

The January 2008 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission focused particular attention on the impact of tourism-related activities and other proposed development projects on the authenticity and integrity of both tangible and intangible heritage attributes of the site, and assessed the adequacy of current management mechanisms to protect the outstanding universal value of the property.

The mission report while noting the *“great efforts and commitment”* of concerned stakeholders and authorities at local and national levels and the significant improvements made, also suggested that *“the scale of the threats to the townscape of Lijiang and its surrounding landscape from conservation/new development projects, other new buildings and services requires urgent action for the development of a Site management plan for Lijiang to be integrated into the Comprehensive Conservation Master Plan for the property”*, and that these *“need to address tourism services, infrastructural development, housing etc. in a holistic way and respect the authenticity and integrity of all three components of the World Heritage site”*.

The mission’s recommendations were based on the recognition of *“the persisting lack of institutional coordination, accompanied by clear conservation policies/strategies and procedures guided by a single agreed vision for the property.”*

The mission’s recommendations focus on the following points:

- Need to re-define the statement of outstanding universal value of the Old Town of Lijiang, including the *“relationship and social significance between the tangible heritage and intangible heritage values”*;

- Need to complete the Comprehensive Conservation Master Plan in conjunction with the local regional development plan of Lijiang, providing overarching principles for regional development and tourism control as well as conservation guidelines;
- Need to elaborate the Site management plan on the basis of careful monitoring of tourist activities, and in close coordination with local communities;
- Need to consider the extension of the buffer zones of Baisha and Shuhe in order to safeguard the integrity of the entire area;
- Need to clearly demarcate the boundaries of both core and buffer zones of the three areas.

The joint mission also draws attention to the Hoi An Protocols for Best Conservation Practice in Asia, which note that *“unlike historical monuments or archaeological sites, living urban settlements often have no institutional custodian. It is therefore important that an administrative and decision-making body be formed which combines local government, business and community representation with professional conservation and planning expertise. The function of this body is to plan long-term integrated conservation and urban improvement”*.

The mission report also notes that, in line with the above, the World Cultural Heritage Lijiang Old Town Protection and Management Bureau, established in October 2005, is *“responsible for the implementation of the rules and regulations as well as the development and implementation of conservation master plan and Site management plan”*. The mission report further notes that while the Bureau *“has been doing a very good job “*, its *“responsibility remains physical restoration and improvements work and the coordination with the tourism and city planning departments seems not to be sufficient”*.

With regard to the last recommendation, the State Party has submitted proposals for the boundaries of core and buffer zones, which will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document *WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add*).

While commending the State Party for its efforts, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that it is essential to strengthen conservation and tourism planning for the Old Town of Lijiang, to co-ordinate the various initiatives under way and to ensure that the planning mechanisms in place give highest priority to preserving the property’s outstanding universal value.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS further consider that the State Party should ensure that the World Heritage Management Bureau is provided with the authority to carry out its responsibilities and to provide the needed co-ordination to protect the property.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.67**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.69**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the continued efforts made by the State Party to improve management of the property, and its full response to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007);*
4. *Reiterates its requests to the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of outstanding universal*

value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, as well as linkages between tangible and intangible heritage aspects, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;

5. Requests the State Party to implement all the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission of January 2008; and especially to:
  - a) Complete the Comprehensive Conservation Master Plan, which should provide overarching principles for regional development and tourism control as well as conservation guidelines, together with the Site management plan;
  - b) Strengthen the capacity of the World Cultural Heritage Management Bureau to implement and coordinate more effectively these planning initiatives;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including information on the progress made in implementing the actions mentioned above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

#### **68. Historic Centre of Macao (China) (C 1110)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

Criteria

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 8B.28**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

### Current conservation issues

On 26 August 2007, the World Heritage Centre was informed through various sources, including a group of citizens who are living in Macao Special Administrative Region (Macao SAR), China, that some on-going development projects in the Historic Centre of Macao, involving high-rise buildings, were affecting the visual integrity of the property, notably the setting of the Guia Lighthouse, which has been serving Macao since 1865 sitting on top of the Guia Hill, at some 90 meters above the sea level. A detailed report about these developments, prepared by a group of professionals from Macao, was also received by the World Heritage Centre and transmitted to ICOMOS for its review and comments. According to this report, the new constructions (allegedly reaching a height of 135 meters) would be obscuring the view of the Lighthouse from the sea, thus undermining its very function and character as a landmark of the City.

In view of the above, the Director of the World Heritage Centre, by letter dated 19 September 2007, requested the State Party to “*consider this expression of concern and take urgent measures to examine the pressing issue so as to protect and if necessary halt any irreversible damage which may be experienced by the property*”. The World Heritage Centre further requested the State Party to submit any relevant information on the state of conservation and development pressures facing this property.

On 11 March 2008, the World Heritage Centre received a letter from the Deputy Secretary-General of the Chinese National Commission for UNESCO, enclosing a report prepared by the Director of Cultural Affairs Bureau of Macao SAR Government.

The report reiterated the Macao SAR Government’s determination to protect the values of the property and adhere to its obligations under the *World Heritage Convention*. It confirmed that the development projects, which are subject of the enquiry, are situated in two specific areas outside the buffer zone and comply with the legislation existing at the time of inscription of the property.

However, considering the concerns expressed by members of its community as well as UNESCO, the State Party had decided to review the existing building regulations in the areas surrounding the property with an aim to mitigate potential negative impacts of development projects. These new regulations concerned in particular the areas outside buffer zone 2 surrounding the Guia Lighthouse and Monte Fortress, another site which lies in buffer zone 1, where lower building height limits were established. Accordingly, the high-rise constructions that had raised concern in the vicinity of the Guia Lighthouse would be reduced. A map was enclosed with the State Party’s report identifying the newly proposed land-use regulations.

The State Party also pointed out that these additional limitations, and the reduction in the scope of the ongoing construction projects, constituted an “*utmost effort*” towards conservation in the socio-economic context of the territory of Macao which covers only 8.7 square kilometers with a population exceeding half a million and record development rates.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS welcome the rapid response of the Macao SAR Government to the concerns expressed by the community as well as the measures it has taken to mitigate possible negative impacts of development projects on the visual integrity of the World Heritage property. At the same time, considering also the complex topography of the site, they consider that a reactive monitoring mission to the property is necessary to determine the appropriateness of these new regulations with respect to future possible development proposals.



**Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.68**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Noting with concern that development projects are being implemented or proposed in areas surrounding the buffer zones of the property, which might have a negative impact on its visual integrity,
3. Welcomes the measures taken by the State Party of China to mitigate possible negative impacts of development projects on the visual integrity of the World Heritage property by reducing height limits for constructions in sensitive areas surrounding the Guia Hill and the Monte Fortress ;
4. Requests however the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to determine whether the above mentioned measures are adequate to ensure the long term protection of the outstanding universal value of the property, and to provide advice on defining the setting of the property and any possible revision of the boundary of the buffer zone which might be required;
5. Also requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, to develop, prior to the arrival of the mission, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
6. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, an updated report on the progress made in implementing the measures mentioned above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

**69. Red Fort Complex (India) (C 231 rev)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2007

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 8B.32**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Current conservation issues

Upon inscribing the property on the World Heritage List at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to submit the completed and agreed comprehensive conservation management plan for approval at its 32nd session in 2008.

A progress report together with a revised draft comprehensive conservation management plan were received by the World Heritage Centre on 31 January 2008. This Plan is currently being re-examined prior to its finalization, approval and implementation. No timeframe has been provided yet.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS have been informed through numerous articles in Indian newspapers of proposed infrastructure projects close to the property, in particular, a proposal for the construction of a monorail in front of the Red Fort, which would separate it from the Jama Masjid and Old Delhi.

To ensure the integrity of the property while allowing for development, the State Party may wish to include heritage conservation concerns in the revision of the Delhi Master Plan and Regional Plan of the greater metropolitan area, to guide all future infrastructures, housing and commercial development in the vicinity of the heritage areas of Delhi, including the Red Fort Complex.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.69**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 8B.32**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Expresses its concern with the potential impact of the monorail project on the outstanding universal value of the property and requests the State Party, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to provide as soon as possible, and before any irreversible decision is made, detailed information on this project;*
4. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, three printed and electronic copies of the revised comprehensive conservation management plan, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.*

## 70. Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986

### Criteria

(i) (iii) (iv)

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

1999-2006

### Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7A.22; 30 COM 7A.24; 31 COM 7B.81**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 92,370 for technical co-operation (up to 2005).

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: Funding under the France-UNESCO Convention for expert missions (2003, 2005 and 2006) for an amount of 14,000 Euros.

### Previous monitoring missions

2000: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; 2001: expert technical assessment mission; 2003 and 2004: World Heritage Centre and experts advisory missions; August 2005: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission; January 2007: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission.

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Design and location of transport infrastructure near inscribed monuments;
- b) Lack of coordination and resource support for site management;
- c) Lack of building and land-use regulations;
- d) Tourism development pressures;
- e) Lack of traffic regulations limiting heavy duty vehicular traffic;
- f) Pressure from illegal constructions.

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report to the World Heritage Centre on 1 February 2008, which provides the following information:

- a) The integrated management plan (IMP) has not yet been approved;
- b) Progress has been made on staffing; however, additional staffing is still needed to fully implement the IMP. A request has been submitted to the relevant authority, but has not yet been approved;
- c) An alternative location for a new Interpretation Centre at Kamalapuram has been chosen, and the process of selecting an architect has begun. The existing site is proposed as a temporary parking lot until a transportation study is completed;

- d) The Master Plan developed by the Hampi World Heritage Area Management Authority (HWHAMA) was finalized in November 2007 and was sent in January 2008 to the Government of Karnataka for final adoption;
- e) A task force has been constituted by the HWHAMA to monitor unauthorized and illegal construction activities. Partial demolition of “*illegal commercial establishments in Hampi*” has been undertaken, and a comprehensive security plan has been finalized;
- f) The Government of Karnataka prepared traffic regulations for banning of heavy goods vehicles and heavy passenger motor vehicles near Hampi World Heritage Area at the roads connecting Hampi to Anegundi and these were published in March 2007. These have not been submitted to the World Heritage Centre;
- g) The Public Works Department, Government of Karnataka, has been given guidelines by the HWHAMA to reduce the width of the bridge, to ensure the bridge finishes are compatible with their surroundings, and for the installation of traffic barriers;
- h) The process of developing a Statement of Significance to be appended to the IMP is on-going. A Statement of outstanding universal value will be developed in due course;
- i) Information was provided on the boundaries of the property and its buffer zones, which do not correspond to the information already held by the World Heritage Centre.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the current responses to the long term management questions raised at the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee (Vilnius, 2006) do not fully address all of the concerns, in particular:

- a) modifying the design and dimensions of the Anegundi Bridge and putting in place traffic regulations for heavy vehicles;
- b) approval and implementation of the IMP based on a revised Statement of outstanding universal value;
- c) clarification of the boundaries of the property and its buffer zones;
- d) limited human and financial resources to allow the implementation of the IMP.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also consider it important to ensure that the implementation of the IMP by the HWHAMA is fully integrated into the State and National Planning framework, particularly for tourism and urban development.

**Draft Decision:        32 COM 7B.70**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.81**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes the continuing efforts made by the Hampi World Heritage Area Management Authority (HWHAMA) to improve the management of the property;
4. Notes with concern that the requests by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) to implement the recommendations of the January 2007 mission have not yet been fully addressed;
5. Urges the State Party to:

- a) *Modify the design and dimensions of the Anegundi Bridge and put in place traffic regulations for heavy vehicles;*
  - b) *Approve and implement the integrated management plan (IMP) based on a revised Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity;*
  - c) *Clarify the boundaries of the property and its buffer zones;*
  - d) *Ensure adequate human and financial resources to allow the implementation of the IMP;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, as soon as possible, the modified design of the bridge; the new traffic regulations for heavy vehicles; the final approved version of the IMP in three copies; the location of the interpretation centre; clarifications on the boundaries and buffer zones and the draft Statement of outstanding universal value, including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
7. *Also urges the State Party to ensure that the implementation of the IMP by the HWHAMA is fully integrated into the State and National Planning framework, particularly for tourism and urban development;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2010** a progress report on the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

## **71. Sangiran Early Man Site (Indonesia) (C 593)**

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

### Criteria

(iii) (vi)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**26COM 21B.52; 31 COM 7B.70**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 40,000

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

September 2006: UNESCO expert mission; 28 January to 3 February 2008: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of an effective site-management authority;
- b) Absence of appropriate land-use regulations in the face of development pressure;
- c) Need for a buffer zone;
- d) Poor site interpretation and Museum display

### Current conservation issues

The report on the state of conservation of the property, prepared by the Directorate General of History and Archaeology, Department of Culture and Tourism, Government of Indonesia, was received by the World Heritage Centre in January 2008. This document covers most of the points raised by the World Heritage Committee in 2002 and 2007:

- a) The Coordinating Board has been reactivated, working through a Conservation Office of Sangiran Early Man Site, recently established by the Minister of Culture and Tourism (February 2007). This Office has the duty of carrying out security, recovery, order, maintenance, preservation, regulation of land, survey, excavation, analysis, presentation, guidance, education, collaboration, community empowerment, documentation, publication, and administration;
- b) No regulations currently exist to control building activities and land-use within the World Heritage property;
- c) Work is nearing completion for revising the boundaries of the core zone;
- d) There has been a considerable expansion and reordering of the museum.

The report by the State Party points as well to other issues of concern, including the lack of awareness among the local community of the importance of conserving the heritage of Sangiran, resulting in trafficking of fossils and inappropriate developments; and heavy rainfall, causing slides that leave precious fossils exposed (and therefore easily stolen).

The State Party report also indicates that all the above issues should be addressed in the framework of a 'Master Plan', consisting of eight sections. The report does not clarify whether this Master Plan is the existing document prepared in 2004 or a revised version, and does not provide indications as to the timeframe for its implementation.

At its 31st session, the World Heritage Committee recommended that the State Party should invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess its state of conservation and assist in addressing the issues raised above. The mission, which visited the property from 28 January to 3 February 2008, noted the significant advances made by the State Party, in particular by establishing a Conservation Office at the site and by making progress in the development of the Master Plan. Some problems persist in ensuring the necessary authority and financial resources for the proper functioning of the Conservation Office. As for the Master Plan, this provides a good basis for the management of the property, but lacks detailed operational policies and procedures, especially with regard to conservation aspects. In its report, the mission made 13 detailed recommendations, summarised here below:

- e) Effective operational planning for the next stage of the Master Plan should be completed as a matter of urgency;

- f) In this context, priority must be given to the development of detailed strategies and actions for conservation, community involvement, land use regulations, interpretation and visitor management;
- g) As regards conservation, work should begin immediately on the preparation of a plan defining long, medium, and short term objectives and establishing technical parameters (materials, surfaces, types of impact and monitoring techniques);
- h) Research activities at the site should be coordinated within the framework of the Master Plan and under the authority of the Conservation Office, with priority given to areas affected by soil erosion;
- i) The authority of the site manager to control development within the World Heritage area must be officially defined and enforced in practice;
- j) Priority should be given to securing funding to enable the Director of the Office to devote his full time to this post, which should be upgraded, the Office being redesignated as a Centre, as proposed in the Master Plan;
- k) It is very important that there is ongoing involvement of the residents as key stakeholders of the property. The Coordinating Board and the Office should consider ways of doing this on a permanent basis;
- l) As part of the Master Plan framework, environmental, archaeological and socio-cultural impact procedures should be mandatory for any significant development proposals within the World Heritage area;
- m) The value statement in the Master Plan should be augmented by the recognition of cultural heritage value of the traditional wood and bamboo architecture, lifestyle, and folk arts and practices of the local community and specific strategies developed to conserve and enhance these aspects of the site's significance;
- n) The policy for interpretation on the property should be minimal physical intervention. The use of vernacular architecture and the involvement of locals as guides and service providers would have the added advantage of involving the local community, providing maximum protection for the property and its contents, and have the long-term benefit of the need for fewer infrastructures.
- o) The mission team commends the staff of the Office and supports the proposal by the Department and the Regencies, to carry out social research concerning the local population with the objective of improving living standards and community involvement in the property. This urgent work should be developed in tandem with research in conservation and interpretation by engaging a wider range of international expertise in its facilitation.
- p) The villagers in the core area resent World Heritage inscription of the property, which has limited their ability to increase their standard of living. It is urgent to offer compensation and a proposal for an alternative livelihood project to ensure the effective implementation of the Master Plan and the successful implementation of the necessary regulations and limitations related to land use.
- q) The property is at a critical stage in terms of ensuring sensitive and appropriate tourism ventures, which benefit locals. Local industries must be encouraged and safeguarded against a situation in which the profits go to outsiders. A strategy focused on these issues should be developed.

**Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.71**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.70**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Expresses its satisfaction regarding the progress made by the State Party in implementing its 2007 recommendations;
4. Urges the State Party to give full consideration to implementing the recommendations of the 2008 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission;
5. Reiterates its requests to the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
6. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a progress report on the above issues, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

**72. 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

**29 COM 7B. 54 ; 30 COM 7B.57 ; 31 COM 7B.71**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 2,752 (Training assistance)

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

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

Previous monitoring missions

1998: World Heritage Centre mission; 2001: France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement mission; 2002: World Heritage Centre mission; June 2004 and May 2005: UNESCO



missions; May 2006: World Heritage Centre mission ; June, December 2006 and April 2007: UNESCO missions

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Uncoordinated urban development - construction of a large scale commercial complex;
- b) Subway route through the historical axis of Esfahan.

Current conservation issues

The State Party report submitted on 30 January 2008 provides detailed information on the following:

- a) A consensus has been reached between the provincial and city authorities to modify the building as recommended by the World Heritage Committee. The lowering of the height of the tower by two stories was started in October 2005 and is continuing;
- b) A management plan for the Cultural and Historic Axis of Esfahan has been completed and forms the basis for the preparation of the possible extension of Meidan Emam as Isfahan's Historic Axis. It addresses issues such as sustainable development, enhancement of architectural, archaeological and natural assets and their urban and landscape settings;
- c) The subway route which was reported on in 2007 has been successfully diverted and efforts are now underway to find solutions for the subway stations located close to the historic centre of Isfahan to more adequately reflect the cultural specificities of the city.

The State Party report does however not provide any information as was requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) concerning the elaboration of mechanisms for undertaking systematic cultural, social and environmental impact assessments prior to designing large scale development projects, which might impact on the outstanding universal value of the property.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.72**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.71**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the efforts made by the State Party to address the overall preservation and conservation of the property;*
4. *Also notes the progress made in drafting the nomination dossier for the extension of the property to include the Cultural and Historic Axis of Esfahan;*
5. *Urges the State Party to complete the reduction of the height of the Jahan Nama Commercial Complex to ensure minimum negative impacts upon the visual integrity of the property;*
6. *Requests the State Party to establish mechanisms for undertaking systematic cultural, social and environmental impact assessments prior to designing large scale development projects, which might impact on the outstanding universal value of the property;*

7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the progress to complete the reduction of the height of the Jahan Nama Commercial Complex tower and in establishing assessment mechanisms for large scale projects, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

### **73. Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (C 870)**

#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1998

#### Criteria

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

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

N/A

#### Previous Committee Decisions

**28 COM 15B.64; 30 COM 7B.67; 31 COM 7B.72**

#### International Assistance

N/A

#### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

#### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

#### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Potential negative impact of an express highway on the property
- b) Potential negative impact of a large-scale event planned to take place on the property in 2010

#### Current conservation issues

On 29 January 2008, the World Heritage Centre received a report from the State Party, dated 22 January 2008, which included the final version of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the Yamato-Kita Road (almost 2000 pages in Japanese, with a summary in English) and a note on the "Basic Concept of the Revised Plan for the Commemorative Events of the 1300th Anniversary of Nara Heijo-kyo Capital". These documents were complemented by separate statements of the views of the Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan (Bunka-cho), the national governmental body responsible for World cultural Heritage properties, on the two issues.

#### *a) The Yamato-Kita Road*

In its report, the State Party informs that the Environmental Impact Assessment procedure for the Yamato-Kita Road is at its final, or “Step 3” stage, in which the Expert Study Committee for the EIA has made the changes required and produced its final version on 26 December 2007. This final version is due to be submitted to the Nara Prefecture Urban Planning Council and the Kyoto Prefecture Urban Planning Council respectively in February and March 2008, when a final decision on the Yamato-Kita Road would be made, if the members of the Councils reach an agreement.

The final EIA confirms the choice of the Saikujō-Saho route for the Yamato-Kita Road, which runs underground outside the core area of the property and, for a stretch of almost 1,5 Km, along the periphery of its buffer zone. With regard to the fluctuation of the water-table levels possibly caused by the infrastructure, which might have posed a threat to the archaeological remains, a study conducted by an independent Committee has determined that this will be minimal, and in any case lower than seasonal fluctuations. Notwithstanding this, the EIA indicates that extra measures will be taken to decrease any impact on the fluctuations in the groundwater level by employing the so-called Groundwater Flow Preservation Method during the construction. Moreover, a special “Groundwater Monitoring Study Committee” has been established to devise the appropriate monitoring system and risk mitigation measures that might be required to prevent any future damage to the precious relics.

With regard to the possible impact on buried cultural properties resulting from open-cut sections of the highway (i.e. about 160 m along the edge of the buffer zone of the property), the EIA envisages the conducting of preventive archaeological soundings and rescue excavations, if required, based on the existing Law for Protection of Cultural Properties. The report notes, however, that the boundaries of the buffer zone were defined to ensure control on the visual integrity of the landscape surrounding the core area of the property (hence the tunnel and the open trench which will not be visible from the property), not out of concern for potential archaeological remains. As concerns the planned ventilation tower in the buffer zone, it will be only 8-meter high, which is within the regulations stipulated by the Nara Prefecture for the area.

In its statement accompanying the EIA, Bunka-cho confirms that in its view, following careful analysis of the question, *“the Yamato-Kita Road Project will not cause any alteration to the ground water levels in areas of archaeological significance or any negative impact on buried archaeological remains and landscape, which could result in loss of the value as a World Heritage property”*.

#### *b) Commemorative Events of the 1300th Anniversary of Nara Heijō-kyō Capital*

Regarding the events which are scheduled to take place in 2010, the State Party reported on a new, revised plan with respect to that presented to the World Heritage Committee in 2007. The changes to the previous proposal appear to downsize the scale of the event in a number of ways: the expected number of visitors during the year will be reduced from five million to two and a half million; the foreseen number of temporary structures will be “drastically reduced”; and no temporary railway platform and pedestrian bridge will be constructed. Moreover, instead of holding a six-month long exhibition within temporary pavilions at the Nara Palace Site, seasonal events will be planned mainly in the Nara Palace Site precinct, utilizing the existing facilities, including the reconstructed Former Imperial Audience Hall, which is due to be completed by 2010. The new plan for the celebrations also includes commemorative events to be held at other World Heritage properties of the province. Bunka-cho considers the proposal acceptable from the point of view of the conservation of the property, and desirable as a means of promoting cultural heritage to visitors.

#### *c) Legal protection*

In November 2007, the World Heritage Centre received information suggesting that the Japanese Government was envisaging modifying the legal status of the Nara Palace Site, by making it a “National Government Park”, under the authority of the Ministry of Public Works (and the continued supervision of Bunka-cho). This change, allegedly, would have resulted in additional resources made available for the management of the property, which could have supported a project for the reconstruction of some elements of the ancient complex, after the completion of the Former Imperial Audience Hall. No reference is made to these allegations in the State Party’s report. Separately, however, the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that information on the above would be submitted later in 2008, as soon as the related administrative and legal aspects are clarified.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the final line of the proposed route of the Yamato-Kita Road does not impact negatively on the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property. They note that the EIA gives assurances that the project will not impact adversely on ground water levels or archaeological remains. Concerning the commemorative events, it is noticed that the scope of these has been reduced and does not appear to include any new reconstruction projects. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would welcome additional information on the proposed National Government Park and its implications.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.73**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.72**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Takes note with satisfaction of the fact that the proposed construction of the Yamato-Kita Road will not impact negatively on the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property;*
4. *Recommends to the State Party, however, to further develop and establish at the property the appropriate groundwater monitoring systems and risk mitigation plans, in order to be able to prevent any unwanted fluctuation of groundwater levels in case of unexpected contingencies;*
5. *Also takes note with satisfaction that the revised plan for the 1300th Anniversary of Nara has been reduced in scope and, at present, does not involve any new reconstruction project;*
6. *Also recommends that the State Party ensures, when preparing the detailed designs for the celebrations for the 1300th Anniversary of Nara, that the appropriate measures are taken to ensure that no damage is caused to the buried archaeological relics within the Nara palace site and its surroundings;*
7. *Requests the State Party to confirm whether or not any new reconstruction project is being planned at the property, in addition to that for the Former Imperial Audience Hall, and, in the affirmative, to provide detailed information thereupon;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to clarify whether any change is being envisaged regarding the legal and institutional framework of the Nara Palace site, and to elaborate*

*on the possible implications of this change for the management and conservation of the site as part of the World Heritage property;*

9. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2009, a report including information on the points above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

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

##### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995

##### Criteria

(ii) (iv) (v)

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

N/A

##### Previous Committee Decisions

**28 COM 15B.60; 29 COM 7B.60; 31 COM 7B.73**

##### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 117,242

##### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 200,000 (France / UNESCO Cooperation Agreement)

##### Previous monitoring missions

15-22 February 2005: UNESCO mission; 26 September–7 October 2007: UNESCO / Region Centre / Ville de Chinon international co-operation project mission; 22-28 November, 2007: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

##### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of enforcement of the Luang Prabang conservation plan (PSMV) and illegal constructions;
- b) Public works (road upgrading and drainage) which may affect the World Heritage values.

##### Current conservation issues

The State Party provided a report to the World Heritage Centre on 23 January 2008. Concerning the points raised by the World Heritage Committee, the State Party report notes the following:

- a) That it would welcome a study to establish a buffer zone, to be led by a Lao-French expert team;
- b) That on the basis of the support provided by UNESCO to carry out a feasibility study to establish a biosphere reserve in the Nam Khan river watershed, it was willing to assure sustainable development to enhance the balance between the property and its region;
- c) Concerning the need to improve risk preparedness measures for natural heritage, the State Party report notes that according to legislation, any infrastructure development project (including those major projects such as the currently planned Nam Theun 2) must be preceded by a feasibility study and a socio-environmental impact analysis;
- d) The State Party notes that it is reinforcing the administrative and legislative base of the PSMV to improve possibilities for its rigorous application. To this end, the State Party notes a heritage law promulgated in 2005, and now being disseminated and applied at the national scale, PSMV awareness campaigns at national and local level, and significant successes in controlling building demolition, construction and restoration through co-operation among various local and national agencies. The report also admits that in certain instances, the regulations of the PSMV have not been observed;
- e) Concerning the World Heritage Committee's request for a coordination meeting of the funding agencies to coordinate the projects envisaged in the property and its periphery, to be held before the end of 2007, the State Party notes that it is amenable to the holding of such a meeting at a mutually agreeable time. The State Party also notes its satisfaction with the international co-operation agreement with the Government of France and in particular the Region Centre and the Ville de Chinon and its readiness to renew this 10 year old agreement.

The State Party report does not respond to a number of the requests of the World Heritage Committee, including the need for better definition of the mandate of the Maison du Patrimoine, the need for strengthening of local capacities and involvement, and the need for an evaluation of the quality of the development projects carried out since inscription, (especially in terms of densification and use of built fabric).

It is worth noting that while the State Party report comments on the French and Thai-built dam Nam Theun 2, planned for operation in late 2009, it does not mention plans for the foreseen Mekong mainstream dam at Luang Prabang, to be developed by the Petro Vietnam Power Corporation for opening in 2014.

By letter received by the World Heritage Centre on 28 March 2008, moreover, the State Party provided information on its decision to launch a revision of the urban plan of the district of Luang Prabang, to strengthen the Maison du patrimoine by recruiting some senior staff, and to reinforce the institutional coordination for safeguarding the property by appointing a 'Special Adviser' to the Vice-Prime Minister in charge of Luang Prabang.

The joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) was undertaken from 22 to 28 November, 2007. The mission considered that the Town of Luang Prabang was at "*a crucial stage in its development and that decision taken now will determine the safeguarding of the Town's outstanding universal value or its progressive loss.*" The report acknowledged that although much had been accomplished in the 12 years since inscription, at present, "*unprecedented pressure from development is posing new strains on the site which the existing conservation system appears unable to counter effectively.*" The report noted further that if "*the Lao traditional heritage continues its steady decline, the Town of Luang Prabang would be heading toward a situation that would justify World Heritage in Danger Listing*".

The principal recommendations of the mission provide time bound targets for response and implementation by the State Party:

- a) the need for a new Statement of outstanding universal value,
- b) the establishment of a buffer zone (for which specific orientations were provided),
- c) a moratorium on all major projects having an impact on the property's outstanding universal value (including the new town in the Chompeth Valley, the airport extension and realignment, the conversion of the primary school and Fine Arts College for tourism, and the pedestrian / motorcycle bridge across the Nam Khan),
- d) the revision of the Urban Plan (which should commence as a matter of urgency, be based on a new inventory and survey of changes that have occurred in the inscribed area since the establishment of the PSMV, and including a strategy for remediation of negative changes),
- e) the strict enforcement of the PSMV with a fully developed annual reporting function for the benefit of the World Heritage Committee.

The report also includes a number of specific recommendations concerning improvement of the MDP's mandate; the strengthening of local capacities and involvement of the community, control of illegal building activities; responses to particular development pressures, addressing the poor state of repair of religious structures on the right bank of the Mekong River, and finally giving consideration to the maintenance of the living heritage.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, while welcoming the steps taken by the State Party, consider that the mission report demonstrates the urgency of the situation, and the need for a well focused set of high priority actions to be undertaken by the State Party. In particular, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note that, in spite of the commitment of many devoted professionals and the Maison du Patrimoine, development within the property is not sufficiently under control, as shown by a number of projects in place which, if implemented, would seriously affect the outstanding universal value of the Town of Luang Prabang.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.74**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling its Decision **31 COM 7B.73**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Reiterating its concern that the level of co-ordination and the priority given to protection of the property's outstanding universal value has been insufficient to halt the progressive loss of its fabric and traditions in the face of development pressures,*
4. *Recognizing the commitment of the State Party to improve the state of conservation of the property, including through recent measures to launch the revision of the Urban Plan, reinforce the Maison du Patrimoine and strengthen coordination at the site,*
5. *Urges the State Party to implement all the recommendations made by the November 2007 mission and especially:*
  - a) *to revise the Urban Plan for the province of Luang Prabang and define, in this context, a buffer zone for the property;*
  - b) *to impose a moratorium, pending the approval of the revised Urban Plan, on major development projects such as the proposed new town in the Chompeth Valley, the airport extension and realignment, the conversion of the primary*

school and Fine Arts College for tourism, and the pedestrian / motorcycle bridge across the Nam Khan;

- c) to ensure the strict application of the Luang Prabang conservation plan (PSMV) and prepare an updated inventory and maps of the property, indicating the changes as regards listed buildings, existing and new constructions, wetlands, etc.;
6. *Reiterates* its requests to the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value, including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
7. *Invites* the State Party to provide information on press reports of an alleged planned Mekong mainstream dam at Luang Prabang, to be developed for opening in 2014, and its potential impact on the property;
8. *Requests* the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

## 75. Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666)

### 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

**28 COM 15B.66; 29 COM 7B.55; 30 COM 7B.58**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 50,000, of which USD 20,000 in 2001 for Brick Conservation and Geophysical Survey of the Core Zone of the property; USD 30,000 in 2007 for the preparation and establishment of an integrated management plan.

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 7,200 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust in 2006



### Previous monitoring missions

8-9 May 2004: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission,; 13-18 November 2005: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a conservation policy and inappropriate management of the site;
- b) Impact on the archaeological remains as well as on the visual integrity of the property by the Maya Devi Temple constructed in 2002.

### Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2008, the State Party submitted a progress report containing three sections:

- a) *Response to requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006):*

No development works have been carried out within the boundaries and in the buffer zone of the property pending the completion of the management plan. However, in the report, references are made to further work on excavation of the surroundings which has been undertaken and the identification of potential areas for possible future excavations. As stressed in the 2006 state of conservation report, it is important to link these activities to an overall research strategy, which will be part of the integrated management plan.

- b) *Preparation of an integrated management plan:*

The report outlines the project to develop an integrated management plan for the property. The proposal has a sound basis and reflects the commitment of the Lumbini Development Trust and the Department of Archaeology.

The State Party stresses the importance of defining and preserving the site-specific elements and attributes that carry its outstanding universal value, which is related to two fundamental aspects: (1) as the birthplace of the Lord Buddha, the sacred area of Lumbini is one of the holiest places of Buddhism, and (2) its archaeological remains contain important evidence about the nature of Buddhist pilgrimage centres from a very early period. To maintain the outstanding universal value of the property, it is necessary to protect the tangible and intangible attributes that represent and embody the two above-mentioned aspects.

The report outlines progress in interaction programmes which have been undertaken, including stakeholder meetings during the preparation of the integrated management plan.

- c) *Follow-up actions in response to the recommendations of the 2005 mission*

Another crucial issue raised by the 2005 mission was the impact of the newly constructed (in 2002) Maya Devi Temple on the archaeological remains, as well as on the visual integrity of the property. The World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to implement the corrective measures suggested by the 2005 mission, as follows:

#### *i) for the protection of the fragile archaeological remains*

With regard to the protection of the archaeological remains, which are threatened by ground water and humidity, collection of data has been initiated but no monitoring system nor strategy have been developed. The State Party has suggested that there should be an overall approach to the preservation of archaeological remains, which it hopes to finalise during the preparation of the management plan. With regard to the corrective measures proposed for the Temple, waterproofing of the roof, removal of the external staircases have been implemented.

#### *ii) visual aspects of the Maya Devi Temple.*

The State Party is going to develop an overall approach towards the rehabilitation of the Maya Devi Temple within the framework of the management plan and implement the remaining corrective measures.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider these proposals to be reasonable. In the meantime, measures necessary to control the ground water and monitoring should continue.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.75**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.58**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),*
3. *Notes the action taken by the State Party and its commitment to comply with the requests of the World Heritage Committee;*
4. *Requests the State Party to continue its work on the development of the integrated management plan, and particularly to:*
  - a) *Draft, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, an updated Statement of outstanding universal value, including the conditions of integrity and authenticity;*
  - b) *Avoid carrying out any development project pending completion of the integrated management plan;*
  - c) *Develop a strategy to ensure the long-term protection of the significant archaeological remains of the property and continue with survey and monitoring the ground water levels and movements, under and adjacent to the Maya Devi Temple;*
  - d) *Develop a strategy for the rehabilitation of the Maya Devi temple incorporating the recommendations and the implementation of the corrective measures proposed by the 2005 mission;*
  - e) *Submit a programme of activities with time frame for c) and d) to the World Heritage Centre;*
5. *Calls upon the international community to provide technical and financial support to assist the State Party in these activities;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, the updated Statement of outstanding universal value for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies; and a report on the progress made on the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

## 76. Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

### Criteria

(iii) (iv) (vi)

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

2003-2007

### Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7A.24; 30 COM 7A.26; 31 COM 7A.23**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 332,775 (1980 to 1999) for technical co-operation

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 10 million (1979-2001)- International Safeguarding Campaign; USD 45,000 (2005) -Dutch Funds-in-Trust

### Previous monitoring missions

February 2003: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; April and August 2005, April 2006, and April 2007: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Uncontrolled urban development resulting in the loss of traditional urban fabric, in particular privately-owned houses;
- b) Lack of coordinated management mechanism.

### Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2008, the State Party submitted a report on implementation of the integrated management plan (IMP). This includes state of conservation reports on each of the monument zones.

The report comments on :

1. results of the bi-monthly Coordinative Working Committee (CWC) meetings;
2. establishment of a Documentation Centre with UNESCO support;
3. establishment of a conservation assistance fund to provide partial funding for the restoration of private historic buildings or the expropriation of threatened buildings;
4. publication in Nepali language of individual handbooks on each monument zone and the overall Integrated Management Framework (with UNESCO support);
5. "Interaction programs" with stakeholders in the monument zones;
6. preparation of an inventory of buildings in the buffer zones of the Patan and Bhaktapur monument zones;
7. detailed review of building permits issued;

8. compliance with associated regulations and ensuing corrective measures.

The report also details a first test of the IMP initiated by unauthorized road construction by the Department of Roads across important archaeological and natural heritage within the Pashupati Monument Zone. Following protests by those involved with the IMP to the highest levels of government, and responses to the proposal by the World Heritage Centre, construction of the road has been halted and mitigation measures are being devised.

The report also documents several dozen rehabilitation and restoration projects, large and small, being undertaken in the last year in the Seven Monument Zones, with support from the Department of Archaeology.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the considerable progress made in implementing the IMP.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that it is important to follow up on the mitigation efforts directed to the new road begun by the Department of Roads in the Pashupati Monument Zone, and to ensure a clear resolution of this conflict designed both to respect the outstanding universal value of the property, and also to guide future planning by Governmental Departments to respect the requirements of the IMP.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.76**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7A.23**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the efforts made by the State Party to implement the integrated management plan (IMP) completed in June 2007; and encourages its to continue its efforts to increase support for effective and sustainable implementation of the IMP;*
4. *Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed on the follow-up to the mitigation efforts for the proposed new road in the Pashupati Monument Zone.*

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

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## 78. Parthian Fortresses of Nisa (Turkmenistan) (C 1242)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2007

### Criteria

(ii) (iii)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 8B.30**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

### Current conservation issues

The State Party's report was received by the World Heritage Centre on 1 February 2008. This report provides brief information on the following:

- a) The access stairs and viewing platform at Old Nisa have been repaired and renovated, and a new site map has been installed;
- b) Information boards for each site have been installed, and two additional viewing points have been arranged to improve facilities for visitors;
- c) A 3 year plan for conservation of excavated sites has been developed and approved by the Ministry of Culture of Turkmenistan. This plan includes a schedule of activities, list of executors and the allocation of financial resources for each monument according to the management plan;
- d) Conservation activities at Old Nisa are included in excavation plans, and are carried out upon completion of the work season under the strict control of the National Department for the Protection, Study and Restoration of Historical and Cultural Monuments of the Ministry of Culture of Turkmenistan;
- e) An on - site database is being created, and copies of all necessary documents in printed and electronic format have been transmitted to the State Historical and Cultural Park "Old Nisa";
- f) The extension of the buffer zone to the south-east of both tells, to include the foot of the Kopet-Dag Mountain, and to the east of New Nisa have been agreed on with the

local authorities. Changes to the zones are being included in the General Development Plan of the Ashgabat city.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS welcome the progress made on all but one (formulation of an interpretation and visitor management plan), of the seven recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007).

**Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.78**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 8B.30**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the actions taken by the State Party in response to six of the seven recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee, and the actions planned for the period 2008-2010; and requests that three printed and electronic copies of the conservation plan be provided for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
4. *Urges the State Party to complete the formulation of an interpretation and visitor management plan;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a progress report on the implementation of the management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2001

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7B.57; 30 COM 7B. 59; 31 COM 7B.74**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property (up to 2005): USD 30,000

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

March 2006: UNESCO / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; April 2005: expert mission; October 2006: UNESCO/ICOMOS mission; December 2007: UNESCO/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Serious impact of a large-scale restoration project;
- b) Impact of urban landscaping programme on the authenticity and integrity of the property;
- c) Detrimental impact of new roads;
- d) Demolition of traditional urban houses.

### Current conservation issues

In its report, received by the World Heritage Centre on 18 February 2008, the State Party confirmed its commitment to further develop the management plan, clarify road schemes, and develop zoning arrangements taking into account the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and the 2007 mission. The report states that a Coordinating Committee for the property was established in 2001 as an "Inter Departmental Commission on Coordination of Safeguarding and Utilization of Cultural Monuments of Samarkand".

The UNESCO / ICOMOS mission of December 2007 noted the following:

#### a) *Strengthened coordination:*

The recommendations of previous missions have been acted upon and there is better coordination between the various bodies responsible for the overall urban areas. Nevertheless, the mission considered that there was a need for more formal coordination and a strengthening of the overall decision-making system. It noted, in particular, that the Inter Departmental Commission for Samarkand should be strengthened, and that international experts should be consulted for essential advice on principles of restoration, documentation of historic properties, and rehabilitation of historic quarters.

#### b) *New developments:*

The mission noted that recent constructions on the periphery of the new road (between the historic areas of Afrosiab and Timurid) consisting of a shopping centre, restaurant, bus stop and gas station are inappropriate for the locality and have a negative impact on Shakhi-Zinda. The mission underlined the urgent need for zoning regulations to be established to respect the sensitive areas of the city.

#### c) *Proposed Reconstruction projects:*

The mission also expressed concern over a proposed large-scale reconstruction project for the Timurid walls and the proposed development of a hotel next to the walls. It was considered that these would be very harmful for the general view of the Timurid part of the town, and would not conform to international conservation principles. A more sensitive development is needed for this area, based on archaeological investigation and the removal of harmful modern buildings.

#### d) *Traditional housing:*

The mission reinforced the need to make progress with documenting the traditional housing in the residential areas around the main monuments and to stop any further demolition until

survey work has been undertaken as a basis for the development of an integrated conservation strategy.

e) *Road schemes:*

Concerning the roads scheme, the mission was advised by the State Party that the new Urban Plan for Development of Samarkand city 2004 –2025 (General Plan), is being revised, based on the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission undertaken in October 2006. After the approval of this General Plan a more detailed plan will then be developed, and this will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre. The timescale for the development of the new road schemes has not yet been fixed. However the mission was told that it will be included in the first stage of realization of the draft management plan: 2007-2010.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS welcome the progress that has been made, but note however that there is a need to keep up the momentum to address the issues highlighted by the mission, in order to ensure that within a reasonable timescale a clear approach is put in place for the overall management, conservation and development of the property. The State Party should submit all major project proposals to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for consideration, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

**Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.79**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.74**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the progress made by the State Party and its commitment to set up a Coordinating Committee for the property;*
4. *Notes with concern further new and inappropriate development proposals between the Afrosiab and Timurid city for the re-creation of the Timurid city walls, and a new hotel with “historic façades” near the city walls;*
5. *Urges the State Party to continue the development of the management plan, including appropriate zoning and other matters identified at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007);*
6. *Also urges the State Party to develop an overall strategic approach to the property’s conservation to be agreed to by stakeholders through the adoption of the management plan, and to submit, to the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, information about any major projects proposals;*
7. *Requests the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress made in:*
  - a) *Finalizing the management plan,*



- b) *Developing the conservation plan,*
- c) *Documenting historic features (inventories and surveys),*
- d) *Reinforcing the Coordinating Committee,*
- e) *Developing proposed zoning and road schemes including proposals to close the new road between Afrosiab and Timurid city to through-traffic,*

*for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.*

## EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

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

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

### 81. Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784)

#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

#### Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

#### Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7B.72; 31 COM 7B.105**

#### International Assistance

N/A

#### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

#### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

#### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressure, high-rise projects with alteration of the visual integrity of the property
- b) Train station project outside the buffer zone with potential visual impacts on the property

#### Current conservation issues

At the time of the drafting of this document, the State Party had not transmitted a report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage property. A letter was sent on 31 January 2008 by the Ministry of Education, Art and Culture that the requested documents were still not ready and that additional time was required. The State Party also submitted a draft Statement of outstanding universal value. This will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document *WHC-08/32.COM/8B*).

According to the report presented in 2007 by the Austrian authorities, several projects have been developed inside and outside the World Heritage property, but final decisions had not been taken. These projects are the following:

*Core zone / Historic Centre:*

*Max Reinhardt Square:* The process of redesigning the square should be followed by the rearrangement of the *Furtwängler Garden* in 2007 or 2008. Furthermore, an underground garage project was foreseen for the *Makart Square*. The initial project has been scaled down to a one level garage but the implementation of the project remained uncertain in 2007. The World Heritage Centre was not informed on any further developments regarding these projects.

*Alte Diakonie:* A project of refurbishment was scheduled to be completed in 2007.

*Museum of natural sciences:* The old building of Museum Carolino was designed to become an extension of the neighbouring museum of natural sciences after an international design competition and the works should have started in autumn 2007.

*Old Town Hall:* the building was adapted for public function, the planned installation of an elevator and an additional emergency staircase required extensive preliminary archaeological and historical research. The work on the installation was supposed to start in autumn 2007, according to the 2007 State Party report.

*Buffer zone:*

The *Campus Nonnta:* an urban design competition for the area was organised to ensure the removal of the existing campus buildings. The building plans have been authorized and some works started in 2006. A design competition for the University buildings was completed and construction should have started by the end of 2007.

*Railway Bridge:* the existing bridge over the river was replaced. Construction began in late 2005, and additional funds were provided by the City of Salzburg, in order to secure a design in accordance with the significance of the Historic Centre of Salzburg. The new bridge shall be completed in 2008.

*Railway station:* the railway authorities decided to upgrade the rebuilding the main station of Salzburg. The existing historical steel and glass structure of the old hall will be preserved and integrated and work is supposed to start during 2010-2011.

*Paradiesgarten in the Nonntal:* the urban housing project for the so-called Paradiesgarten was supposed to start in 2006 and has been postponed, according to the 2007 State Party report.

*Stern-brewery:* an international design competition for a housing project on the area of the old Stern brewery in the Riedenburg-quarter was completed and construction was foreseen to start in 2007.

*Beyond the buffer zone:*

*Square of the Train Station:* the area to the north of the square was to be redeveloped in three sections: a building next to the station (five stories) was planned; apartment buildings and an office tower for an insurance company were proposed. Construction work stated in 2006 but no further information was provided. It is regrettable that that no further information was submitted by the Austrian authorities on the consultation process for this project, nor concerning potential visual impacts on the visual integrity of the property. *Uzilinga project* in Itzling is a project of eight apartment buildings (eight stories) 1 km from the historic centre.

Plans were submitted to the authorities and building permits granted in 2006. Construction was postponed to the second half of 2007.

*Management plan:*

It was mentioned in the 2007 report that a management plan for the Historic Centre of Salzburg was under preparation. Modifications to the management plan should integrate discussions with experts responsible for other World Heritage Cities with historical centres having similar problems as Salzburg. This management plan should have been finalised in 2007, but has not been received by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for review.

No additional information has been provided to the World Heritage Centre concerning the implementation of specific legal protection of the historic urban fabric and structure.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.81**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **29 COM 7B.72** and **31 COM 7B.105**, adopted at its 29th (Durban, 2005) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not provide any report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee;*
4. *Notes with concern the lack of information on major on-going development projects and reiterates the importance of completing a management plan to ensure the protection of the outstanding universal value of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed and to provide a detailed report on the urban development projects that may affect the outstanding universal value of the property and urges the State Party to submit three copies of the management plan by **1 February 2009** for review.*

**82. Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

**83. Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## 84. Belfries of Belgium and France (Belgium and France) (C 943 and 943 bis)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999 and 2005 (extension)

### Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 8B 45 ; 31 COM 7B.108**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Construction project for a covered market for fresh produce at the foot of the Béthune Belfry (France), located in the buffer zone, that threatens the visual integrity of the Belfry and its surroundings;
- b) Construction of an underground parking under the Grand Place of the Belfry.

### Current conservation issues

An architectural competition was launched at the beginning of 2005 by the City of Béthune for the construction of a permanent covered market for fresh produce. In July 2005, the jury selected a project that foresaw a building of 39 m by 30 m and no higher than 5.7 m. The covered market would be just within 3 m of the base of the Belfry. The materials envisaged are steel, aluminium and glass. On 21 February 2008, the State Party provided information in response to Decision **31 COM 7B.108**:

#### *Improvement of legislation:*

The State Party's services are working towards the improvement of the *Heritage Code* to include a specific legal provision concerning properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and their buffer zone. This legal provision has not yet been adopted. A Ministry of Culture circular of 28 November 2007 sent to concerned regional authorities (local representatives, Ministry services) contained a temporary provision.

#### *Visual Impact Evaluation of the covered market, architectural perspective:*

The specifications indicated that particular attention be accorded to the respect for outstanding universal value of the Belfry. The project was notably selected for this reason. The architectural treatment of the building is intentionally totally modern in order to draw a clear distinction between the Belfry heritage and the new covered market. It is, therefore,

low in height with horizontal interest, and leaves a fairly clear view of the Belfry. Furthermore, the construction will be reversible as it is a building placed at ground level.

*Visual Impact Evaluation of the covered market, historical perspective:*

The tradition of covered markets associated with the belfries is found in Béthune. A cloth market existed from the 14th to the 17th century in Béthune. Rectangular in shape, it surrounded the three sides at the base of the Belfry. It was replaced by boutiques up until their destruction during the First World War. The Belfry has never been isolated on the side where the present project is destined to be. The architectural project follows very closely the place of the historic market, except that it is separated from the Belfry.

*Underground parking :*

It does not visually affect the Belfry. It will have an underground link to the covered market. Its two entrances are located on two nearby streets and do not give directly onto the Grand Place. Below ground, in the immediate vicinity of the Belfry, the area is irreversibly modified and changed with respect to the old underground quarries and archaeological vestiges linked to the urban history and its surrounding environment.

All the French State Party authorities have approved the architectural and urban project for the covered market and parking. The new covered market – the structure of which appears to be reversible according to the State Party report – covers practically the same area as the ancient cloth market. The integrity of use is respected, and the project appears to satisfactorily respond to the specifications requiring respectful treatment of the visual integrity and authenticity of the property. The covered market relives a tradition of commercial enterprise at the foot of the Belfry, a tradition dating back over long years of history.

**Draft Decision : 32 COM 7B.84**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.108**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Takes note of the French State Party's commitment to improve existing legislation to guarantee satisfactory legal protection and appropriate authorization procedures with regard to World Heritage status ;
4. Also takes note of the detailed visual impact study provided by the State Party of France regarding the outstanding universal value of the property, and that the present project covers, for the most part, the area of the old cloth market, coherent with the secular use of the immediate surroundings of the Béthune Belfry for commercial activities ;
5. Considers that the parking project does not have any direct visual impact on the inscribed property ;
6. Encourages the State Party of France to :
  - a) Confirm the strengthening of the legal protection and reinforce procedures for the authorization of work permits for World Heritage properties and their buffer zones;
  - b) Supervise the strict implementation of the project for the covered market of the Béthune Belfry and its reversibility ;

- c) *Provide the World Heritage Centre with a detailed report on the archaeological situation of the underground area of the Belfry, by 1 February 2009.*

## **85. Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 rev)**

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

### Criteria

(vi)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 8B.49; 30 COM 7B.82; 31 COM 7B.93**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 15,000 (1995)

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 190,000

### Previous monitoring missions

21-24 June 2006 : ICOMOS mission ; 11-13 June 2007: UNESCO / ICOMOS mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

Construction of a hotel in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property, not in conformity with provisions of the Master Plan, which was part of the management plan included in the nomination file.

### Current conservation issues

#### *Inappropriate construction of a hotel in the buffer zone:*

The President of the National Commission for UNESCO informed the Centre, by letter of 31 January 2008, that following the decision of the World Heritage Committee and the recommendations set out in the report of June 2007, the Chairperson of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina has organised a meeting on 29 January 2008 to review the situation and activities. The following conclusions were made: Further construction activities have been stopped since 2006 and no works would be undertaken before the full implementation of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee and the recommendations of the UNESCO / ICOMOS experts.

Four out of five recommendations provided in the previous mission report were incorporated into the new architectural design, and the fifth recommendation related to the height of the building, is to be taken into account in the new architectural design in order to comply with the recommendations. The works carried out were: the design of the facades have been

improved by re-creating the depths and the “chiaroscuro” effect with the full and voids of the windows, loggias, etc; the typical material of the area, including stone and wood, with modern manufacturing techniques are applied in the new design; the relationship of the building with its immediate external spaces, with the streets surrounding the lot and with the adjacent buildings, is taken into account; and big surfaces of reflecting glass and projecting bodies made entirely of glass and steel are avoided. At the request of the State Party an UNESCO / ICOMOS advisory mission took place from 26 to 28 May 2008. The report is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008>.

### *Cracks at the Mostar bridge*

The World Heritage Centre was informed by press articles that cracks have begun to appear in the bridge, probably caused by an earthquake. The World Heritage Centre sent a letter on 4 January 2008 asking the State Party to report on the conservation issues of the bridge. The Mayor of Mostar by a letter of 22 January 2008 reported that the following measures were taken: a commission to collect all relevant information related to the appearance of the cracks was established; the official supplier of the monitoring system of the bridge was asked for the immediate interpretation of the data collected by the monitoring system incorporated into the bridge structure during the reconstruction process. The official supplier was sending experts by the end of January 2008; a topographic survey of the bridge was requested, in order to review the situation in comparison with previous surveys, and to determine whether there are any deformations of the bridge structure.

The Mayor suggested that once all available information is collected, a meeting of all the stakeholders including UNESCO, World Bank, designer, supervisor, and contractor(s), would be held to come to an objective analysis of the situation. Furthermore, a technical mission by the Dean of the Sarajevo Faculty of Civil Engineering took place in December 2007, and reported that in no case cracks could endanger the present stability of the bridge, but further monitoring is proposed. Furthermore, with the state of conservation report of 1 February 2008 the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre about the observation of cracks on the Old Bridge. It is mentioned that cracks appeared in November 2007, on the side arches and part of the intrados. An independent international expert team was set up, which concluded that the bridge is in no immediate danger, but that regular monitoring is essential. The State Party has taken steps to comply with the suggestions made by the expert team. However, it is of the view that technical assistance is required from the World Heritage Centre to secure the funds and conditions for another visit of the expert team by May 2008 at the latest.

ICOMOS commented that the bridge does not seem to be structurally threatened. The key issue concerns the establishment of a systematic monitoring of the bridge, taking into account the documentation on its construction.

The State Party also reported on the activities of the “Stari Grad” Agency in 2007, responsible for the preservation of the World Heritage property and the implementation of the management plan. These activities concern restoration, reconstruction and refurbishment activities for buildings, monitoring and preventive actions.

### **Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.85**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,



2. Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7B.82** and **31 COM 7B.93** adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,
3. Also recalling that the works for the construction of the hotel were suspended immediately upon receipt of Decision **30 COM 7B.82**, acknowledges that the State Party continues its efforts towards identifying appropriate solutions to protect the outstanding universal value and the integrity of the property;
4. Urges the State Party to continue examining the situation in order to find proper solutions for the volume and the design of the hotel, taking into account the management plan of the World Heritage property and the recommendations of the 2006 and 2007 missions, in collaboration with UNESCO and ICOMOS;
5. Notes the cracks at the Old Bridge structure of Mostar, and requests the State Party to continue monitoring, collecting data and take the appropriate measures to ensure the stability of the bridge, in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, an update report on the state of conservation of the property, the results of the monitoring of the cracks of the Old Bridge and measures taken as well as progress made with an alternative design of the hotel construction project, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

#### **86. Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

#### **87. Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia) (C 822)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**30 COM 7B.84 ; 31 COM 7B.95**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 14,600 for training (1998).

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: Italian Funds-In-Trust USD 4,279 for an expert mission in December 2005.

### Previous monitoring missions

December 2005: upon the request of Estonian National authorities, UNESCO expert mission to Tallinn .

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of an integrated management plan;
- b) Extension to Viru Hotel;
- c) Development of the Skoone Bastion;
- d) Construction of new buildings adjacent to the Town Wall between Suurtüki and Rannamäe Streets;
- e) Impact of the transportation of hazardous materials to the Old Town;
- f) Framework for high-rise buildings.

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on 25 January 2008, which responds to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007).

#### *a) Comprehensive management plan*

The World Heritage Committee had requested preparation of a “comprehensive management plan for the property and its buffer zone” in both 2006 and 2007. However, the State Party report notes that the Tallinn City Government is preparing a “development plan” for Tallinn Old Town for 2008-2013. The State Party presents the “development plan” without explaining the relationship of this plan to the requested “comprehensive management plan”. The aim of the “development plan” is described as being “to find appropriate financing mechanisms and spatial and functional solutions” which are in harmony with the historic fabric of Tallinn Old Town. The “development plan” is said to describe a “vision of safeguarding and sustainable development of Tallinn Old Town as an authentic and holistic city space, strategic objectives and the action plan needed to achieve these objectives”. The items described in the development plan include “open space, security, heritage, culture, cultural industry, tourism, housing, living in old town, infrastructure, traffic and parking”. The Plan is said to be ready for approval on 30 March 2008.

The Tallinn “development plan” seems to share some – but not all of the characteristics of a management plan. In essence, the Tallinn development plan seems to be a kind of strategic master plan focused on physical and functional improvements rather than a fully developed contemporary heritage management plan, although it is difficult to fully judge the nature and utility of the development plan until it is submitted for review.

The report refers to two thematic plans, one on the “Location of high-rise buildings in Tallinn” (reviewed by ICOMOS), and a second on “Regulation of Tallinn Central City Milieu Protection Areas, Boundaries, Protection and Usage Conditions”. A copy of the latter should be submitted for review in the context of links to the development plan, the earlier thematic plan on high rise buildings and the proposal for minor modification of boundaries.

The State Party has submitted a request for minor modification of the boundaries of the core and buffer zones which will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document *WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add*). Clearly any comprehensive management

plan would need to address the wider areas that the State Party now considers need protecting.

b) *New buildings on the section of the town wall between Suurtuki and Ranamae streets*

The State Party reports that, following decisions by Estonia's State Court, no possibilities exist at national level to stop construction of 2 of the 3 houses originally proposed by Restor Company to be built next to the town wall, and that the only further recourse would be to appeal to the European Court. It further reports that the Tallinn City Government has accepted a compromise to build 2 of the 3 originally proposed houses, and sees little basis on which to appeal to the European Court. While the State Party expresses its appreciation to the World Heritage Committee for its encouragement during its 31st session to analyze international law for applicable precedents, it does not report on any commitments to challenge the State Court decision, as requested by the Committee, on the basis that obligations incurred through the ratification of the World Heritage Convention override local considerations.

c) *Halting new construction projects and modification of municipal planning mechanisms to ensure that planning proposals which may threaten outstanding universal value are rejected.*

The State Party reports positively on recent efforts to improve coordination of the planning approvals process between concerned municipal and federal departments, and to explore further improvements through a round table in the first half of 2008. These are designed to overcome the problems apparent in the recent approval of a 17 story hotel extension in the Viru Square detailed plan (since withdrawn), and other projects based on approvals obtained in the late 1990s and early 2000s.

d) *Thematic Study on high-rise buildings*

ICOMOS reviewed this study in October 2007 and noted that neither a Thematic Plan for high rise buildings, nor a Strategic Plan for the City, should be adopted until a management plan has been agreed which will set the context for these other plans, through relating outstanding universal value to the spatial patterns of the city and thus to what needs protection.

The Thematic Study for tall buildings cannot be said to address concerns over the impact of tall buildings on the skyline of the World Heritage site, as the Plan only considers buildings over 45 meters and buildings of a much lower height could impact adversely on outstanding universal value. Any such revised Thematic Study would need to refer to additional constraints necessary to protect the visual integrity of the World Heritage site. The 2008 Report does not mention this proposed thematic framework on high-rise buildings.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS remain concerned that in spite of repeated requests by the Committee, to prepare a comprehensive management plan for the property and its buffer zone, as a framework for addressing development and other threats, no progress has been made. The Master Plan which is now being prepared should be submitted for review.

Although some progress has been made in the co-ordination of planning approvals between federal and municipal levels, these mechanisms need to be seen as a critical part of the management plan.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are extremely concerned that the State Court's judgment does not seem to respect *World Heritage Convention* obligations, and considers that the State Party should challenge this result formally.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.87**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.95**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes the State Party's efforts to address the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee during its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), including improved coordination of planning approvals between concerned municipal and federal departments;
4. Regrets that no progress has been made with a comprehensive management plan for the property and its buffer zone, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th and 31st sessions;
5. Also notes that a Development Plan for the property is in progress and requests the State Party to provide three copies of this plan to the World Heritage Centre as well as a progress report on the comprehensive management plan and also requests the State Party to ensure the conformity between the two plans;
6. Reiterates its request to the State Party to challenge the State Court's decision to allow construction of new buildings on the section of the town wall between Suurtüki and Rannamäe Streets, on the basis of the obligations incurred through ratification of the World Heritage Convention;
7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a progress report on the above requests and on the status of the proposed Framework for high-rise buildings, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

**88. Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (France) (C 85)**

See Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

**89. Bordeaux, Port of the Moon (France) (C 1256)**

See Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

**90. Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

**91. Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

**92. Cologne Cathedral (Germany) (C 292 rev)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

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

2004-2006

Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 15B.70 ; 30 COM 7A.30 ; 31 COM 7B.110**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2003: Workshop

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressure through high-rise building project impacting on the visual integrity of the Cathedral as a landmark;
- b) Lack of buffer zone.

Current conservation issues

Buffer zone:

The State Party of Germany, in its letter dated 30 January 2008 provided the World Heritage Centre with a map of a buffer zone, as requested by the World Heritage Committee. It covers

the east bank of the Rhine with the size of 258 hectares. This buffer zone was already adopted by the City Council of Cologne on 14 December 2006, but was not officially submitted to the World Heritage Centre according to the procedures in place. In order to ensure the effectiveness of the buffer zone, the State Party stated in its report that "any future planning decision and measures in the Cathedral buffer zone will take into account the outstanding universal value and the visual integrity of the World Heritage site". The boundaries of the buffer zone were transmitted to ICOMOS for review, as a minor boundary modification (to be discussed under Item 8 of the Agenda – Document *WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add*).

*Urban renewal of Deutz:*

As part of the consultation process, a workshop was held for the design of a planning framework for the site of Cologne/Deutz, the ICE railway terminal and its surroundings. Its results were presented in the State Party report of 2007 defining three World Heritage status compatible solutions for the area of the Kölnmesse/ Deutz train station. Based on the three proposals, framework requirements have been formulated for the planning decisions. No further decision regarding the implementation of a proposal has been taken at the time of the preparation of this document.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.92**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7A.30** and **31 COM 7B.110**, adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the submission of a buffer zone including the east bank of the river and recalls the need to take into account the outstanding universal value of the property and its integrity for any further development in the buffer zone;*
4. *Takes note that an urban planning consultation process for the development of the Deutz area took place in 2007, and urges the State Party to provide further information prior to taking a decision concerning the future development of this area;*
2. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the progress concerning the proposals of urban development in the Deutz area.*

**93. Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

**94. Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400 and 400 bis)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987 and 2002 (extension)

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**26 COM 23.10/11/12 ; 27 COM 8C.2**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO and Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

20 to 22 March 2005 : World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS advisory mission ; 4 to 7 November 2007 : ICOMOS advisory mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Inappropriate use of public areas and street amenities;
- b) Lack of conservation of residential housing in the area inscribed as World Heritage;
- c) Increased volume of traffic.

Current conservation issues

The main issue concerns the demolition of old buildings and the construction of new ones in their place in a part of the buffer zone, in particular the old « Jewish quarter » in the 6th and 7th districts:

- a) Between 2004 and the present day, the demolition of several large or important buildings in this area may be noted. These buildings are of great architectural and urban quality. They date from the second half of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century;
- b) In the framework of real estate projects, these old buildings are replaced by higher buildings, of denser housing and mediocre architectural quality. They modify the urban integrity and authenticity of the quarter;
- c) The urban regulations presently in force in the buffer zone would appear to be ill-adapted.

A clear negative effect to the urban value of the buffer zone and the outstanding universal value of the property is noticeable.

Demolition problems and reconstruction of old buildings in the Jewish quarter appear more to be an economic problem of rentable property rather than a heritage one. The buildings being

demolished are generally of high architectural interest and conserve an evident contemporary urban potential that could lend itself to rehabilitation or restoration appropriate to the integrity of the property.

**Draft Decision : 32 COM 7B.94**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decisions **26 COM 23.10/11/12** and **27 COM 8C.2**, adopted at its 26th (Budapest, 2002) and 27th (UNESCO, 2003) sessions respectively,
3. Expresses its utmost concern regarding the ongoing demolition of old buildings of great architectural and urban quality in the buffer zone of the inscribed property, particularly in the so-called “Jewish quarter”;
4. Also expresses its grave concern regarding the reconstruction, in their place, of contemporary buildings of mediocre quality that profoundly transform the architectural and urban value of this quarter;
5. Requests the State Party to act, without delay, to:
  - a) Declare and immediately apply a moratorium on all demolitions in the buffer zone;
  - b) Re-examine, case by case, the demolition permits already granted with a view to equity with the holders of permits already granted, but giving priority to the conservation of the existing built heritage;
  - c) Establish an urban conservation and development plan for the buffer zone, fully respecting the principal architectural and urban values of each quarter, and for which enforcement would be stricter than it is at present in each quarter;
  - d) Seek additional funding (fiscality, grants, etc.) and in a dynamic manner, direct private building investment to rehabilitation operations and restoration rather than demolition and reconstruction;
6. Also requests the State Party to undertake archaeological work to identify the physical traces of the ancient ghetto and to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the urban situation in the “Jewish quarter” and on conservation measures in force.

**95. Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape (Hungary) (C 1063)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2002

Criteria

(iii) (v)



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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**26 COM 23.13 ; 26 COM 23.14**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2001: International Workshop on vineyard landscapes

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre was informed by individuals and NGOs about different development projects within and in the vicinity of the property, including a project for an electricity power station in the buffer zone, an energy plant with wood pallets; a project on the territory of the State Party of Slovakia for a coal energy plant.

Following the letter by the World Heritage Centre dated 23 October 2007, the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that the Hungarian World Heritage Commission was following the issue closely in consultation with stakeholders concerned and hoped to be able to provide a report by 1 February 2008.

By letter dated 16 January 2008, the World Heritage Centre also received the proposition of the President of the Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén County Government concerning the project as well as being informed that specific legislative measures were being initiated by this County Government in order to guarantee the protection of the property. By letter dated 1 February 2008 the State Party provided a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property prepared following the special session of the Hungarian World Heritage Commission headed by its President, Minister of Education and Culture. The State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that it is fully committed to protect the site and that negotiations of all parties are under way to find mutually acceptable solutions. The State Party stated that a comprehensive World Heritage impact study is going to be carried out in order to avoid any potential damage to the property and negotiations are under way to reach an agreement with all parties involved. The State Party confirmed that legal instruments will be drafted aimed at the further strengthening of the legal environment related to the property. The State Party also confirmed that the World Heritage Committee will be kept informed on any progress in this matter.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS urge the State Party as soon as possible to provide full details of the proposed energy plant in accordance with paragraph 172. of the *Operational Guidelines*, and of the proposed heritage impact assessment in order to evaluate the potential impact of the plant on the outstanding universal value of the cultural landscape will be considered.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.95**

*The World Heritage Committee*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **26 COM 23.28** and **26 COM 23.14**, adopted at its 26th session (Budapest, 2002),*
3. *Encourages the State Party, with the Slovakian authorities, to collaborate towards a transboundary extension of the property, as requested at its 26th session (Budapest, 2002);*
4. *Notes the detailed report provided by the State Party on development proposals including an analysis of the situation and actions envisaged;*
5. *Urges the State Party to provide as soon as possible full details of the proposed power plant in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and of the proposed heritage impact assessment;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, an update report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

**96. Skellig Michael (Ireland) (C 757)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

N/A

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

### Current conservation issues

An ICOMOS advisory mission visited the property from 25 to 29 November 2007, following the receipt by the World Heritage Centre of complaints regarding the need for a revised management plan, the scale of new interventions on the South Peak, the unrecorded destruction or movement of original features, the speculative nature of the reconstruction, the failure to publish the results of archaeological and architectural surveys, and a failure to consult local ferry operators on changes in access rules.

The mission concluded that, whilst the works have transformed the appearance of these remains, they are justifiable and that the outstanding universal value of the property remains intact. The mission also examined other aspects of the island's management in the context of the draft management plan and, in particular, a disagreement between the Irish authorities and local ferry operators over landing permits.

The mission made the following key recommendations:

- a) a fully resourced programme of publication should begin;
- b) an academic advisory committee should be appointed to advise on publication and future research;
- c) annual minuted meetings should be held with the ferry operators;
- d) the criteria for the granting of new landing permits should be identified;
- e) a site manager should be appointed for the property;
- f) no changes should be made to the property boundary;
- g) a detailed visitor survey should be conducted to inform visitor management;
- h) toilet facilities should be provided on the island.

The full report of the mission is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008> and was transmitted to the authorities for comments. In a letter to the World Heritage Centre dated 26 February 2008 the State Party indicated that the recommendations of the mission would be incorporated into the management plan, which was to be finalized very shortly.

### **Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.96**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Notes the conclusions and recommendations of the report of the ICOMOS advisory mission to the property in November 2007;*
3. *Also notes the comments from the State Party on the mission report and its decision to incorporate the recommendations in the management plan for the property;*
4. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, three printed and electronic copies of the final management plan, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.*

**97. Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia) (C 852)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

**98. 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

**29 COM 7B.67, 30 COM 7B.87, 31 COM 7B.114**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 60,000

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2001: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN mission; November 2003: World Heritage Centre mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Potential pollution from the oil exploitation of the D-6 oil field in the Baltic Sea by the Russian Federation;
- b) Lack of bilateral cooperation between Lithuania and the Russian Federation including joint assessment of environmental impact of the D-6 project;
- c) Impacts of sewage spill accident which took place at Klaipeda Water Treatment Station.

Current conservation issues

As requested by Decision **31 COM 7B.114**, a report was submitted by the Lithuanian authorities dated 2 February 2008 and another was submitted on 15 February 2008 by the Russian Federation. These reports inform that:

- a) The Joint "Lithuanian-Russian Post-project Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)" of the D-6 oil platform issues were discussed during the 5th meeting of the Joint Lithuanian-Russian Environmental Protection Commission, held on 15 June 2007. The Commission approved the final report on Post-project EIA and agreed that one of the

working groups of the Commission would prepare an implementation plan for the recommendations listed in the final report, until the following Commission meeting. A summary of the final report was also transmitted by the Lithuanian authorities on 3 March 2008.

- b) The bilateral “Agreement Concerning Co-operation in Case of Pollution accidents, Pollution Prevention, Mitigation and Compensation Measures” and the joint “Lithuanian and Russian Action Plan for Co-operation in Case of Pollution accidents in the Baltic Sea” were also discussed during the meeting mentioned above. Both States Parties agreed on some provisions of the Agreement that had not been agreed upon before. The Intergovernmental Commission of the Republic of Lithuania and the Russian Federation on trade and economy, science and technology, humanitarian and cultural cooperation, held in Svetlogorsk Russian Federation (December 2007) and chaired by the latter, urged both States Parties to accelerate the signing of the Agreement. Both States Parties mentioned in their reports that the Agreement is being approved by the respective national authorities. However, Lithuania expressed its wish that the agreement should be signed as early as possible.
- c) The Joint “Lithuanian and Russian Action Plan for Co-operation in Case of Pollution accidents in the Baltic Sea” has been finalised but cannot be signed since the above-mentioned Agreement, which constitutes the legal basis for the Plan, has still not been ratified by the States Parties.

The Russian report further informs that the creation of a joint Environmental Monitoring Programme of the Russian and Lithuanian parts of the Baltic Sea continues. The programme permits the exchange of monitoring results. The results of 2007 monitoring are to be discussed at the forthcoming Joint Commission.

Concerning the sewage spill accident which took place at Klaipeda Water Treatment Station on 18 March 2007, the Lithuanian report informs that the broken treatment system was repaired on 20 March 2007. The report further specifies that only 1000 cubic meters passed to the Curonian Lagoon and that according to the conclusions of the Regional Environmental Protection Agency and marine experts, the impact on the water ecosystems of the Lagoon was minimal and there was no impact on the Curonian Spit. Furthermore, the Russian report noted that the sewage spill did not affect the Russian part of the property.

On other current conservation issues identified, the State Party of Lithuania reports that the most serious problem for this property has been intensive erosion due to the destructive impact of extremely powerful storms and hurricanes during the last decade. At the beginning of the 2007 about 9 hectares of the protected dunes were eroded partially by storms and scarps of 4 to 5 metres high opened in some areas. In those areas priority is given to coastal management measures. Methods such as strengthening the dunes with branches, fences, by grass and shrubs planting have already been successfully applied to other parts the Curonian Spit coasts, including the 9 hectares of the eroded dunes during 2007.

In conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the State Party of Lithuania reports that due to sporadic occurrence of possibly illegal constructions in the World Heritage property, legal procedures have been initiated to restrict negative impacts and to prevent such constructions in the future. Subsequently, 36 cases have been transmitted to the Klaipda Regional Administrative Court. 10 cases have been examined by the Court and met the complaints of the prosecutor. However, the decisions of this Court were appealed by owners to the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania. In one case, the latter decided that the judgement of the Klaipda Court was legitimate. Nine other appeals are due to be reviewed soon. The State Party report further specifies that the decisions of the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania are final and not subject to appeal.

**Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.98**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.67, 30 COM 7B.87, 31 COM 7B.114**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005), 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively;
3. Welcomes the continued collaboration between both States Parties and progress made in the Joint Lithuanian-Russian Post-project Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the D-6 oil platform, in the bilateral "Agreement Concerning Co-operation in Case of Pollution accidents, Pollution Prevention, Mitigation and Compensation Measures" and in the joint "Lithuanian and Russian Action Plan for Co-operation in Case of Pollution accidents in the Baltic Sea", and encourages them to continue bilateral environmental monitoring;
4. Regrets the delay in signing the above agreements and urges both States Parties to sign the Agreement and Action Plan and to initiate their implementation as a matter of urgency;
5. Notes the additional information provided by the State Party of Lithuania on other current conservation issues identified in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and requests the State Party of Lithuania to take into account the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property when examining cases of possibly illegal constructions in Court, and to keep the World Heritage Centre informed on any progress on these issues;
6. Also requests both States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a detailed and updated report, on the issues mentioned above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

**99. Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania) (C 541)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7B.79; 30 COM 7B.86**

### International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 114,550 between 1995 and 2000.

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: Within the framework of the Revitalization Strategy for Vilnius, UNDP – SPPD provided USD 64,000; World Heritage Fund: USD 23,245.66 for the organization of training workshops by ICCROM.

### Previous monitoring missions

1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000: World Heritage Centre project missions; May 2005: World Heritage Centre site visit; December 2006: on-site regional seminar

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) High rise buildings outside the buffer zone of Vilnius Historic Centre which have an impact on the visual integrity of the property;
- b) Demolition of wooden heritage in the buffer zone;
- c) Lack of integrated management plan.

### Current conservation issues

At its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006), the World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to develop a fully integrated management plan, through a participatory consultation process, which would coordinate all decisions affecting development in the old town. In a report dated 2 February 2008, the State Party indicated progress made on the protection of the property.

### Management plan

In regard to the management plan, the State Party indicated that a new Master/General Plan for the City of Vilnius was approved by City Council of Vilnius on 14 February 2007. The State Party considers that this Master/General Plan, as the main strategic planning document for urban planning and development, should be considered as the management plan for the World Heritage property.

The State Party also noted that the Regulation on the Protection of the Vilnius Old Town, passed in 2003, was currently being updated to take into account the 2005 Law on Heritage Protection. It is expected that the updated regulation will be approved during 2008.

It is not clear, however, exactly how the Master/General Plan relates to the other planning instruments, protection initiatives, and decision-making systems in the Vilnius Old Town at the State and local levels. In general, master plans are concerned more with physical and territorial development, and are not necessarily adequate to incorporate all of the concerns related to the integrated management and protection of a World Heritage property.

It is the view of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, that such an integrated plan, carried out in a participatory manner as already requested by the Committee, is still needed, to adequately address the integrated management and protection of the World Heritage property.

### Buffer Zone

In regard to the buffer zone, the World Heritage Committee requested “the redefinition of the buffer zone surrounding the historic core, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session in 2008” as part of the overall preparation of the management plan.

The State Party reports that an exercise was carried out by the competent authorities to make minor modifications to the buffer zone of the property. These modifications will be

examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add).

The State Party also noted that the *Conceptual Plan of the Protection (Buffer) Zone of the World Heritage site – The Vilnius Old Town* was prepared and approved by the Vilnius City Council in 2006.

#### *Other Issues*

The State Party also reports that it is in the process of adopting a new special law on the protection of World Heritage Properties, *Concept Law of the Republic of Lithuania on Protection of the Objects of Lithuania Inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List* which is expected to be completed in 2008.

In regard to the issue of high-rise buildings, a regional seminar was held in Vilnius in December 2006, sponsored by the World Heritage Fund and coordinated by the Vilnius Old Town Renewal Agency (OTRA) and ICCROM, on “High-Rise Buildings and the Historic City Centre”. The meeting was attended by representatives of the three Baltic countries as well as participants from the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. The situation in Vilnius was presented, in particular the *Scheme on the Restriction of High-rise Construction* approved in 2004.

#### **Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.99**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.86**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),
3. Notes the continued efforts made by the Ministry of Culture and the Municipality of Vilnius related to the legal and planning framework for the conservation of the property, and in particular the development of a Master/General Plan for the City of Vilnius;
4. Notes with concern that an integrated management plan for the property has not been produced as a means of ensuring adequate management and protection;
5. Strongly urges the State Party to initiate, as requested during its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006) development of the fully integrated management plan, to govern and co-ordinate all decisions affecting the Old Town development and conservation, through participatory consultation processes.
6. Requests the State Party to ensure an adequate coordination mechanism for the implementation of the integrated management plan at both the local and national levels;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre the new Regulation on the Protection of the Vilnius Old Town, as well as the Master/General Plan and updated documentation on the development of high-rise buildings in the buffer zone for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the development of an integrated management plan for Vilnius Old Town as described in the recommendations above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.



## **100. Megalithic Temples of Malta (Malta) (C 132 bis)**

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980,1992 (extension)

### Criteria

(iv)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**28 COM 15 B.76, 29 COM 7B.80, 31 COM 7B.115,**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 77,448 for the safeguarding of the monoliths at the property of Hagar Qim (1998) implemented for USD 22,779

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

1994: UNESCO mission; 2001: ICOMOS mission; 2006: ICCROM mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

Absence of a management plan, need for visitor centres, protective shelters, and walkways, illegal constructions

### Current conservation issues

A draft management plan prepared by Heritage Malta (The National Agency for Museums, Conservation Practice and Cultural Heritage) was received by the World Heritage Centre on 1 February 2008, and was reviewed by ICOMOS.

This Plan has been prepared in full conformity with the requirements of the Committee. After setting out the parameters underlying the needs of World Heritage sites and monuments in terms of management it sets out a series of objectives, classified as overall long-term objectives, statutory and policy objectives, land-use objectives, sustainable tourism, visitor management, management of leisure and sport activities, impacts on local communities, conservation objectives, and research and documentation objectives. The achievement of these objectives is defined by 29 specific actions.

The State Party also submitted an additional report on 4 March 2008 on action taken in respect of the visitor centres, protective covers, and walkways in response to the World Heritage Committee's request. The three key projects were those for (1) the Haġar Qim and Mnajdra Archaeological Park, (2) the Tarxien Temples, and (3) the Ġgantija Temples. The present submission of detailed designs and drawings was restricted in scope to (1), where the design process of the major components had now been completed. In the 2007 report, it

had been indicated that work on site was expected to start in the second half of 2007. Owing to a number of design improvements and mitigation measures that were undertaken, this work was now scheduled to take place during the 2nd and 3rd quarters of 2008. The detailed designs and drawings for project in Tarxien Temples would be submitted later in 2008 and those for project in Ġgantija Temples by early 2009.

**Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.100**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **29 COM 7B.80** and **31 COM 7B.115**, adopted at its 29th (Durban, 2005) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Noting that the State Party has completed the draft management plan,*
4. *Urges the State Party to work towards its timely finalization, approval and implementation;*
5. *Acknowledges the progress made by the State Party in the design of the visitor centre for the Haġar Qim and Mnajdra Archaeological Park and the protective shelters, taking into account advice by the 2006 expert mission for these components of the property and requests the State Party to take into consideration the need to minimize the impacts of the constructions mentioned above on the outstanding universal value and visual integrity of the property;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the final management plan for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a report on its implementation, as well as a report on work at the Haġar Qim and Mnajdra Archaeological Park and on the proposed works at the Tarxien and Ġgantija Temples.*

**101. 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

**28 COM 15B.78; 29 COM 7B.84; 31 COM 7B.100**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 46,000 (and Participation Programme 2002-04, USD 47,000).

### Previous monitoring missions

2003: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission; January 2006: Management planning Course; February 2008: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Earthquake damage;
- b) Lack of management planning;
- c) Urban development and urban pressure.

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a progress report to the World Heritage Centre dated 1 February 2008.

The joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out from 18 to 21 February 2008 to review the proposed bridge construction of the Verige crossing and the overall situation of the property, following the submission of the draft management plan for the World Heritage property. The mission carefully considered the bridge proposal and expressed its concern about potential impacts and recommended a number of steps to be taken before any final decisions are taken on the bridge proposal. It also recommended the implementation of the management plan for effective management and protection of the property and the overall sustainability of its socio-economic and cultural development.

The summary conclusions and key recommendations of the mission are as follows:

#### *Verige Bridge*

The mission noted that the current location of the Verige bridge is 2.5 km away from the World Heritage property and welcomed the fact that another site within the boundaries of the property had been rejected. The mission however recommended that the following steps be urgently undertaken:

- a) Definition and delineation of a buffer zone around the core area of the property as requested since 2003 to enhance protection in accordance with Paragraphs 103 to 107 of the *Operational Guidelines*; The mission urged the authorities to clearly define such a buffer zone for the protection of the property and take into account the integral aspects of the whole Boca Kotorška. This region has an overall cohesion integrating cultural and natural aspects into a cultural landscape;
- b) Commissioning of a *visual impact study* for the current bridge proposal taking into consideration the outstanding universal value of the property and its landscape setting, within the whole territory of the Boca Kotorška, including the World Heritage property and its surroundings (future buffer zone), as well as important views (specifically between Perast and the Adriatic Sea), and connection lines; The authorities could consider carrying out either a separate visual impact study or integrating it in the overall environmental impact assessment (EIA) required for the project. The mission further discussed that other geographical and technical options may exist which could also be taken into consideration. The mission concluded that no bridge construction should be

allowed prior to the delineation of a buffer zone already requested in 2003 and the visual impact study.

- c) In case other bridge or tunnel options are considered, environmental and cultural impact assessments should be carried out, including visual impacts;

### *Management*

The draft management plan submitted in 2007 was reviewed by ICOMOS and ICCROM. It was also reviewed by the mission, which recommended that it be approved after completing it with the legal protection, clear delineation of a buffer zone, and adequate tools to implement it. The mission also suggested a better coordination among the institutions and authorities involved and a review of its status versus different other plans. The mission further noted that the management system is not adequate due to the lack of a specific site manager (although the Institute had been nominated) and effective control mechanisms. An advisory committee could be created with international expert consultation. No financial commitment by the government is currently foreseen in the management mechanism. The mission urged the authorities to ensure optimal coordination among different plans and legal instruments including the Spatial Plan of Montenegro (1996/2008), the Law on Coastal Zones (2008), municipal plans, urban development and zoning plans. The mission noted that the legal framework for the property is not adequate and expressed concern about the ongoing and accelerated urban development of the Kotor region. The dynamics of these transformation processes are beyond prediction and existing institutions cannot cope with it. The lack of consensus between private and public interests is linked with the lack of coordination between different planning instruments; The mission recommended developing an Integral Urban and Spatial Plan for the whole area which covers the three communities of Kotor, Tivat, and Hezeg Novi to ensure integrated planning and development processes in the region.

### *Conservation*

The mission noted that the state of conservation of the historic city of Kotor is adequate with excellent restoration works. The Regional Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments in Kotor closely works with municipalities and communities on the protection, restoration and valorisation of cultural heritage monuments and ensembles. The mission however points out that the overall cultural landscape is not taken into account in a holistic manner and that professional expertise in this regard could be strengthened. The mission noted that all development and infrastructure projects need to be taken into account within this overall framework. This includes ongoing traffic developments. The full report of the joint mission is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008>.

### **Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.101**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **29 COM 7B.84** and **31 COM 7B.100**, adopted at its 29th (Durban, 2005) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Noting the results of the February 2008 World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission to the property to examine the suitability of the proposed bridge at Verige and its impacts on the outstanding universal value of the property and its landscape values,*
4. *Urges the State Party to delineate a buffer zone to better protect the property and consider re-nominating an enlarged area around the bay as a cultural landscape;*

5. Requests the State Party to take into account the detailed recommendations of the joint mission and also urges the authorities to carry out a visual impact study of the Verige bridge project;
6. Also requests the State Party to carry out detailed environmental, cultural and visual impact studies in the event that other bridge or tunnel options are considered in the future;
7. Encourages the State Party to complete the management plan after having put in place adequate legal protection, a buffer zone and appropriate resources; and further requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, to develop a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
8. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 **February 2009**, a copy of the visual impact study and a progress report on the approval and implementation of the management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

## 102. Auschwitz Birkenau

**German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp (1940-1945)  
(Poland) (C 31)**

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

### Criteria

(vi)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7B.68; 30 COM 7B.88; 31 COM 7B.101**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20,000 (preparatory assistance, 1998) for the organisation of an international expert meeting on the planning and protection of the surroundings of the World Heritage Site Auschwitz Concentration Camp.

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 10,000 from Israel

### Previous monitoring missions

July 2001: Reactive Monitoring mission Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee / World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS; December 2006: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS site visit during the management seminar

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of management plan;
- b) Consultation with local communities.

### Current conservation issues

As requested by the World Heritage Committee (**31 COM 7B.101**) the State Party submitted on 1 February 2008 a state of conservation report on the property including a report on progress since its last report of April 2007.

The State Party notes that the work on the management plan is progressing since the draft management plan was sent to the World Heritage Centre in April 2007 and that is being further discussed and developed in particular with efforts aimed at building confidence with the local community. The State Party organized an Expert Workshop from 10 to 13 May 2008 to review the status of the management plan and discuss a strategy for the World Heritage property. The international consultation meeting on "AUSCHWITZ BIRKENAU. German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp (1940-1945) UNESCO World Heritage site", which was held in Kraków and Oświęcim, 10-13 May 2008, was crucial to continue the consultation process following the preparation of the management plan with stakeholders to ensure its implementation. The establishment of the National Heritage Board as a focal point for World Heritage matters in Poland was a positive development as is the work carried out to inventory and register structures relevant to the Holocaust but outside the two camps.

However, the management plan, although formally adopted by the Ministry for Culture in May 2007 does not have the full support of all stakeholders. The consultation meeting had therefore also a public meeting with relevant stakeholders on 12 May 2008 to discuss the issues. The consultation meeting reviewed the implementation of the 2006 recommendations and came up with a series of suggestions and recommendations, including on tourism management, infrastructure development such as roads and registering additional buildings. The meeting was particularly concerned by proposals for the S1 Expressway and the link road to Oswiecim. The full report is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008/> which has been transmitted to the authorities for consideration.

The Minister for Culture and National Heritage took the decision that the National Heritage Board of Poland is responsible for supervising the work of the management plan. A Steering Committee was already appointed in 2006, which held its last meeting in October 2007. During the meeting the Representatives of the City of Oswiecim expressed their negative attitude to all works carried out outside the protective zone. A conservation strategy based on the draft management plan is now being prepared to specify principles and guidelines. The final version of the strategy framework was ready for national consultation by March 2008; however the need for close cooperation with International experts was identified. The report details other issues including the visitor traffic to the site with an increased number of visitors with an average of 3,300 per day (2007:1,2 million people), the construction of a car park with access to the Birkenau site and the reorganization of the Museum display.

Concerning the protection of the property and its surroundings the report notes the strict legal protect under a number of legal provisions. It details that new documents are being studied and research work undertaken. Intensive work is being carried out on the surroundings to enter selected buildings and sites into the register of monuments, as proposed by the 2006 workshop. In addition, the Director of the Auschwitz Museum provided a copy of the 2007 report which details a great number of education and awareness activities.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.102**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7B.88**, and **31 COM 7B.101**, adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the progress made following the submission of the draft management plan for the property in April 2007, the preparation of a strategy and consultations undertaken with international experts in May 2008 as well as work on entering relevant buildings in the surroundings of the property on the register of monuments;*
4. *Also notes the understandably slow progress with stakeholder consultations which delays the finalization of the management plan and the associated strategy and encourages the State Party to intensify efforts to ensure involvement of local communities;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the status of the management plan, the strategy and implementation frameworks, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

**103. Historic Centre of Sighisoara (Romania) (C 902)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

Criteria

(iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**28 COM 15B 94 ; 29 COM 7B.82 ; 31 COM 7B.117**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20,000

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2002 : World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Dracula Park project ;
- b) Deterioration of monuments in general and the fortifications in particular ;
- c) Lack of protection and maintenance measures, local responsibility and funding strategies.

### Current conservation issues

The State Party's report, received on 15 February 2008, provided information on the state of conservation of the property, projects, and activities undertaken by the National Institute of Historic Monuments of Romania and the Municipality of Sighisoara since the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007), as follows :

#### *Monitoring of the state of conservation*

The monitoring of the state of conservation of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara was included in the 2007 work plan of the National Institute of Historic Monuments. All the problems linked to the protection of the property were assessed during the missions of specialists of the Institute. The report contained statistics concerning the state of conservation of the property: 44% of the buildings are in good condition; 29% are in fairly good conditions; 20% are in poor condition; 7% are in a very bad state of repair. Around the walls of the City, extending over 930 m, the experts noted collapsed areas where the stability of the structure was at risk. The towers, fortifications and most of the houses of the city suffer from cracks in the walls, uneven floorboards or damage to the wooden structures. Masonry and plastering suffer from condensation, infiltrations and mould. The experts also evaluated examples of interventions on the buildings (use of inadequate material, replacement of traditional carpentry, irregular interventions on the façades), as well as examples of reuse of houses threatening the historic urban fabric.

"Action plan" comprise proposals and recommendations to follow during the different interventions on buildings, as well as proposals for public areas and infrastructure which have been prepared by the experts in the framework of the Feasibility Study for the Rehabilitation and Revitalization Project for the Historic City of Sighisoara, approved by the National Commission for Historic Monuments in July 2007.

#### *Protection and management of the site*

With the report on the state of conservation, the State Party transmitted the « Framework Protection and Management Programme of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara » completed by the National Institute of Historic Monuments with international assistance, as well as the Strategic Development Plan for Sighisoara prepared at the request of the Municipality of the City (« Support for Cities » - URBACT 2002-2006 project). The Framework Programme addresses all concerned institutions and organizations, includes a plan of activities for 2007-2012 for the protection of the property. The State Party informed that the Ministry for Development, Public Works and Housing granted financial support for the implementation of the Urbanism and Protected Areas Plan of Sighisoara.

In collaboration with the Tourism Association of Sighisoara, the Municipality has elaborated a Sustainable Development Plan for Tourism to improve the quality of tourism and diversification of services. A Tourist Information Office was opened in June 2007, thanks to support from the UNESCO Office in Venice. At each entrance to the city signage announces the inscription of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara on the World Heritage List. The National Institute of Historic Monuments collaborated in the preparation of the methodology for the evaluation of potential tourism of the territory, integrated into the National Spatial Development Plan.

#### *Rehabilitation, restoration, construction*



The consolidation project for some parts of the surrounding wall of the Citadelle, as well as the paving project of the streets and public areas of the Citadel are progressing.

#### *Training activities*

In November 2007, the National Institute of Historic Monuments and the Municipality of the City of Sighisoara organized a seminar on the Rehabilitation and Revitalization of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara.

#### *Promotional activities*

In 2007, the Ministry of Culture and Cults published an album « Romania. Patrimoine Mondial. World Heritage ». Several promotional activities were organized in Sighisoara during 2007.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS noted that the report prepared by the national authorities contained detailed information concerning the state of conservation of the property, as well as details relating to implemented projects. All initiatives on the part of the national authorities aimed at the continued monitoring of the state of conservation of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara should be encouraged.

The report mentioned that the Framework Programme for the Protection and Management of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara, was addressed to all the institutions and organizations concerned. However, the report does not indicate whether the Plan for the Protection and Management of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara is completed and approved by the State Party.

#### **Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.103**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.117**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the detailed report of the State Party, and the elaboration of the Framework Programme for the Protection and Management of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara ;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to explore all avenues to closely monitor the state of conservation of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara ;*
5. *Urges the State Party to approve and establish the Plan for the Protection and Management of the property including the Manual for Restoration, Rehabilitation and Construction;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, an updated and detailed report including the Plan for the Protection and Management of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

#### **104. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)**

##### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1990

##### Criteria

(i) (iv) (v)

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

N/A

##### Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7B.83; 30 COM 7B.72 ; 31 COM 7B.88**

##### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 29,540 for Emergency Assistance (2003)

##### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

##### Previous monitoring missions

1992, 1993, 1994: ICOMOS mission; August 2002: UNESCO / ICOMOS / ICCROM mission and on-site workshop; April 2007: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

##### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Structural integrity of the Church of the Transfiguration;
- b) Absence of an integrated management plan that addresses overall management of the World Heritage property;
- c) Tourism development pressures affecting the property.

##### Current conservation issues

As requested by the World Heritage Committee, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 5 February 2008 the state of conservation report which only partially responds to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee.

The State Party informed that significant progress had been achieved in implementing the decisions by the World Heritage Committee, in particular the implementation of technical preparatory work for restoration of the Church of the Transfiguration, as well as the reinforcement of risk preparedness measures. The first pilot restoration works have started by the Kizhi Museum Reserve Direction in compliance with the request by the World Heritage Committee.

However, in the Explanatory Note annexed to the State Party report, the Director of the Kizhi Museum Reserve underlined that, at this stage, the complete restoration works cannot be started without clearly designated delegated administrative and executive authority for this project, although the World Heritage Committee requested at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) that the State Party start immediately with the repair and restoration works of the Church of Transfiguration.

The World Heritage Centre noted that the report was prepared by the Directorate of the Kizhi Museum Reserve. As site manager, the Director provided very detailed and complete information on its activities concerning this World Heritage property, including environmental and landscape issues.

The information requested by the World Heritage Committee, which is missing in the State Party report (e.g. draft of the integrated management plan for Kizhi Pogost; maps indicating the boundaries of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone), should be provided by the Federal authorities. It seems that they are still not actively involved in the process concerning the restoration works or the preparation and implementation of a comprehensive management plan for this World Heritage property, which should include tourism development, an overall vision for the site as well as clear boundary and buffer zone definition (including its eventual revision).

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS underline the importance of the participation of all stakeholders concerned at all levels to the process of the safeguarding, protection and management of the World Heritage property, as well as the preparation of the state of conservation reports requested by the World Heritage Committee. Taking into account the importance and difficulties of the restoration works of the Church of the Transfiguration, as well as specificities of the fluvial tourism development the State Party could be invited to create a Special State Committee or Group with two commissions, one in charge of the restoration works, other of the management and tourism development issues.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.104**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.88**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Urges the State Party to start immediately with the repair and restoration works of the Church of Transfiguration;*
4. *Notes the continuous efforts by the Directorate of the Kizhi Museum Reserve in the management of the World Heritage property, which represents a small part of the territory of the Reserve and encourages the site management to continue its work towards an integrated management plan for the property;*
5. *Also urges the State Party to urgently confirm the implementation of the necessary administrative arrangements concerning the delegation of authorities for the restoration works, as well as the funds made available for restoration works for the duration of the project;*
6. *Invites the State Party to establish a Special State Group in charge of effective coordination, in close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's decisions and the recommendations by the reactive monitoring missions concerning this property;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a progress report on all issues mentioned above, including the following documents:*
  - a) *Detailed progress report of the restoration works;*
  - b) *Draft Statement of outstanding universal value, including the conditions of integrity and authenticity;*

- c) *Three printed and electronic copies of the draft integrated management plan for Kizhi Pogost including a tourism strategy, risk preparedness measures and maps indicating the boundaries of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone;*
- d) *Revised and approved documents concerning protected areas of the Kizhi Museum Reserve including the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone;*

*for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, with a view to consider, in the absence of substantial progress, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.*

## **105. 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

**14 COM VII.A; 30 COM.7B.78; 31 COM 7B.102**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 17,620 for the St Petersburg International Conference, January 2007;

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 18,000 from the Dutch Funds-in-Trust

### Previous monitoring missions:

February 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission; 28 January to 3 February 2007: International Conference of 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.

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Quality of new design projects in the inscribed zone;
- b) Confusion over definition and extent of inscribed zone and buffer zone;

### Current conservation issues

Although the World Heritage Committee, at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), requested the State Party to submit a state of conservation report, the State Party only submitted a set

of maps. No information was provided on high rise development, including the issuing of building permits, nor details on the Gazprom project, the so-called "Ohkta Centre".

During an official visit to Moscow in September 2007, the Deputy Director General of UNESCO reiterated the World Heritage Committee's decision concerning the high rise development within the boundary or with potential visual impact to the Historic Centre of St. Petersburg.

During a mission to Moscow from 6 to 10 December 2007, the Director of UNESCO's World Heritage Centre, met representatives of Gazprom and its affiliate the Social and Business Centre Okhta, as well as the British architectural firm RMJM, which won the competition for the tower of the Ohkta Centre. Representatives of the National Commission of the Russian Federation for UNESCO were also present at the meetings. During these meetings, the Director indicated that alternatives for the design of the tower respecting the value and spirit of this historic city should be found, and suggested that Gazprom and the City of St. Petersburg work in that direction.

Representatives of the federal authorities informed UNESCO that the project to build a tower in the Historic Centre of St. Petersburg was, at this stage, only "an architectural concept." They moreover said that they have received no technical documents from the City of St Petersburg so far. The World Heritage Centre offered its assistance to the Russian authorities towards finding a solution which would preserve the outstanding universal value that warranted the inscription of the Historic Centre of St Petersburg on the World Heritage List.

The World Heritage Centre has been informed by local and international NGO's, civil society and media on the situation in St. Petersburg, including information on the existing regulation which limits construction to 48 m and which could be revised up to 100 m. Furthermore, information was received that preparatory works already started on the site proposed for the Gazprom high-rise building.

The World Heritage Centre asked for official details of the existing situation and regrets that no report had been received from the State Party in accordance with the World Heritage Committee's decision.

On 5 February 2008, the State Party transmitted the new version of the report entitled "*Proposals of St Petersburg on Identifying the World Heritage Area: Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments*" prepared within the framework of the Retrospective Inventory project and based on the seminar "Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Group of Monuments" held by the authorities in December 2007. However the delimitation of some components of the property was still not considered satisfactory, especially for the Historic Centre of St. Petersburg, and maps for the components of the property located within Leningrad Region were still missing.

In its previous and repeated comments on boundary clarification and modification of this World Heritage property, the World Heritage Centre already provided detailed information which need to be submitted by the State Party. Taking into account that the State Party noted, once again, various mistakes, discrepancies and gaps in the World Heritage nomination documents originally submitted, owing to the different legal system in place at the time, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider the urgent need to create a special group of experts to assist the authorities and national experts to finalise the boundary clarification document based on the evaluation of more than 36 components with 136 elements of this serial property. The site manager already underlined the necessity to receive international expert's technical assistance on this issue. This exercise should be carry out in parallel with the preparation of the draft of the Statement of the outstanding universal value.

The World Heritage Centre wishes to underline the importance of the more active involvement of the Federal authorities in the process aiming to safeguard this exceptional World Heritage property.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.105**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.102**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not provide the detailed state of conservation report, including the high rise development project in St. Petersburg requested by the World Heritage Committee, and also regrets that the maps submitted by the State Party dated 18 January 2007, 5 March 2007 and 5 February 2008, did not comply with the World Heritage Committee's request as they did not provide detailed boundaries and buffer zones of all components of the property, including the Leningrad Region;*
4. *Expresses its concern about the proposed Gazprom tower of the "Ohkta Centre", which could affect the outstanding universal value of this property and recalls that it considered at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) the possibility of inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
5. *Urges the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre on the official position of the Russian authorities vis-à-vis the existing project of the "Ohkta Centre" tower in St. Petersburg; and encourages it to revise the proposed design of the tower;*
6. *Invites the State Party to establish, in coordination with the World Heritage Centre, an international expert group on the St. Petersburg Retrospective Inventory, and provide necessary financial support for this activity;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a state of conservation report, including details on the Gazprom project of the "Ohkta Centre", which may have an impact on the outstanding universal value of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, **with a view to consider inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

**106. Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## 107. Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation) (C 1170)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

### Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 8B.43**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Main threats identified in previous reports

Changes in the built fabric

### Current conservation issues

On 20 August and 2 September 2007, the World Heritage Centre was informed by representatives of the civil society and NGOs that new construction works, authorised by the President of the Russian World Heritage Committee, started within the boundaries of the property. The World Heritage was also informed that on 29 August 2007 the court of the City of Yaroslavl temporarily halted the construction work of a commercial complex on the Volkov place. The Director General of UNESCO received a letter dated 11 September 2007 concerning a construction project of a cultural and commercial centre considered by the authorities of the Yaroslavl region.

Following the letter of 26 September 2007 from the President of the Russian World Heritage Committee concerning the new project, the World Heritage Centre requested, on 29 October 2007, the State Party to provide complete documentation of this project including maps and plans necessary for its evaluation by the Advisory Bodies. The World Heritage Centre furthermore asked for a detailed report concerning the current state of conservation of this World Heritage property including the description of any intentions to undertake or to authorize major restorations or new constructions which may affect the World Heritage value of the property in compliance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

No report has been provided by the State Party at the time of the drafting of this document.

Taking into account information concerning different projects which could affect the outstanding universal values of the property, as well as the decision of the World Heritage Committee at the time of the inscription which requested the State Party to pay particular attention to monitoring and management trends and eventual changes in the built fabric, as well as to the functions of the nominated area and its buffer zone, the World Heritage Centre

and ICOMOS consider it necessary to dispatch a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.107**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 8B.43**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Expresses its concern about numerous construction and restoration projects within the boundaries of the property which could affect its outstanding universal value;*
4. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property;*
5. *Also requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, to develop, prior to the arrival of the mission, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2009**, a detailed state of conservation report including, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, the description of any intention to undertake or to authorize major restorations or new constructions which may affect the outstanding universal value of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

**108. Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320 bis)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

**109. 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

**29 COM 7B.86; 30 COM 7B.92; 31 COM 7B.119**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2002: ICOMOS mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressure;
- b) Lack of comprehensive management plan.

Current conservation issues

In accordance with the World Heritage Committee's requests (**30 COM 7B.92; 31 COM 7B.119**), the State Party organized a training and information seminar on management of Spanish World Heritage cities, which took place from 27-28 September 2007 in Aranjuez, Spain. The results of the seminar can be found at: <http://www.aranjuezcultural.es/actividades/>. Given that the seminar did not take place in Salamanca, it did not allow the expert group to focus on the urban interventions in the property. The case of Salamanca was however presented and discussed at the seminar.

Following these discussions, the World Heritage Centre received on 24 October 2007 the documentation on the revised project of the Huerto de las Adoratrices. In agreement with the developer Caja de Duero the project was redesigned by a new architects team of Alvaro Siza Vieira (Portugal) and Juan-Miguel Hernandez Leon (Spain), and the surface use, height as well as building volumes were reduced. The authorities further informed that permission for construction is pending and should be given as soon as possible.

ICOMOS noted that the design was not fully described or worked out in the documents so that it is not possible to understand if some of the earlier and current ICOMOS recommendations have been addressed. It further noted that, while the revised project is an improvement in terms of visual impacts on its historic surroundings, there continue to be contradictions and ambiguity in the design proposals made when comparing it to the recommendations of the 2002 mission. Compared to the first project reviewed by the mission in 2002, the new project foresees a reduction of the building height to allow for visual prominence of the surrounding historical buildings. The proposed building takes up the traditional patio structure encircling the building plot and leaving open garden space. The auditorium building itself will be located within a part of the patio space. The roof levels shall be set back from the street, and the material chosen is traditional Salamanca sandstone. The project team ensured that the ground water level would not be negatively impacted by the proposed building structure.

Despite the recommendations of the 2002 mission, the existing walls of the 'Huerto' are still planned to be integrated into the street façade of the building. Like in the first project, a significant number of existing buildings – namely the current building of the Adoratrices and the connecting buildings to neighbouring plots – are planned to be taken down to make room for (1) the new main building, and (2) for the refurbishment of an adjacent pedestrian street that shall allow accessibility to all sides of the future auditorium building and to the apsidal of the church Santa Maria de los Caballeros.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that more attention should be paid to ensure that necessary changes respect the adequate functional and aesthetic perspectives and contribute to define the identity and unity of the area, given that the area adjacent to the Adoratrices project shows a very indented hence fragile boundary. It further needs to be underlined that the recommendations of the 2002 mission report and the decisions of the World Heritage Committee at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions have not been fully met.

It is therefore recommended that the Adoratrices project be suspended to allow for a World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission to evaluate the state of conservation of the property. The objective of the mission should be to work out jointly with local authorities what kind of design changes and management planning changes would allow the State Party to meet the World Heritage Committee's request and expectations.

Further to the project of the Huerto de las Adoratrices, several ongoing rehabilitation and construction projects in the core and buffer zones were brought to the World Heritage Centre's attention by local NGOs as being problematic.

ICOMOS considers that the new Urban Law does not constitute the kind of integrated management plan involving all stakeholders and focusing on preservation of outstanding universal value that has been requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th and 31st sessions.

Such a management plan would ensure that those projects and amendments to the approved urban development plan (PGOU) are in line with the long-term conservation objectives agreed in the "Convenio" between the Regional Government of Castilla y Leon and the City of Salamanca signed in 2007.

The State Party further transmitted a map of the city of Salamanca intended to clarify the boundaries of the core and the buffer zones. However, this document was returned to the State Party for further clarification.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.109**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7B.92** and **31 COM 7B.119**, adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and its 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the results of the seminar on management of Spanish World Heritage cities (27-28 September 2007, Aranjuez, Spain);*
4. *Expresses its concern about the lack of progress with the integrated management plan for the property;*
5. *Also noting the changes made to the "Huerto de las Adoratrices project", requests the State Party*
  - a) *to suspend the project until the results of an expert mission are available;*
  - b) *to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to evaluate the overall state of conservation of the property, the Huerto de las Adoratrices project and the management requirements and boundary clarification of the property, in discussion with the local authorities;*

- c) to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, and prior to the arrival of the mission, a draft Statement of Outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
6. Recalling Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, also requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre about any major restoration or construction projects or significant changes to the approved urban development plan (PGOU) and conservation documents, which may affect the outstanding universal value of the property;
7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2009, a progress report on the implementation of the Convenio between Regional Government of Castilla y Leon and the City of Salamanca and on the preparation of the integrated management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

#### **110. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

#### **111. Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis)**

##### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1990

##### Criteria

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

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

N/A

##### Previous Committee Decisions

**27 COM 7B.80 ; 28 COM 15B.99 ; 29 COM 8B.56**

##### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: 1998, USD 19,750

##### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

May 1999: ICOMOS expert mission; April 2006: expert mission (Italian Funds-in-Trust); November 2007: World Heritage Centre information meeting for site managers

### Main threats identified in previous reports

Urban development pressure

### Current conservation issues

In line with the World Heritage Committee Decision **28 COM 15B.99**, the State Party kept the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS informed on different projects, which may have an impact on the property.

On 1 December 2005, the State Party invited an expert mission, which took place in April 2006, to assess the state of conservation of the St. Sophia Cathedral of Kiev and its Bell Tower, as well as to review studies on scientific and technical problems of protection and conservation of this property. The expert mission's recommendations were integrated into the conservation programme for St. Sophia.

On 27 December 2006, the State Party transmitted to the World Heritage Centre information on the reconstruction works planned in the vicinity of the St. Sophia Cathedral. Following evaluation, ICOMOS did not support the proposed works.

On 14 February 2008, the State Party transmitted to the World Heritage Centre a project proposal for the renovation of the Mystetsky Arsenal which will be used as a Cultural Art and Museum Complex, situated within the buffer zone of the property. The project proposal has not been finalised yet and exists only as a concept. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS have also been alerted about development projects in the vicinity of the property.

During the meeting with Ukrainian site managers organised by the Direction of St. Sophia Cathedral jointly with the Ukrainian National Commission for UNESCO (November 2007, Kiev), the representative of the World Heritage Centre discussed issues concerning the urban development pressure within the boundaries of the property, its buffer zone and the wider setting, as well as the use of the cultural monuments for religious purposes.

In addition, the State Party provided in January 2008 the boundary clarification document requested for the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra, as well as the proposal for boundary and name modifications, which will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document *WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add*).

Considering the high number of development projects within the buffer zone of the property, there is a need to ensure adequate review and environmental and cultural impact assessments for these proposals. It is also urgent to establish a National Coordination Board, which will assure the collaboration between the two site managers (St. Sophia Direction, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra Direction), the Kiev City Municipality, as well as the Orthodox Church.

### **Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.111**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decisions **28 COM 15B.99** and **29 COM 8B.56**, adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,

3. Notes the continued collaboration of the State Party with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS;
4. Expresses its concern about numerous construction or restoration projects within the buffer zone of the property which could affect the outstanding universal value of the property;
5. Invites the State Party to create a National Coordination Board in order to enhance collaboration between all stakeholders concerned;
6. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property and the issues identified in Decision **29 COM 8B.56**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005);
7. Also requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, to develop, prior to the arrival of the mission, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a state of conservation report covering all components of this property including, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, the description of any intention to undertake or to authorize major restoration or new construction projects which may affect the outstanding universal value of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

## **112. Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## **113. Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom) (C 426)**

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

**30 COM 7B.74; 31 COM 7B.91**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

November 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Construction proposals in the immediate vicinity of the Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church World Heritage property that could have an adverse impact on the setting, related vistas and integrity of the World Heritage property;
- b) Lack of an in-depth visual impact study on possible impacts of development projects, as well as the lack of an approved management plan;
- c) Need for a protection of the immediate surrounding of the World Heritage property through an adequate and commonly agreed buffer zone;

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on 31 January 2008. It also submitted a draft Statement of outstanding universal value. This will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8B of the Agenda (Document *WHC-08/32.COM/8B*).

#### a) *Dynamic Visual Impact Study*

The State Party has reported that this study is still on-going. It is part of a wider study being undertaken by English Heritage called "Seeing History in the View" which will set out a methodology for assessing the impact of development on views to and from World Heritage properties. No further details have been provided to the World Heritage Centre on this study and no timescale is given for completion. There is concern that the study being undertaken is generic rather than specific to the Westminster Palace. The World Heritage Committee had a specific request for a skyline study of the Westminster Palace, the Abbey and the Church, its setting, and views, in order to allow rapid assessment of the potential impact of proposed development.

An objective of the Management plan is to undertake this study.

#### b) *Buffer Zone*

The World Heritage Committee requested measures on protection of the immediate surroundings of Westminster Palace through an adequate and commonly agreed buffer zone. The management plan makes it clear that there is currently no buffer zone, as defined in the *Operational Guidelines*, which would help to sustain the special qualities of the setting of the property. Without appropriate consideration of the sensitivities of the property and its setting, development beyond the boundary on a large scale may pose risks to the outstanding universal value. The State Party's report states that delineation of a buffer zone will follow the Visual Impact Study.

#### c) *Management plan*

In June 2007, the State Party had submitted the completed management plan for review by ICOMOS. This plan was produced by a Steering Group working with consultants.

The aim of the management plan is: "*to complement but not supersede the relevant policies set by the site owners and managers, Westminster City Council and the Greater London*

*Authority; to provide guidance for day to day management and long-term strategies; and to set a shared framework, within which the multiplicity of activities, requirements and opportunities can be balanced with the protection of the special qualities of the site”.*

The issues, which now or in the future, might undermine the outstanding universal value of Westminster, have been set out with appropriate objectives for each. One management objective is to “*seek the immediate integration of St Margaret Street, Abingdon Street, Old Palace Yard and Parliament Square, including Cannon Green within the boundary of the World Heritage Site in order to ensure their protection and to create a single unified site*”, and “*In the medium term, to consider an enlargement of the World Heritage site in order to include, and therefore protect, those buildings and spaces associated with the Palace of Westminster, Westminster Abbey including St Margaret’s Church, which share the outstanding universal value. Such elements would include buildings spaces and archaeology of particular importance.*”

The plan also includes the following objective: “*To seek to ensure that the World Heritage Liaison Steering Group scrutinises proposals for landscape, transport, traffic management, street furnishing or significant infrastructure projects, within or close to the World Heritage site in order to encourage such proposals to take into account the significances and value of the World Heritage site, address and realise the objectives of the World Heritage site management plan*”.

These aforementioned objectives do not compensate for the lack of a proper definition of zones around the World Heritage property. There are no defined statutory buffer zones for the site. The management plan refers to external policies relevant to the preservation of the property, but the mechanisms of future negotiations between stakeholders and possible conflict resolutions are not explored. It is not clear enough from the documents to what extent the management plan is subject to a formal agreement nor who will endorse the plan.

#### d) *Update on legislation*

The State Party provided information on the draft “Heritage Protection Bill”, previously mentioned as the “Heritage Protection White Paper”. This will be put before Parliament in 2007-2008. In advance of this, three new measures are also being considered regarding procedures for development proposals, strengthening the protection of World Heritage properties and guidance on the status and use of buffer zones.

#### *Development proposals*

The State Party provided the following information on development proposals affecting the property identified at the last World Heritage Committee in 2007:

- *Beetham Tower*: An application for a 170 metre tower (10 metres less than the plans presented in August 2007) was approved by Southwark Council in December 2007. The State Party indicates that this application might be ‘called-in’ and thus be subject to a Public Inquiry and they therefore consider that they cannot comment further.

- *Doon Street*: This development which includes a 144 metre residential tower was subject to a Public Inquiry from 10 to 20 February 2008, the outcome of which has not been communicated yet.

- *Elizabeth House*: The initial application for three blocks up to 117 metres high have now been slightly revised and will be considered by the Lambeth Planning Committee in April 2008.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS have also been alerted to plans for a major development scheme at Victoria station, which includes tall towers and could have an impact on the setting, the outstanding universal value and the integrity of the World Heritage property.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that progress has been made with the development of the management plan but express concern that this has not made clear how conflicts between conservation and development in the setting of Westminster Palace might be addressed. There is also concern that no adequate buffer zone has been put in place. In addition, a specific skyline study of the property, its setting, and views has not been carried out, although a generic study of methodologies for assessing the impact of development on views for World Heritage properties is on-going.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.113**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.91**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the actions taken by the State Party in response to the World Heritage Committee's requests in developing a management plan, and preparing guidance on methodology for assessing development in World Heritage views;*
4. *Also notes progress with implementing proposals associated with the "Heritage Protection White Paper" and its subsequent "Heritage Protection Bill";*
5. *Regrets that the following issues still need to be addressed:*
  - a) *buffer zone with adequate protection,*
  - b) *specific skyline study of the property, its setting and views, to allow rapid in-depth assessments of the impact of development proposals in the immediate vicinity of the property,*
  - c) *lack of clarity on the management system set out in the management plan for addressing conflicts between conservation and development, particularly in the setting of the property;*
6. *Takes note that the State Party has demonstrated its commitment to comply with the requests of the World Heritage Committee (Decision **31 COM 7B.91**) to protect the property, its setting and related vistas and defers consideration for the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger to its 33rd session in 2009;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a progress report on the above issues, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

**114. Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom) (C 373)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986



### Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**28 COM 15B.102 ; 29 COM 7B.88 ; 31 COM 7B.104**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of closure of the A344 and “A303 Stonehenge Improvement scheme”;
- b) Lack of visitor management

### Current conservation issues

On 30 January 2008, the Head of the Policy, Strategy and Resources Unit of the Department of Culture, Media and Sport reported to the World Heritage Centre that the Government of the United Kingdom had announced on 6 December 2007 that the proposed 2.1 km bored tunnel scheme for improvement of the A303 road overlooking the Stonehenge ancient monument had been cancelled because of the increased estimated costs (more than USD 975 million). This meant that it would no longer be possible for English Heritage to build the proposed new visitor centre, outside the World Heritage property, since its planning consent was dependent upon implementation of the A303 road scheme. It would also further delay the planned closure of the A344 road, which cuts the avenue very close to the Stones.

A thorough review of visitor management and access to the Stonehenge World Heritage property (including the proposed closure of the junction of the A344 road with the A303) is being carried out by English Heritage and other stakeholders. This work is being overseen by a high-level project board, chaired jointly by the Minister for Culture and the Minister of Transport. It is intended that proposals for a visitor centre and the draft revised management plan should go out for public consultation in the summer of 2008, with the objective of having the visitor improvements in place by 2012.

Although work on improving visitor facilities, and on closing the A344 minor road, is to be welcomed, the State Party should be encouraged to consider longer term measures to improve the landscape of the Stonehenge part of the World Heritage property.

The State Party also proposed some minor adjustments to the boundaries of the Avebury portion of the World Heritage property, which will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document *WHC-08/32.COM/8B.Add*). These are designed to include significant areas of ancient landscape subject to statutory designation which are at present only partly included within the existing boundary. They include an important prehistoric–medieval landscape, a major long barrow, a palisaded enclosure, and two groups of round barrows.

**Draft Decision:            32 COM 7B.114**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.104**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Also recalling that at the time of the inscription of the property in 1986 the Committee noted with satisfaction the assurances provided by the authorities of the United Kingdom that the closure of the road which crosses the avenue at Stonehenge (A344 road) was receiving serious consideration as part of the overall plans for the future management of the property;
4. Regrets that further delays would take place in the long overdue improvements to visitor access to the Stonehenge part of the property, to its presentation to visitors, and to the setting of the monuments;
5. Urges the State Party to address the issues above in priority;
6. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a progress report on the closure of the road, visitor management and access, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

**115. Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**30 COM 7B.93; 31 COM 7B.121**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

18-20 October 2006: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressure;
- b) New constructions in the area surrounding the property;
- c) Lack of strategic plans for future development that set out clear strategies for the overall townscape and for the skyline and river front taking into account the townscape characteristics and important views related to the property and its buffer zone;
- d) lack of awareness of developers, building professionals and the wider public about the World Heritage property, its outstanding universal value and requirements under the *World Heritage Convention*;

### ii. Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on 30 January 2008. This stated that a new Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Liverpool is being prepared by a consultant commissioned by Liverpool City Council. A draft will be put out for consultation in April 2008. It is expected to be approved after the consultation ends in autumn 2008.

The State Party indicates that the Supplementary Planning Document is likely to:

- a) Confirm that proposed buildings which are tall in relation to others in the immediate vicinity should not be allowed within the property. Within the setting of the property the emerging cluster of tall buildings in the new business district to the northeast of the Pier Head is likely to be regarded as an acceptable location for further tall buildings. The SPD will also define in which other parts of the setting tall buildings might be acceptable and where they will not.
- b) Provide an analysis and description of townscape characteristics relevant to the outstanding universal value, important views and the need to adhere to these characteristics, wider values and sense of place.
- c) Set out a policy framework which will allow this diversity of character to flourish, while being sufficiently robust to ensure that development which does not respond adequately to the historic context is not allowed. The SPD is likely to specify that design briefs must take account of outstanding universal value.

The State Party also provided an update on proposals considered by the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission:

*New Museum Building* (on the waterfront inside the inscribed property); the cladding for this building is now being changed from travertine marble to jura limestone and a new planning application has been submitted. It is understood that the original architect has been replaced by a new local architect.

*Prince's Dock* (to the north of the inscribed property); Planning permission for *Alexandra Tower*, a 24 storey building was given in 2004 just after inscription. This is now nearing completion. The granting of permission set a precedent for tall buildings in the Prince's Dock complex, which resulted in Liverpool City Council approving a 34 storey building in June 2007. This does have some impact on the views of the property from the North.

*Mann Island* (in the south of the inscribed property); The three towers are now under construction. In addition, for the *Mersey Ferry terminal building* (in inscribed property front of the *Three Graces*) a four storey building has been given planning permission next to the river.

For the *Kings Dock* (to the south of the inscribed property in the setting), a large conference centre and arena are now nearing completion. Regarding the *Central Docks* (to the north of inscribed property and partly in setting) and *Birkenhead Docks* (on west side of river opposite inscribed property), a concept for the development of these areas has been put forward by

developers. This includes a cluster of towers up to 50 storeys high. The State Party indicates that this scheme is expected to change significantly once the SPD is published.

The State Party included in its report the recommendations of the English Heritage/Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment Urban Panel on the *Central Docks* scheme. This stressed the need for a still more compelling vision and associated strategic framework for the whole sub-region, preferably one based on sustainability, such as an eco-city; and stated emphatically that World Heritage site status would be jeopardised by a sixty storey building.

In response to concern over the lack of understanding of the outstanding universal value of the property, the State Party reports on several initiatives. Liverpool City Council, with support from the Liverpool Culture Company and English Heritage, has updated the property's web-site, commissioned consultants to produce a World Heritage Education and Interpretation Strategy, and has instructed the consultants for the emerging SPD to carry out pre-production consultation with selected developers and conservation groups. English Heritage and its partners have published five informed conservation books and improved education provision.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS welcome the progress that has been made in responding to the recommendations of the mission, but stress the urgency to approve the SPD in order that planning permission for tall buildings does not set more precedents as has happened at *Prince's Dock*, where tall buildings have compromised the silhouette of the *Three Graces*. While the SPD will put in place an overall framework within which development can be assessed, there nevertheless remains the need for further work to address the lack of strategic plans for future development. These should set out clear strategies for the overall townscape and for the skyline and river front – as highlighted by the mission and reinforced by the comments of the Urban Panel. Such strategic plans could be pro-active in promoting high quality, sustainable, development in appropriate places.

Although some work has been done on raising the profile of the property, press reports suggest that there is still more work needed to ensure that development meets the highest aspirations and inspires confidence that the best has been achieved.

**Draft Decision:        32 COM 7B.115**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.121**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the progress that has been made in developing supplementary planning guidance which will:*
  - a) *Clearly establish and respect prescribed heights;*
  - b) *Define the townscape characteristics, wider values (building density, urban patterns and materials) and sense of place;*
  - c) *Suggest how design briefs can incorporate characteristics and qualities of the property,*
4. *Also notes that work has been undertaken to raise the profile of the property and inform the general public about its outstanding universal value and its management;*

5. Urges the State Party to complete and approve the Supplementary Planning Document as soon as possible;
6. Encourages the State Party to supplement this Supplementary Planning Document with the development of strategic plans for the overall townscape and for the skyline and river front – as highlighted by the 2006 reactive monitoring mission and reinforced by the comments of the Urban Panel – in order to achieve the highest quality and to ensure sustainable development;
7. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, an update report on progress made on the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

## **116. City of Bath (United Kingdom) (C 428)**

### 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

N/A

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

### Current conservation issues

The City of Bath was inscribed for the way its grand neo-classical crescents, terraces, and squares spread out around its hills and within a green valley combine harmoniously, integrating architecture, urban design and landscape to create deliberately a beautiful city. By letter dated 31 January 2008, the State Party has submitted a Statement of outstanding universal value for the World Heritage Committee to approve which sets this out. This will be

examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8B of the Agenda (Document *WHC-08/32.COM/8B*).

The area inscribed as the City of Bath encompasses the core of the city, an area of 2,900 ha (this was confirmed in 2005 by the State Party through the Retrospective Inventory) within which are some 4,919 protected buildings, including 638 listed at the highest protection level. At the time of inscription, ICOMOS considered the whole historic and monumental ensemble of Bath, to be of exceptional value. It did at the same time recognise that safeguarding its discontinuous monumental heritage could cause serious problems.

In the past two years proposals have been put forward for the large scale re-development of an extensive flat area alongside the river roughly in the centre of the World Heritage property. This is known as "Bath Western Riverside". The area is in the bowl of the valley and thus can be seen from higher parts of the city.

The proposals, to develop the area with a dominant cluster of large blocks of some 2,000 flats rising to six stories high and with three taller buildings anticipated to be nine stories high, next to the river, have met with considerable opposition from many conservation organisations and residents for the negative impact the development could have on views from crescents and terraces and on the overall visual and planning coherence of the property in its landscape setting. The area in question was open grassland until the end of the 19th and early 20th centuries when it was used for gas generation and other small-scale industries. In spite of many objections to the proposed development, initially including English Heritage, Bath and North East Somerset Council have indicated their intention to approve the proposal. In January 2008, the relevant Minister decided not to hold a Public Inquiry. The proposals have not yet been confirmed as there are technical requirements to be met.

In February 2008, the Bath and North-East Somerset Council also indicated their intention to approve another large-scale project alongside the river, contrary to strong recommendations from their own officers. This is for a new Dyson Academy and would involve the demolition of a listed building and the construction of buildings with prominent glass facades that could be highly visible when illuminated.

The State Party in its report dated 18 February 2008, reiterates the significance of Bath for its Georgian architecture and planning and overall landscape qualities and acknowledges that the Bath Western Riverside site is highly visible from the river and hills surrounding Bath. However, the authorities consider that the 35 hectares development project is necessary to provide a new 21st century residential area.

Although there is general support for the continuing evolution of Bath, there is concern that the current proposals do not respect the outstanding universal value of the property, manifest across the city in its built form and landscape setting. The Bath Western Riverside project, among others projects, are not in line with the need for sympathetic development as set out in the management plan dated 2003. Both schemes should be considered by a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission before final approval is given by the responsible authorities.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.116**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,

2. Expresses its concern at the potential impact on the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property of the proposed Bath Western Riverside and the Dyson Academy developments;
3. Requests the State Party to withhold final approval of the developments until the World Heritage Committee has had the opportunity to fully review these proposals;
4. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to consider its overall state of conservation and particularly the possible impact of the Bath Western Riverside development and the Dyson Academy on the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property;
5. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

## 117. Old and New Towns of Edinburgh (United Kingdom) (C 728 )

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995

### Criteria

(i) (iv) (ix)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**27 COM 7B.81; 28 COM 15B.101**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Impact of fire at Cowgate;
- b) Impact of rubbish containers.

### Current conservation issues

The Old and New Towns were inscribed on the World Heritage List for their remarkable juxtaposition of two urban planning phenomena: the early mediaeval 'herringbone' layout of

the Old Town on the crag, and the regular layout of the Enlightenment New Town, with Sir Walter Scott's Waverley valley in between.

Edinburgh was for many years commended for its far-sighted town planning policies, which has allowed the city's skyline and urban spaces to evolve but maintain their significance over time. This strategic approach has recently been revived by the City Council who recently commissioned a new skyline report, in order to protect key views. This is now out for consultation. The Council is also developing a strategic approach to the re-development of Prince's Street, the main shopping street of the New Town, based on an analysis of its original layout and form. These new strategies are emerging at the same time as the city is facing development pressure from many different quarters, some of which could impact on the skyline and the overall character and outstanding universal value of the World Heritage property.

### *Canongate*

Part of the Old Town is now facing re-development by proposals known as 'Caltongate'. The 3.46 hectares site which is highly visible from the Calton Hill, is on the North side of the Canongate, the main spine of the Old Town, and covers an area between Waverley Station and Holyrood. It includes the site of the old bus station garage.

On 6 February 2008, Edinburgh City Council were minded to grant consent for major elements of the Caltongate scheme, in spite of considerable opposition from the Edinburgh World Heritage Trust and others, including a specially formed Canongate Community Forum which has mobilised community support to keep homes for locals in the Old Town. The plans include a five-star hotel, conference centre, houses and offices. They would involve the demolition of one protected building, the rear of a second, and several tenanted houses. The Councillors' decision has now been referred to Scottish Ministers for their determination.

The State Party submitted a report on 9 April 2008 which sets out the overall parameters of the scheme and its current status. It also reported that in spite of earlier concerns over the scheme, Historic Scotland were now supportive.

### *Leith Docks*

The report also provided details of the proposed development at Leith Docks site on the River Forth. This is some 2.5km from the World Heritage property around the old port for Edinburgh. The port activities have been moved to a new site. The proposals are still at the concept stage but Historic Scotland has expressed concerns at the height and bulk of the proposed developments which include a 28 storey tower. They consider that these proposals would create a new skyline for the docks that could compete with the skyline of the World Heritage property and alter its relationship with the river.

### *St James Centre*

Another development scheme mentioned in the State Party's report is that for the St James Centre. This is the redevelopment of a 1960-70s building in a prominent position in the New Town which currently has a negative impact on the property. This scheme is still at the early stages of planning and will provide regeneration of the immediate area. Historic Scotland supports in outline the proposals for the focus of the site but does not support larger towers that the developers have also suggested. These would not be in line with the city's emerging skyline strategy and could have a major impact on the city's skyline.

### *Cowgate Fire site*

The State Party also provides an update on the Cowgate fire site. Proposals to re-develop the site are at the pre-application discussion stage.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are concerned that the scale of the Canongate development will impinge on the very strong, tight, grain of the Old Town and the overall



coherence of its urban form and spaces, and impact negatively on views from Carlton Hill. Given the scale and location of the development; it could impact on the integrity and outstanding universal value of the World Heritage property.

As has been presented by the State Party, the Caltongate scheme could be followed by others of a similar or even larger scale and degree of intervention, such as the proposals at Leith Docks which could alter the relationship between the Old and New Towns and its port. Developers appear to be challenging the current limits of development in a way that could adversely affect the integrity of the World Heritage property. There is a need to understand how the overall coherence of the property and its distinctive skyline, both crucial to its outstanding universal value, might be protected while at the same time allowing sympathetic development.

**Draft Decision:            32 COM 7B.117**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Expresses its concern at the potential impact of the Caltongate development;*
3. *Urges the State Party to halt approval of this scheme until a mission has visited the property and reviewed the situation;*
4. *Requests the State Party to invite a World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS joint reactive monitoring mission to the property to consider the overall state of conservation of the Old and New Towns and particularly the possible impact of the Caltongate development on the integrity and outstanding universal value of the World Heritage property, as well as the outline proposals for Leith Docks, the St James Centre, and other current proposals;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

**118. Heart of Neolithic Orkney (United Kingdom) (C 514)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

Criteria

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

N/A

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Current conservation issues

The monuments of Orkney, dating back to 3000-2000 BC, were inscribed as an outstanding testimony to the cultural achievements of the Neolithic peoples of northern Europe. Their culture flourished for around 500-1000 years at a particularly dynamic time in European pre-history.

The monuments include Maes Howe, a chambered tomb, Stones of Stennes and Ring of Brogdar, stone circles and Skara Brae, domestic remains. The Monuments of Stones of Stennes and the Ring of Brogdar, are visually interconnected and in their relationship with the sea, an inland loch (lake) and surrounding hills, are seen to map human interconnection with earth, water and sky.

The World Heritage Centre received information concerning a proposal to erect three large 72 metres wind turbines to the north-west of the Stones of Stennes and the Ring of Brogdar. These turbines would be highly visible on the horizon of the bowls of the hills surrounding the two stone circles. The proposal was approved by the local council in spite of a good management plan, clear policies to protect the components of the World Heritage property in local plans and advice from Council Officers to refuse the application. The proposals were then subject to a Public Inquiry at which Historic Scotland, the government agency for heritage in Scotland objected. The outcome of this inquiry is still awaited.

In its report dated 30 January 2008, the State Party acknowledges that the proposed development would impact adversely on the integrity and outstanding universal value of the property and sets out the objections made by Historic Scotland. The report also informs the World Heritage Centre that the management plan is under review. This may be an opportunity for strengthening the protection of the visual integrity of the property.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.118**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Expresses its concern at the potential impact of the proposed wind turbines on the integrity and outstanding universal value of the property; and requests the State Party to suspend the project;

3. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, further information on how the protection, including visual integrity, of the property might be strengthened to ensure that this project and other similar projects, which might impact on the outstanding universal value of the property can be prevented;*
4. *Further requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the draft revised management plan for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.*

## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

### 119. Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia) (C 567 rev)

#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2000

#### Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

N/A

#### Previous Committee Decisions

N/A

#### International Assistance

N/A

#### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 870,000 (2008-2011, Japanese Funds-in-Trust (JFIT) project)

#### Previous monitoring missions

August 2002: UNESCO and international experts mission; November 2007: World Heritage Centre mission

#### Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

#### Current conservation issues

With the aim of making an evaluation of the state of the property and identifying priorities for future projects, the Government of Japan, at the invitation of the State Party, sent an exploratory mission in August 2002, which included Japanese and international experts, as well as representatives from UNESCO and the Bolivian authorities. A mission for the preparation of the project document for the Japan Funds-in-Trust (JFIT) took place in November 2007, with the participation of the World Heritage Centre and national and international experts.

This mission noted that updating the management and conservation plans was extremely urgent in order to guarantee appropriate conservation of the property. Due to limited capacities, conservation techniques and archaeological research activities are not always implemented to international standards. There is an evident need to precisely define regulations for the conservation and preservation of the main archaeological complex and the site museum. Currently, the construction of new laboratories and facilities for archaeologists are being carried out.

The mission also highlighted that the Tiwanaku communities are aware of the value of the property and are very interested in collaborating in its conservation and preservation. All projects and decisions concerning exploration and conservation of the property are made in close collaboration with the *Comité Interinstitucional para la Gestión de Tiwanaku* (CIACSAT), a consortium of seven organizations involved and related to Tiwanaku at the national, regional and local levels. The organization includes: the Vice-Ministry of Culture, Vice-Ministry of Tourism, the Prefecture of La Paz, the Municipality of Tiwanaku, the *Central Agraria* (agriculturist association), *Junta de Vecinos* (residents association of the town of Tiwanaku) and the National Archaeology Unit (UNAR) at the technical level. Indigenous communities of the surrounding areas are represented as well.

The 2002 mission recognized the need for a buffer zone. Little progress has been made in this matter due to land tenure problems. To date, the Bolivian Government is the owner of the 71 ha property, but the total archaeological area extends to approximately 600 ha.

The town of Tiwanaku, which is located just beside the property, has not been properly monitored or regulated in terms of its growth and development for its impact on the outstanding universal value of the property. The Municipal Government explained that a cadastral mapping of the town is in progress as well as a project for the elaboration of a Land Use Regulation Plan, however, no clear explanation of its content nor any definition concerning environmental policies has been made. More coordination between the Vice-Ministry of Culture/UNAR and institutions such as universities and researchers is urgently needed to identify proper intervention mechanisms at an international standard level.

In March 2008, a total budget of USD 870,000 (JFIT) was approved for a three-year project for the “*Preservation and conservation of Tiwanaku and the Akapana Pyramid*” for the following main activities:

- a) Update and implement the management and conservation plans including the archaeological complex of Tiwanaku;
- b) Promote more efficient support and coordinated participation of local communities;
- c) Develop conservation methodologies for the excavated and exposed areas;
- d) Document and conserve excavation materials; publish results;
- e) Ensure appropriate museum management;
- f) Train staff and community members in conservation and excavation techniques;
- g) Strengthen efforts for sustainable development in local communities;
- h) Promote understanding and awareness among local inhabitants of the outstanding universal value of the property;
- i) Develop national capacities for the conservation of cultural heritage.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.119**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Notes with satisfaction the approval of a three year “*Preservation and conservation of Tiwanaku and the Akapana Pyramid*” to be implemented at the property;
3. Requests the State Party to develop, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, as soon as possible, appropriate guidance and regulations for archaeological interventions in accordance with international standards;

4. Also requests the State Party to work in close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Quito Office to implement the activities foreseen in the management and conservation plans;
5. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on the updated management and conservation plans and other aspects related to the preservation and conservation project, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

## **120. Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia) (C 285)**

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1984

### Criteria

(iv) (vi)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**27 COM 7B.89; 28 COM 15B.112**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

2003: ICOMOS mission ; 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

Dilapidated state of conservation of the Church of Santo Domingo;

Construction of TRANSCARIBE, a new public transportation system and its impact on the wall;

- a) Lack of a regulatory conservation management system of the property;
- b) Impact of the harbour public works on the fortifications of Cartagena.

### Current conservation issues

On 3 January 2008, the World Heritage Centre received a report by the State Party presenting the actions taken by the Colombian Government regarding the conclusions and recommendations of the 2006 mission.

According to the report, most of these recommendations will be taken into account in the new Special Protection Plan (PEP) that will be finalized by September 2008. Another study for the state of conservation of the historical centre has been finalized (in partnership with the Interamerican Development Bank) and its results will be taken into account for the PEP. Some participation programmes have started and seem to have been carried out satisfactorily, but no clear results were sent.

Concerning land use, there have been changes in the coastal areas around the city in order to build tourist complexes or private residences. It is important to clarify how this situation may affect the historical area.

No clear information of how current regulations are being implemented in order to protect the area. Furthermore, there is no information on some recommendations of the mission, including a timeframe for the finalization of the PEP.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are concerned that despite several joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS missions, which provided detailed advice on conservation and management there has been little progress in improving the protection and management of the property. In particular, there is concern over the lack of a detailed response to the recommendations of the 2006 reactive monitoring mission.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.120**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **28 COM 15B.112**, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),*
3. *Deeply regrets that most of the recommendations of the 2006 reactive monitoring mission report are still in planning phase and no action has been taken ;*
4. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and on progress made in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2006 mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010, focusing on:*
  - a) *Updated information on the boundaries of the core and buffer zones of the World Heritage property and related regulations;*
  - b) *Procedures and responsibilities concerning the establishment of urban building regulations;*
  - c) *Updated information on the instruments for land use control, notably in the core area, and policies to promote diversification of activities;*
  - d) *Advancement of the integral study of the condition of the Fortifications' walls.*

**121. City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## 122. Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129)

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

## 123. 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

**22 BUR V.54; 29 COM 7B.91; 31 COM 7B.127**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

2004: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressures in areas surrounding the property;
- b) Lack of management plan.

### Current conservation issues

On 4 March 2008, the World Heritage Centre received the State Party's report. The report was submitted in Spanish, but contains little new substantive information concerning the current situation to address the requests of the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007).

It outlines activities implemented since 2003 for the development of the management plan which has yet to be finalized because it is awaiting national approval. The long planning process considered a consultation approach, several working groups were formed to address current issues affecting the property by particular themes and/ or areas of expertise. Other interest and social groups were later integrated in the process to gather their assessments and proposals for the final compilation of the management document. However, no



documentation was provided to assess the quality or comprehensiveness of the proposals made, how they will conserve the outstanding universal value of the property or how the major issues confronted, such as visitation, will be addressed in the short and long term.

In addition, representatives from the National Institute of Anthropology and History have participated in other planning initiatives that might impact the property, such as the Regional Programme for Touristic development of the Teotihuacan corridor and the urban plans for both municipalities related to the property. This participation is important but should be structured in a way where decisions regarding the property and its setting are taken in accordance to the conservation of the outstanding universal value and the integrity of the property and no detrimental actions are implemented. This programme is tourist oriented and it does not correspond to the decision of the World Heritage Committee that requested the State Party to set up an intersectoral working group at local, federal and national levels to analyze the archaeological, environmental and social impacts related to uncontrolled urban development.

An additional project has started to develop a geographic information system which will be useful for future decision making. However, in spite of all these actions there is still no articulation between the different levels of planning (territorial, municipal and site) and different proposals have not been brought together to guarantee there is no impact on the values of the property, including its setting. Although plans might exist, their implementation will pose a different challenge, particular in regard to illegal constructions or unplanned for developments in the areas.

**Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.123**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B;*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.127**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007);*
3. *Reiterates its request to submit to the World Heritage Centre three printed and electronic copies of the finalized management plan by **30 October 2008**, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
4. *Invites the State Party to integrate the outcomes from other planning initiatives, such as the Regional Programme for Tourist Development and Municipal plans, into the management plan for the archaeological site, and to ensure the GIS system is available so that all appropriate actors can share the same information and tools for comprehensive decision-making;*
5. *Also reiterates the request to set up an intersectoral working group specifically for the World Heritage property, with representatives from local, federal and national levels to analyze the archaeological, environmental and social impacts related to uncontrolled urban development to collaborate in the management of the archaeological site and its surroundings;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a progress report on the agreements achieved as well as on the advance of preparation of the management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

## 124. Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

### Criteria

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

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7B.103; 30 COM 7B.95; 31 COM 7B.128**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 5,000 (1999) for the preparation of guidelines for a management plan

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

November 2002: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Demolition of historical buildings in the protected area of the Historical Centre;
- b) Urgent implementation of the management plan in Xochimilco.

### Current conservation issues

On 25 February 2008, the World Heritage Centre received a report from the State Party concerning the property of Xochimilco.

### *Management System*

The State Party reported that the "Agreement for the implementation of the World Heritage Management System" between the Tláhuac, Milpa Alta and Xochimilco delegations was signed on 11 December 2007 in order to formalize the implementation of the management plan. A letter sent by the National Institute of Archaeology and History (INAH) to the World Heritage Centre in November 2007 indicated that the INAH would have proposed that the *Comisión Interdependencial* be the Management Unit in charge of the implementation of the management plan. The Commission expressed its commitment to facilitate the work and operation process; however, it does not assume the responsibility of acting as the management unit.

Concerning the increased collaboration with research institutions within the framework of the implementation of the studies undertaken by Mexican universities, two activities were also mentioned by the State Party: (1) Study for the Rehabilitation of the Chinampas, in collaboration with the National University of Mexico and (2) the Register of the Xochimilco Chinampas, with the Public Register Direction of INAH.

### *Demolition of historic buildings and ensembles in the core zone*

Following information received with reference to the demolition of 14 historical buildings in the core zone of the property, the World Heritage Centre expressed its concern for this very sensitive situation. Consequently, the State Party submitted additional information explaining that the demolitions were part of the "Programme for the Reorganization of the Popular Commerce" (ambulant commerce) launched on 6 March 2007 within the zone A (core protected area). Its aim was to provide street sellers with new market places in the historical centre in order to avoid overcrowding of public spaces.

The State Party also explained that, as part of the programme, the Federal District Government of Mexico City had decided to expropriate the inhabitants of 14 historical buildings in 2007 as a first step. Following this decision, the buildings were demolished. INAH did not authorize the demolition of five historical buildings. Although the authorization was denied, the demolition of these five buildings and others was carried through.

According to INAH, other demolitions were denounced. Negotiations between the Mexico City government and other institutions are currently under way. However, there is no clear indication of how the situation will be dealt with.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are concerned that the documentation shows that it is the intent of the Mexico City government to continue with this programme, which would severely compromise the integrity of the historic centre. No link is demonstrated between the different levels of government and the decisions being made to manage the economic and social conditions with the conservation of historic buildings.

### **Draft Decision:      32 COM 7B.124**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.128**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the intention of the State Party to propose the Comisión Interdependencial as the responsible institution for the implementation of the management plan for Xochimilco;*
4. *Invites the State Party to organize, as soon as possible, a coordination meeting with the Comisión Interdependencial and the UNESCO Mexico Office to reflect on the feasibility of this commission to become the Management Unit of the property;*
5. *Deeply regrets the demolition of 14 historical buildings in the core protected area of the Historical Centre of Mexico;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit comprehensive information on the current status of all the buildings considered for demolition by **30 September 2008**;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to invite a World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS joint reactive monitoring mission to assess the impacts of these actions on the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property and to work with the different levels of authority to clarify the administrative and technical procedures for further interventions at the Historical Centre of Mexico ;*
8. *Further requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, to develop, prior to the arrival of the mission, a draft Statement of*

*outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*

9. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2009, an updated state of conservation report and the results of the coordination meeting mentioned above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

**125. Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)**

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add*

**126. Archaeological site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panama) (C 790 bis)**

*Year of inscription on the World Heritage List*

1997, 2003

*Criteria*

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

*Previous Committee Decisions*

**27 COM 8C.40**

*International Assistance*

N/A

*UNESCO extra-budgetary funds*

N/A

*Previous monitoring missions*

N/A

*Main threats identified in previous reports*

- a) Severe deterioration of historic buildings that threatens the outstanding universal value of the property;

- b) Conflicting interests of different stakeholders in regard to the use, management and conservation of the historic centre;
- c) Limited capacity for the rehabilitation and maintenance of historic structures;
- d) Deficiencies in the implementation of the legislative framework for protection;
- e) Lack of implementation of clear conservation and management policies for the property;
- f) Demolitions of urban ensembles and buildings;
- g) Forced displacement of occupants and squatters.

### Current conservation issues

This report presents information based on exchanges between the World Heritage Centre and the State Party as well as on a preliminary desk evaluation of current conditions by ICOMOS. Information was received concerning the expropriation at a historic building, which had been a rehabilitation project approved in 1999. Instead of proceeding with the restoration and rehabilitation works, the owners demanded permission for using the building as a parking lot. Even if the temporary use as parking space was permitted by a Resolution of the Direction of Historic Heritage of the National Institute on Culture in 2005, this is cannot be considered as an adequate function.

Instead of fostering synergies between public and private spheres, the State Party promotes expropriations as a means of ensuring heritage conservation. Unfortunately, the expropriation is inadequate in the framework of the current juridical system, which provokes delays in implementation of conservation works. Pictures supplied indicate the neglect caused by the inadequacy of this system. This poses some doubts about the actual capacity of the State Party to ensure proper rehabilitation and maintenance of expropriated buildings.

They also show an alarming state of conservation of historic buildings such as the San Felipe Market, partially demolished, the electricity company, the *Compañía de Jesús* and buildings owned by the *Hipotecario* Bank. All demonstrate instability and lack of proper use. Additional information, in the form of newspapers articles and letters from community organizations, reflect concerns regarding the conservation and management of the historic centre, including the following:

- a) 105 non restored buildings in the historic centre of which 80 are in an alarming state of conservation;
- b) Real estate speculation damaging the image of the property;
- c) Owners do not restore buildings, contrarily to the Law;
- d) Residents forced to abandon ancient buildings.

This explains the dilapidated state of conservation of some buildings as well as conflicts of interests between the State, private owners and the community itself. The legal framework seems not to meet the conservation needs of the property.

Further communications from the State Party explained that the area is undergoing a process of change. The historic and environmental values of the historic district are an opportunity for investors; as the economic values of buildings increase regardless of their state of conservation. Private investment is in conflict with the social reality of the area: low income families occupy historic buildings, sometimes illegally. The conflict of interests among stakeholders is obvious and leads to misunderstanding between various public and private organisations.

**Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.126**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **27 COM 8C.40**, adopted at its 27th session (UNESCO, 2003),
3. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the current state of conservation, the authenticity and the integrity of the property and to give recommendations to enhance management and conservation practices as well as guidance on an Emergency Plan;
4. Also requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, to develop, prior to the arrival of the mission, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
5. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, prior to the arrival of the above mission, a comprehensive report on the current management system;
6. Requests moreover the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, with an updated report on the issues above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

**127. Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)**

See Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add