**DESIRED STATE OF CONSERVATION FOR THE REMOVAL**

**OF A PROPERTY FROM THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE**

**IN DANGER**

**GUIDANCE NOTE**

The purpose of this Guidance Note is to provide advice on preparing, monitoring and reporting on the Desired State of Conservation for the removal of a property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR). The primary audiences for the Guidance Note are those involved in this process, including States Parties and site managers. This will also be useful for anyone interested in the DSOCR process.

1. **Background - the List of World Heritage in Danger and DSOCR**

A World Heritage property is inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger when it is threatened by serious and specific danger, whether potential or ascertained (see Box 1 below). In order for a property to be removed from this List, it must be determined that it is no longer under threat (in line with Paragraph 191 of the *Operational Guidelines*).

The decision to remove a property from the List of World Heritage in Danger should therefore be based on demonstrating the reduction of threats, the restoration of deteriorated attributes, and the capacity of the property’s protection and management system to prevent the threats from recurring.

In 2007, the World Heritage Committee requested the establishment of a Desired State of Conservation[[1]](#footnote-1) in order to facilitate sound decisions for the removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger (**Decision** **31 COM 7.3**, 2007). The Committee also requested that States Parties with properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger prepare draft Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value for these properties which did not have such statements, as these are the basis for the development of DSOCRs.

**Box 1: *Operational Guidelines* paragraph 177 setting out procedures and criteria in relation to the implementation of the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

In accordance with Article 11, paragraph 4, of the *Convention*, the Committee may inscribe a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger when the following requirements are met:

1. the property under consideration is on the World Heritage List;
2. the property is threatened by serious and specific danger;
3. major operations are necessary for the conservation of the property;
4. assistance under the *Convention* has been requested for the property;
5. the Committee is of the view that its assistance in certain cases may most effectively be limited to messages of its concern, including the message sent by inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and that such assistance may be requested by any Committee member or the Secretariat.
6. **What is DSOCR and how does it relate to other instruments and processes linked to the List of World Heritage in Danger?**

The Desired State of Conservation for removal of a property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR) is part of the wider conservation system for Danger listed properties. The different components of this system are described below:

**Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:** The inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger by the World Heritage Committee recognizes that a property is threatened by serious and specific danger, whether potential or ascertained.

**Corrective Measures:** The Committee requests States Parties to implement a set of actions, called Corrective Measures, in order to remove the threats to a property and enable the restoration of any deteriorated attributes within a specific timeframe.

**The Desired State of Conservation for removal** is a defined state of conservation that a property must reach in order to demonstrate that it is no longer threatened by serious and specific danger, and to enable its removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It is achieved through the successful implementation of the Corrective Measures.

**Removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger:** When the Desired State of Conservation for removal is achieved the Committee may decide, if the property is no longer under threat, to remove it from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

1. **Preparing a DSOCR framework, including Desired State indicators** (see Annex 3)

The four key elements of the DSOCR framework

The Desired State of Conservation for removal (DSOCR) is assessed through a set of indicators which are developed on the basis of a review of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, the Corrective Measures and the overall state of conservation of the property. The indicators should provide an effective and transparent way of evaluating when a property has reached the Desired State of Conservation for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The four key elements of a Desired State of Conservation for removal framework are described below:

1. **Indicators to monitor Outstanding Universal Value**, including for attributes, integrity (for natural and cultural properties[[2]](#footnote-2)), authenticity (for cultural properties only), and protection and management. These indicators should measure the restoration of the attributes that convey the property’s Outstanding Universal Value and relate to the Corrective Measures established by the Committee. In cases where a property’s attributes are degraded, indicators should ascertain that the restoration of attributes is well underway at the time of removal from the List in Danger, but do not need to ascertain full recovery. Indicators should ideally relate to existing monitoring systems.
2. **A rationale for the indicators selected**. For natural properties, forest cover is a good indicator for a forest property inscribed under criteria (ix) and/or (x) because it is fundamental to maintaining biodiversity; for cultural properties rate of conservation of the built fabric is an appropriate indicator for properties under criteria (iv) that sustain the value of buildings or architectural ensembles.
3. **A method of verification for each indicator,** for example for natural properties through surveys of the property’s attributes (e.g. wildlife populations, habitat extent and condition), or protection and management measures (e.g. regular patrol visits, adoption of laws or policies); and for cultural properties condition assessments and monitoring to verify the state of conservation of the built fabric, the development and implementation of regulatory frameworks to protect the setting, among others. Methods of verification should be feasible and should ideally be based on existing monitoring systems in order to significantly reduce the cost of measuring indicators.
4. **A timeframe for the realisation of the DSOCR**, which should be realistic and allow sufficient time to implement the Corrective Measures and other conservation actions as necessary, to carry out adequate monitoring in order to determine whether the DSOCR indicators are met, and to enable recovery of any deteriorated attributes. In cases where attributes are degraded it may take time to restore these and therefore the timeframe for the realisation of the DSOCR will be longer than that for the implementation of the Corrective Measures.

For example, for natural properties if populations of species are damaged by poaching, once the poaching is brought under control through the Corrective Measures it will take time for these populations to be well on their way to recovering and to enable a site’s removal from the List in Danger. In the case of cultural properties, where the decay of materials has compromised the integrity of the property, and its ability to convey its Outstanding Universal Value, these conditions will require sustained actions to reverse, including investments in conservation interventions, and will need subsequent maintenance actions to ensure the long-term preservation of the property.

Preparing the DSOCR framework

The draft DSOCR framework is prepared by the State Party, in collaboration with the site manager and other stakeholders, and is included in its annual state of conservation reports, which are submitted to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Joint World Heritage Centre/Advisory Body reactive monitoring missions to properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger should assist States Parties and site managers in developing and finalizing DSOCR frameworks. Indicators should ideally relate to existing monitoring systems in order to significantly reduce the costs of monitoring the DSOCR framework. Additional advice on preparing and monitoring DSOCR can be sought from the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre.

Table 1 provides detailed guidance on preparing a DSOCR framework, including indicators. Annex 3 provides a form which can be used by States Parties to prepare the DSOCR framework, and examples of such frameworks for natural and cultural sites are provided in Annexes 1 and 2.

Adopting the DSOCR framework

Once completed, the DSOCR framework is submitted to the Advisory Bodies who recommend a version for approval by the World Heritage Committee, in close consultation with the State Party, the site manager and the World Heritage Centre. The agreed DSOCR is presented to the World Heritage Committee for adoption.

***Box 2: Example DSOCR Okapi Wildlife Reserve (Democratic Republic of the Congo)*** *(see Annex 1 for the full DSOCR)*

The DSOCR framework for the Okapi Wildlife Reserve was developed following a joint UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property in 2009, in cooperation with managers of the property and their partners. It consists of eight indicators measuring the restoration of the property’s attributes (biological values), integrity and management.

* **3 attribute indicators** (percentage of forest cover, adbundance indices for key species of fauna, edos are attended by fauna)
* **3 integrity indicators** (status of resident population, indices of poaching, status of mining quarries)
* **2 management indicators** (frequency and extent of patrols adoption, implementation of management plan)

These indicators are supported by a rationale and method of verification, and are based on the state of the attributes for which the property was inscribed, as documented in its Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. A timeframe of three years is proposed, as well as a survey at the end of this period in order to monitor progress in meeting the DSOCR indicators.

***Box 3: Example DSOCR Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)*** *(see Annex 2 for the full DSOCR)*

The DSOCR framework for the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone was developed following a joint UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property in 2010, in cooperation with the site manager of the property, representatives from the authorities in charge of cultural heritage and ICOMOS.

The DSOCR establishes the desired state of conservation of the property and a series of corrective measures to be implemented over a 3 year period.

The main indicators to assess the progress made in addressing the threats to the physical fabric and material integrity of the property include:

* Reduction of the rate and extent of deterioration at the main nine palaces and exposed decorated surfaces (Method of verification: annual condition assessment surveys, number of conservation and maintenance projects at priority areas, monitoring of water table levels)
* Functioning boundaries for the property (Methods of verification: existence and maintenance of vegetation barriers and perimeter walls, monitoring of solid waste management practices)

The main indicators to assess the progress made in regard to protection and planning include:

* Adoption of regulatory measures for the management of the buffer zone and full enforcement of legislative and regulatory frameworks passed by the State Party (Methods of verification: approval/ enactment of regulatory measures for Law No. 28261 to ensure the conservation and protection of the Outstanding Universal Value and conditions of integrity and authenticity of the property)
* Relocation of illegal settlers in collaboration with pertinent authorities (number of people relocated)
* Adequate control of encroachments and urban pressure (Approval/enactment of Management plan and integration with territorial and urban development plans, aerial photographs, monitoring of the buffer zone and limits of the property).

The main indicators to assess the progress made in regard to management include:

* Operational management arrangements and budgets secured for the comprehensive implementation of the Management Plan (Methods of verification: approval/enactment of management plan and existence of budgets)
* Functional institutional arrangements with adequate resources secured for long-term implementation of the formulated Management Plan (Methods of verification: number of staff, existence of annual operation budgets).

1. **Monitoring and reporting on the DSOCR framework** (see Annex 4)

The Desired State of Conservation for removal process is an integral part of World Heritage monitoring and reporting processes, and should also be integrated into a property’s overall management. An overview of the ways in which the DSOCR framework fits in with these processes is provided below:

Site management

The Desired State of Conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and particularly its indicators, should be part of a property’s overall management. For example, indicators should ideally be incorporated into a site’s existing monitoring framework in consultation with the site manager; in order to track progress in achieving the DSOCR.

The Desired State of Conservation for removal framework can also play an important part in coordinating the engagement of various actors in the conservation and management of a property, including States Parties, community groups and non-governmental organisations.

Monitoring and reporting processes

Progress towards achieving the indicators should be reported by the State Party within its annual state of conservation reports (using the form provided in Annex 4).

The Advisory Bodies evaluate the progress achieved in meeting the indicators and report on this within the joint World Heritage Centre / Advisory Body state of conservation reports. When substantial progress is achieved, a joint World Heritage Centre/Advisory Body monitoring mission visits the property and makes a recommendation regarding its removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger to the World Heritage Committee, based on an evaluation of the DSOCR framework.

1. **Removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger**

The Desired State of Conservation for removal is intended to enable the World Heritage Committee to take informed decisions regarding when a property should be removed from, or retained on, the List of World Heritage in Danger, on the basis of the status of threats, of the recovery of any damaged attributes, and of the capacity of the property’s protection and management system to control threats. Danger Listed properties should be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger until the Desired State of Conservation is met.

**Table 1: Guidance on preparing a Desired State of Conservation for removal framework** (using the form provided in Annex 3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Steps** | **Point to consider** |
| 1. **Review the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, the Corrective Measures, and the property’s state of conservation.** | 1. Review key documents/data: Indicators should be chosen on the basis of a thorough review of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, Corrective Measures, and the overall state of conservation of the property. 2. A DSOCR cannot be prepared without a SOUV: A Statement of Outstanding Universal Value defines a property’s Outstanding Universal Value and therefore provides a baseline for the indicators. If a SoOUV is unavailable, a retrospective statement should be drafted prior to preparing the DSOCR. The technical guidance note on drafting retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value is available on IUCN’s website - [www.iucn.org/worldheritage/](http://www.iucn.org/worldheritage/) |
| 1. **Develop a set of indicators to monitor Outstanding Universal Value** | 1. Choice of indicators: The indicators should relate directly to a property’s Outstanding Universal Value, i.e. the criteria under which it is inscribed, the attributes that sustain those criteria, its integrity and/or authenticity and its protection and management, as defined in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.  * The indicators should focus on the key threats that are the basis for the property’s inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as well as the attributes affected by these threats. * Indicators must be measurable, time-bound, supported by a clear rationale, verifiable, and developed in consultation with the site manager and other stakeholders. * The wording of indicators should also indicate the ‘direction of change’, i.e. an upward or downward trend, a minimum or maximum threshold, or the adoption of specific policies. When there is the progress in achieving the Desired State of Conservation for removal, the indicators will typically reflect either an upward trend in the condition of attributes, or a downward trend in threats. * In cases where a site’s attributes are degraded, indicators should ascertain that their restoration is well underway at the time of removal from the List in Danger, but do not need to ascertain full recovery; * Indicators should ideally relate to existing monitoring systems, where possible.  1. Relate indicators to Corrective Measures: The indicators should reflect the Corrective Measures adopted by the Committee to address the threats which led to inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. 2. Natural property example indicator: “Reduction in deforestation levels to a maximum of 10%, and cessation of illegal activities such as mining. 3. Cultural property example indicator: “Adoption of regulatory measures for the management of the buffer zone and relocation of illegal settlers in collaboration with pertinent authorities” |
| 1. **Develop a rationale for each indicator** | 1. The rationale should explain why each indicator was chosen with reference to the current state of conservation of the property and the importance of the indicator in relation to the property’s OUV. 2. Natural property example rationale: “Grazing by domestic stock remains the most critical problem affecting the ecological integrity of the property. No grazing zones covering a minimum of 30% of the property are necessary to bring this threat under control. There are no census statistics, but according to the GRSPD there are 38,000 livestock units in the 17 counties which have land in the park. Addressing this threat should, over the long-term, restore the park’s richness in species and habitats.” 3. Cultural property example rationale: “Continuous illegal invasion of the legally protected area constitutes a threat to the fabric of the property; establishing mechanisms to monitor this activity as well as the enforcement of regulatory measures are crucial to control this decay factor. This measure is essential to ensure the conservation of the archaeological site and to maintain its conditions of integrity over the long-term” |
| 1. **Specify a method of verification.** | 1. Methods of verification must be feasible and should ideally be based on existing monitoring systems, where possible. 2. Natural property example method of verification: “Surveys of the values of the property (e.g. wildlife populations, habitat extent and condition), or measures of particular protection or management measures (e.g. regular patrol visits, adoption of laws or policies).” 3. Cultural property example method of verification: “Condition assessments and monitoring to verify the state of conservation of the built fabric, and assessments on the development and implementation of regulatory frameworks to protect the setting.” |
| 1. **Set a timeframe for the DSOCR** | 1. Set a realistic timeframe: Ultimately, the DSOCR should measure the success of the Corrective Measures and other conservation actions in removing the threats that led to Danger Listing, and in restoring any damaged attributes. Therefore, the timeframe for the DSOCR should be realistic and allow sufficient time to implement the Corrective Measures and other conservation actions as necessary, to carry out monitoring of the DSOCR indicators, and to enable recovery of any damaged attributes. Indicators should be systematically tied to clear and realistic conservation actions, e.g. within the property’s management plan. 2. What happens until the indicators are met? The property should be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger until the indicators are met and the property is no longer threatened by serious and specific danger. |
| 1. **Summarize the approach adopted to establish the DSOCR** | The process adopted to establish the DSOCR should be briefly described. For example, was it developed during a World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission in collaboration with the site manager and other stakeholders? |

**ANNEX 1: Nature case study**

**Okapi Wildlife Reserve DSOCR** (Source: 2009 UNESCO/IUCN Mission Report)

* 1. **Establishment of the Desired State of Conservation for the Removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger**

On the basis of the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, the mission has developed, in cooperation with the managers of the property and their partners, a proposal for the Desired State of Conservation for the Removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, consisting of 8 indicators (I) in order to measure the restoration of the biological values of the property, its integrity and its management. These indicators should be achieved before the Okapi Wildlife Reserve can be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

* + 1. Biological Indicators

The biological indicators should enable an assessment of the state of the biological values that constitute the basis of the OUV of the property, i.e. maintaining the diversity, abundance and distribution of species. Two types of measurements can be accepted: forest cover and the abundance indices of key species of fauna.

* + - 1. *Forest cover*

The maintenance of forest cover of the Okapi Wildlife Reserve is proposed as an indicator for the desired state of conservation, as it constitutes a requirement for the maintenance of floristic diversity, including the abundance and distribution of key species.

The surface of the Okapi Wildlife Reserve is 13,726 km2 and the current surface of encroached areas (essentially in the agricultural zones) is 1,400 km2, i.e. 10 %. The indicator should show that the encroached area does not grow larger and thus does not exceed 10 %.

|  |
| --- |
| **I 1**: The surface of encroachment in the Okapi Wildlife Reserve does not exceed 10 % of the total surface. [Methods of verification: periodical analyses (5 years) of satellite images; monitoring of the boundaries of agricultural zones]. |

* + - 1. *Abundance indices (rate of encounter) of key species of fauna*

A key element of the desired state of conservation is the fact that viable populations of flagship species are present in the property. An important indicator is the improvement of trends in the abundance of these species.

The 2008 report on the distribution and frequency of fauna and human activities in the Okapi Wildlife Reserve indicates a reduction of abundance indices of the majority of species of large fauna between 1995 and 2006[[3]](#footnote-3). Although it is unlikely that the recovery of pre-war indices can be achieved within the coming five or six years, particularly for elephants[[4]](#footnote-4), it is nevertheless necessary to empirically demonstrate that a gradual recovery of populations is underway.

Monitoring abundance indices of large fauna is notoriously difficult for methodological reasons[[5]](#footnote-5) and requires relatively significant financial resources. Additionally, the situation in the Okapi Wildlife Reserve is complicated due to the fact that there are areas with different hunting pressure (agricultural zone, hunting zone, conservation zone). It is therefore necessary to use a methodology for monitoring the rate of encounter of fauna that is on the one hand statistically sufficiently robust to detect actual trends, and on the other hand feasible from a logistic and financial perspective. The method will be based on a simplified version of the systematic survey protocol used for previous surveys, of which the sampling scheme and the geographic locations of all transects are known. The rate of encounter of illegal human activities will also be collected through this protocol (see § 6.1.2 – management indicators).

The sampling scheme should include all three zones (agricultural zone, hunting zone and conservation zone). In addition to the three flagship species identified in the Statement of OUV (okapi, elephant, chimpanzee), the rates of encounter of small ungulates and duikers, “common” species particularly targeted by the bush-meat trade, will be monitored. For logistic and financial reasons, this systematic survey can reasonably only be carried out once (in 2012).

The rates of encounter (fauna and human activities) derived from the patrol monitoring system will also be monitored continuously and should confirm a gradual improvement of the situation. It should nevertheless be emphasized that the indices derived from patrol monitoring and those derived from systematic surveys are not directly comparable as they are collected through differing methods and with different means. However, the trends will be comparable.

According to the surveys report (Rapport IMU n° 9, 2008), the rate of encounter of indirect indices of species of fauna in the three sampled zones in 2005/2006 were:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Rate of encounter of indirect indices (indices/km)  (nests for chimpanzees, dung for other species) | | |
|  | Agricultural zone | Hunting zone | Conservation zone |
| Elephant | 1.33 | 1.20 | 1.72 |
| Okapi | 0.11 | 0.22 | 0.51 |
| Chimpanzee | 0.35 | 0.45 | 0.82 |
| Small ungulates | 0.20 | 0.51 | 1.18 |
| Red-flanked duiker | 0.22 | 0.51 | 1.41 |
| Yellow-backed duiker | 0.06 | 0.13 | 0.25 |

This represents, for the period 1995-2006, the following declines (all zones combined):

Elephant: -48%  
Okapi: -43%  
Chimpanzee: no data   
Small ungulates: -26%  
Red-flanked duiker: -42%  
Yellow-backed duiker: -59%

The rates of encounter of 2006 will serve as the baseline for the establishment of benchmarks to be achieved in 2012. Obviously it is not realistic to expect a complete reversal of these declines in a period of 6 years (2006-2012). On the one hand, poaching will not stop overnight and on the other hand, animal populations, particularly of large species with long reproduction cycles, need time to recover. In addition, the rate of change will be different per zone, higher in the conservation zone and lower (or even nil) in the agricultural zone.

The following indicators are proposed:

|  |
| --- |
| **I 2**: In 2012, the evolution of rates of encounter of fauna indices compared to those of 2006 will be: |
| |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Agricultural zone | Hunting zone | Conservation zone | | Elephant | no decline | ≥ 10% | ≥ 20% | | Okapi | no decline | ≥ 10% | ≥ 20% | | Chimpanzee | no decline | ≥ 10% | ≥ 20% | | Small ungulates | no decline | ≥ 15% | ≥ 35% | | Red-flanked duiker | no decline | ≥ 15% | ≥ 35% | | Yellow-backed duiker | no decline | ≥ 15% | ≥ 35% |   [Method of verification: systematic survey based on the methodology applied to the 2005/2006 surveys; patrol monitoring data] |

Attendance of *edos[[6]](#footnote-6)* by large fauna (elephant, bongo, buffalo) is a good indicator of the level of protection. Being open environments, these areas are quickly abandoned by forest animals when poaching intensifies. Four *edos* are particularly important: Mehwa, Kiboko, Boyea, and Afaru. These *edos* should be monitored regularly and recent traces of attendance confirmed. The presence of concentrations of grey parrots and green pigeons at Mehwa should be maintained. The attendance of *edos* can be verified during patrols or research visits through the presence of attendance indices (tracks, dung, ...).

|  |
| --- |
| **I 3**: The *edos* Mehwa, Kiboko, Boyea, and Afaru are actively attended by fauna.  [Methods of verification: regular patrol visits; aerial overflights] |

* + 1. Integrity and Management Indicators

The main factor influencing the level of encroachment and the level of hunting in the Okapi Wildlife Reserve is the number of people having their residence there. A major objective of the management of the Okapi Wildlife Reserve is to stabilize this number. The demographic census of 2003 has counted 17,000 people living inside the Okapi Wildlife Reserve, and 37,000 people living within 15 km of the Okapi Wildlife Reserve. A census is currently in progress and the results will be available during the first half of 2009. According to preliminary analyses, it is likely that the number of people currently living inside the Okapi Wildlife Reserve will be between 20,000 and 21,000. Although with the establishment of an immigration control system it is possible that this number will be slightly lower (by regulating the situations of resident and non-resident people), it is nevertheless unlikely that the situation of 2003 can be re-established. It is therefore necessary to halt immigration in order to stabilise the population at its current level.

|  |
| --- |
| **I 4**: In 2012, the resident human population inside the Okapi Wildlife Reserve does not exceed 21,000 people.  [Method of verification: demographic census in 2012; data from the registers of residents of each village]. |

Other integrity indices are the indices of illegal activities. The major illegal activities inside the property are poaching and mining:

|  |
| --- |
| **I 5**: In 2012, the indices of poaching (illegal hunting) have reduced by at least 60% in the conservation zone and by at least 30% in the hunting zone compared to the situation in 2006.  [Methods of verification: 2012 fauna survey; patrol monitoring data]. |

|  |
| --- |
| **I 6**: The mining quarries identified in 2006 are not re-opened and no new quarries are established.  [Method of verification: aerial overflights (twice a year)]. |

In order to measure if adequate protection is in place to maintain the values and integrity of the property, the following indicators are proposed:

|  |
| --- |
| **I 7**: At least one kilometre of patrol is carried out each year in 85% of 5km x 5km quadrants of the Okapi Wildlife Reserve.  [Method of verification: patrol monitoring data] |

|  |
| --- |
| **I 8**: The management plan of the Okapi Wildlife Reserve, foreseeing the establishment of a conservation zone with national park status, is officially adopted and implemented.  [Method of verification: ministerial decree for the adoption of the management plan; decree for the creation of the conservation zone with national park status]. |

* + 1. Calendar for Implementation

The mission considers that if security conditions are met and the efforts for the implementation of the corrective measures continue, these indicators could be achieved in 3 years (2012).

In order to ensure the monitoring of these indicators, the mission considers it necessary to organize, before the end of 2010, a review to elaborate the methodology to be used for the 2012 survey. The aim is to propose a lighter, but statistically sound[[7]](#footnote-7) version of the methodology used for the 1995 and 2005/2006 surveys.

**ANNEX 2: Culture case study**

**Chan Chan Archaeological Zone, Peru**

Chan Chan Archaeological Zone in Peru was inscribed on the World Heritage List and immediately on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1986 due to the fragility of its earthen architecture and decorated surfaces, exacerbated by the lack of sustained conservation and maintenance practices, the illegal occupation of the property, unregulated farming activities, rising water table levels and the delay in implementing protective measures. The Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011)

Since the inscription of the property three reactive monitoring missions were carried out. The 2007 mission to the property identified a series of corrective measures to be implemented by the State Party and which were subsequently reported in the annual state of conservation reports presented to the World Heritage Committee.

In 2010, with the approved Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, the mission worked with the site manager and the authorities in charge of the cultural heritage in Peru, and developed a draft Desired State of Conservation which was subsequently revised by ICOMOS and the State Party prior to its approval by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012).

**Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

Based on the adopted Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the property, several measures were identified to ensure that the threats affecting the property were systematically and holistically addressed.

The Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger that was adopted is as follows:

1. Operational and sustainable management system for the Chan Chan Archaeological Zone in place, including functional institutional arrangements and secured funding,
2. Approval of revised Management Plan and integration with other planning tools at the municipal and provincial levels, particularly for the management of the buffer zone,
3. Continued implementation of conservation and maintenance measures at the property, including mitigation measures to address the vulnerability of the earthen architecture remains,
4. Legislative and regulatory measures to address the issues of illegal occupations and activities at the site enacted and enforced;

**State of conservation of the physical fabric of the property**

Conserving the physical fabric and the material integrity of the archaeological site is crucial for sustaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The continuous deterioration of earthen architecture structures and decorated surfaces from lack of conservation and maintenance practices and from rising water table levels had eroded the physical integrity of the property and affected a significant number of attributes of the property, in particular the ability to distinguish the differentiated use of space, the characteristics of the architectural elements and the decorative features, as well as the remains from agricultural systems and irrigation systems.

The following corrective measures were identified for conservation:

* Comprehensive conservation condition assessment and monitoring to assess the existing state of conservation of the property,
* Identification of priority areas for the implementation of conservation and maintenance actions,
* Implementation of priority and emergency conservation measures at vulnerable areas of the property, with particular focus on the nine palaces and areas with decorated surfaces, as well as measures centred on the control of water table levels,
* Definition and adoption of conservation guidelines for intervention,
* Implementation and maintenance of the physical delimitation of the property including vegetation barriers and perimeter walls,
* Comprehensive assessment of the current conditions of the existing site museum, identification of priority emergency measures and definition of a comprehensive intervention programme to be included in the public use plan.
* Addressing of solid waste management at the boundaries of the site in collaboration with pertinent authorities,
* Monitoring programme fully in place to evaluate the efficacy and results of interventions and to revise them if needed,
* Interventions for public use at the property, particularly in respect to the site museum in accordance to provisions included in the revised Management Plan,
* Interventions for risk management in accordance to provisions identified in the Management Plan,

The main indicators to assess the progress made in addressing the threats to the physical fabric and material integrity of the property include:

* Reduction of the rate and extent of deterioration at the main nine palaces and exposed decorated surfaces. (Method of verification: annual condition assessment surveys, number of conservation and maintenance projects at priority areas, monitoring of water table levels)
* Functioning boundaries for the property (Methods of verification: existence and maintenance of vegetation barriers and perimeter walls, monitoring of solid waste management practices)

**Protection and and Management**

The illegal occupation of the property, as well as the unregulated farming activities and the lack of efficient implementation of legislative and regulatory measures affected the integrity of the property. These conditions particularly affected the remains of the prehispanic production sectors, in particular the agricultural units, the outlying residential areas and intermediate architecture. The setting and visual integrity of the property was also impacted negatively by illegal farming practices, which had been exacerbated by pending resolution of land tenure and relocation issues and by encroaching urban and infrastructure development.

For protection and planning, the following corrective measures were identified:

- Updating of the Management Plan, including a revised risk Management Plan and a public use plan as well as scheduled and costed provisions for the conservation and management of the property and its buffer zone,

* Finalization of the definition of the buffer zone and its regulatory measures in collaboration with municipal authorities,
* Dissemination and circulation among stakeholders of updated plans for the property and its buffer zone, including provisions and regulations for each zone. Collaboration with entities in defining regulatory measures for the management of the buffer zone and of the World Heritage property,
* Finalization of regulations for Law no. 28261 to address fundamental issues such as the illegal removal of soil, agricultural works and the illegal occupation at the property,
* Integration of the Management Plan in territorial and urban development plans,
* Dissemination of the revised Management Plan to strengthen public and private support in its implementation.

The main indicators to assess the progress made in regard to protection and planning include:

* Adoption of regulatory measures for the management of the buffer zone and full enforcement of legislative and regulatory frameworks passed by the State Party (Methods of verification: Approval / enactment of regulatory measures for Law No. 28261 to ensure the conservation and protection of the Outstanding Universal Value and conditions of integrity and authenticity of the property)
* Relocation of illegal settlers in collaboration with pertinent authorities (Methods of verification: number of people relocated)
* Adequate control of encroachments and urban pressure (Methods of verification: Approval/ enactment of Management plan and integration with territorial and urban development plans, aerial photographs, monitoring of the buffer zone and limits of the property).

For management, the following measures were identified:

* Evaluation of effectiveness of existing institutional arrangements to include revised provisions in the updated Management Plan,
* Identification of sources for secured funding in the long-term,
* Full and systematic implementation of the revised Management Plan in accordance to prescribed policies,

The main indicators to assess the progress made in regard to management include:

* Operational management arrangements and budgets secured for the comprehensive implementation of the Management Plan (Methods of verification: approval/enactment of management plan and existence of budgets)
* Functional institutional arrangements with adequate resources secured for long-term implementation of the formulated Management Plan (Methods of verification: number of staff, existence of annual operation budgets)

Based on discussions with the site manager and the national authorities, and in consideration to the existing resources and capacities, it was considered that the identified corrective measures could be implemented within a three year period.

**ANNEX 3: Template worksheet – Desired State of Conservation for removal framework**

**How was the DSOCR developed?**

**Timeframe for implementation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **INDICATOR FOR REMOVAL OF THE PROPERTY FROM THE LIST IN DANGER** | **RATIONALE** | **METHOD OF VERIFICATION** |
| **ATTRIBUTES** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **INTEGRITY/ AUTHENTICITYY** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **PROTECTION& MANAGEMENT** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**ANNEX 4: Template worksheet – Progress Report on the Desired State of Conservation for removal framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **N** | **INDICATOR FOR REMOVAL OF THE PROPERTY FROM THE LIST IN DANGER** | **RATIONALE** | **METHOD OF VERIFICATION** | **STATUS OF INDICATOR** |
| **ATTRIBUTES** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **INTEGRITY/ AUTHENTICITY** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **PROTECTION& MANAGEMENT** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**ANNEX 5: Decision 31 COM 7.3 – Outcomes of the benchmarks meeting**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-07/31.COM/7.3,
2. Recalling Decisions **29 COM 7C** and **30 COM 9** adopted at its 29th (Durban, 2005) and 30th (Vilnius, 2006) sessions respectively,
3. Thanking the Government of the Netherlands for having hosted the meeting of experts, which took place from 2 to 3 April 2007 in Paris, as well as all the experts who contributed to it,
4. Noting the results and recommendations of the expert meeting,
5. Decides to formally adopt a monitoring framework for World Heritage properties;
6. Decides to integrate the monitoring framework into the next revision of the Operational Guidelines and to ensure cross referencing for all World Heritage processes;
7. Specifically requests for the revision of the Operational Guidelines to ensure the link between outstanding universal value and the format for nominations (Annex 5: 4a on present state of conservation and 4b on factors affecting the property);
8. Further requests the States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to establish desired state of conservation in all state of conservation reports to facilitate sound decisions, specifically for inclusion in / removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger;
9. Urges the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to provide technical guidance on how to draft statements of significance / outstanding universal value and requests ICCROM to use the funds, already allocated, for a focussed guidance manual, in consultation with IUCN and ICOMOS, to be published by the end of 2007;
10. Noting the prioritised implementation strategy with focus on the application of the monitoring framework to properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger, requests States Parties with properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger to prepare a draft Statement of outstanding universal value for these properties,
11. Further requests all States Parties, with the Advisory Bodies, to prepare a draft Statement of outstanding universal value for their properties prior to the arrival of a reactive monitoring mission, and to ensure that the draft statements of outstanding universal value be prepared in advance for the next cycle of Periodic Reporting;
12. Requests that stakeholders be involved in preparing all reports required under the World Heritage Convention (nomination documents, state of conservation reports, periodic reports) in order to ensure full participation in the definition of the values and desired state of conservation of a property;
13. Recalls the requirement that at the time of inscription the Committee decision should entail a clear Statement of outstanding universal value with authenticity and/or integrity and decides to add the requirements to describe the desired state of conservation;
14. Notes confusion around the term "benchmarks" and requests instead the use of the terms "desired state of conservation" and "corrective measures" in all state of conservation documents relating to the List of World Heritage in Danger, and adopts in principle the format for state of conservation reports in Annex II.

1. Note that Desired State of Conservation is not yet included in the *Operational Guidelines*. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The notion of integrity for cultural heritage is currently under development and has not yet been adopted by the Committee for integration into the *Operational Guidelines*. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The results of surveys of fauna indicate that the populations of elephants and okapis have diminished by 48% and 43% respectively between 1995 and 2006. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. In the case of forest elephants, of which the home ranges exceed the boundaries of the Okapi Wildlife Reserve, it is unlikely that the population can reach the same level as in 1995 (estimated at 7,500 individuals using the Reserve) on account of the loss of its habitat outside the Okapi Wildlife Reserve (advancement of human activities – agriculture, forest exploitation – from east to west). Nevertheless, an increase in abundance indices will help to show an improvement of the level of protection even if the absolute number of elephants remains below that of 1995. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Contrary to trees, animals move and are quite rarely seen during surveys. Survey methods are therefore based on indirect indices (dung, tracks, nests) on the basis of which estimations of abundance are calculated. Consequently, the estimations of absolute abundance of populations are often imprecise (large variance) and the collection of data is time consuming (and therefore costly). Therefore, generally the abundance index (rate of encounter of indirect indices) is sought, rather than the absolute abundance of individuals. This index allows the monitoring of trends even if absolute numbers are unknown. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Forest clearings rich in mineral salt that attract animals [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. In particular it is necessary to elaborate a methodology that would allow minimizing the variance coefficient for the rates of encounter, because with methodologies generally used in forest environments in Central Africa it is difficult to detect changes of less than 20%. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)