

**Distribution limited**

**WHC-02/CONF.202/INF.10**

**Paris, 27 May 2002**

**Original : English/French**

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

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

**30th Anniversary  
(1972-2002)**

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Twenty-sixth session**

**Budapest, Hungary  
24 - 29 June 2002**

**Information document: Report on the state of conservation of the Historic  
Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru): Report of the UNESCO-IUCN-ICOMOS  
Mission to Machu Picchu, Peru, 25 February to 1 March 2002**

# **REPORT ON THE MISSION TO THE HISTORIC SANCTUARY OF MACHU PICCHU (PERU)**

**FROM 25 February to 1 March 2002**

---

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

## **1 BACKGROUND TO THE MISSION**

- 1.1. Inscription history
- 1.2. Examination of the state of conservation by the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau
- 1.3. Justification for the mission

## **2 NATIONAL POLICY FOR THE PRESERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTY**

- 2.1. Legal framework
- 2.2. Institutional framework
  - 2.2.1 Management of the site
  - 2.2.2 Machu Picchu Programme

## **3 ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE UNESCO-IUCN-ICOMOS MISSION OF OCTOBER 1999**

- 3.1. Planning and management arrangements
  - 3.1.1. Master Plan
  - 3.1.2. Management Unit
- 3.2. Access to the Historic Sanctuary and to the Ciudadela
- 3.3. Visitor services and facilities
  - 3.3.1. Visitor services
  - 3.3.2. Plan for the village of Aguas Calientes
  - 3.3.3. Landslides, Ciudadela Area

3.4. Potential extension of the World Heritage site

3.5. Overall state of conservation

3.5.1. Natural heritage

3.5.2. Cultural heritage

**4. ADDITIONAL ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY THE WORLD HERITAGE BUREAU AND/OR THE UNESCO-IUCN-ICOMOS MISSION OF FEBRUARY 2002**

4.1 Public Use Plan

4.2 Operational Plans of the Management Unit

4.3 Landslide Danger, Aguas Calientes Area

4.4 Scientific and financial support

4.4.1 Scientific support

4.4.2 Financial Support

4.5 Policy for the Use of the Site for Commercial Purposes

4.6 State of Conservation of the Intihuatana

**5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**ANNEXES**

I. Terms of reference

II. Itinerary and programme

III. Mission team

---

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The mission team expresses its appreciation for the full co-operation and support it received from the national, local and regional authorities. It also expresses its gratitude to the Representative of UNESCO in Peru and her staff for the support provided in the preparation and undertaking of the mission.

2 March 2002

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu was inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1983 under both cultural and natural criteria.

The management arrangements and planning mechanisms for the preservation of the Sanctuary have been of serious concern to the World Heritage Committee for many years. Specific projects, such as a proposed cable car from Aguas Calientes to the Ciudadela and a hotel extension, were also brought to the attention of the World Heritage Committee as having a potential negative impact on the conservation of the Sanctuary.

A first expert mission to assess the management and state of conservation of the site was undertaken by experts of IUCN and ICOMOS in October 1997. Following recommendations of the Committee and its Bureau, in October 1998, the Government of Peru adopted a Master Plan for the site and in June 1999 a Management Unit was created under the leadership of the directors of both the Institute for Natural Resources (INRENA) and the National Institute for Culture (INC).

At the request of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-third session, a second mission of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, IUCN and ICOMOS was undertaken in October 1999 with the objective of assessing the effectiveness of the Master Plan and Management Unit for the Sanctuary, the status of the cable car and other projects, options for extension of the site and the overall state of conservation of the Sanctuary. The report of this mission was submitted to the twenty-third session of the World Heritage Committee and fully endorsed by it.

In June 2001, the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee deemed it necessary to request UNESCO, IUCN and ICOMOS to undertake a third mission to assess the implementation of the recommendations of the mission of 1999 and, in response to damages caused to the Intihuatana sundial, to look into the policy for the commercial use of the site. The mission was undertaken from 25 February to 1 March 2002.

The 2002 Mission finds that only a few of the recommendations of the 1999 Mission have been fully implemented. Planning and management arrangements for the Sanctuary, which are fundamental requirements for effective site conservation, have improved only marginally. A variety of studies undertaken by the Machu Picchu Programme have provided sound information on, and analysis of, many of the critical problems confronting the Sanctuary. However, this information has been used only rarely as the basis for concrete decisions and action. In effect, the planning and management arrangements for the Sanctuary remain inadequate. Most of the Sanctuary's many stakeholders continue to act in their own self-interest, with little regard for the guidelines established in the Master Plan or the effects of their actions on the conservation of the site, or the sustainable development of the region.

Access to the Sanctuary and to the Ciudadela remains as it has been for many years, except that the railway connection between Cusco and Aguas Calientes has been given out as a private concession. The result has been a marginal improvement in service, hefty increases in passenger and freight rates, and decision-making on this vital transportation link totally independent of the Sanctuary Management Unit. No

credible studies of the alternatives for transportation to the Sanctuary from Cusco, or within the Sanctuary, have been undertaken.

The recommendations of the 1999 Mission regarding new infrastructure for visitor services around the Ciudadela have been partially implemented. Permits for the construction of the proposed cable car and expansion of the hotel at the entrance to the Ciudadela have not been issued. A study on carrying capacity of the Camino Inca has been completed. Terms of reference for development of a Public Use Plan for the Sanctuary are currently being developed in preparation for out-sourcing of this critical work. Since tourism is the major driving force within the Sanctuary, the Public Use Plan will be pivotal in terms of determining carrying capacities, alternatives for access, and the safety of Aguas Calientes for visitor use. These are critical factors that should be used as the basis for planning visitor services and facilities, without negatively impacting the universal values of the site, or compromising visitor safety. While urban development and natural disaster mitigation plans have been developed for the village of Aguas Calientes, they have not been implemented nor have their recommendations been followed.

Studies are being undertaken to determine how the critical natural and cultural resources surrounding the Sanctuary can be managed in ways that will complement the management objectives of the Sanctuary. This may be through expansion of the Sanctuary itself, or the establishment of complementary management units.

The overall state of conservation of the natural resources of the Sanctuary has improved only marginally since the visit of the 1999 Mission. A fire control plan has been developed and is being implemented, and efforts are being made to limit use of the Camino Inca. Studies of the other major factors causing the deterioration of the natural environment have been carried out, especially in reference to grazing, introduced species, land tenure, squatter families, and restoration of vegetation in critical areas, but almost no action has been taken.

The overall state of the cultural resources of the Sanctuary is quite good. The Ciudadela and archaeological sites along the Camino Inca are well preserved and maintenance is regular. There were reports, however, that the Camino Inca itself is in disrepair in some sections, and that garbage removal, and sanitation remain serious problems. Efforts to control the number of hikers using the Camino Inca during peak periods have apparently resulted in less crowding, though there is divided opinion on this.

The 2002 Mission identified additional issues that require immediate consideration. Planning, and the implementation of plans, remains an important issue. The terms of reference for development of the Public Use Plan had not been completed at the time the Team was in the field, but there was concern that the Plan be based on detailed studies of visitor carrying capacities, alternatives for access, and the very real vulnerability of Aguas Calientes to natural disasters. It is important that the Public Use Plan provide sufficient detail to guide implementation, especially in terms of human and financial resource requirements, and physical planning of infrastructure. The Team also noted the need to link the Operational plans of the Management Unit to the strategies outlined in the Master Plan, and to a monitoring of results from implementation of the previous year's Operational Plan. The Team was particularly

concerned about the lack of implementation of the Natural Disaster Mitigation Plan, and the lack of an explicit policy decision regarding the continued use and development of Aguas Calientes as a tourist destination and distribution centre.

Scientific and financial support for management of the Sanctuary remains a critical issue. The Machu Picchu Programme, supported by the Government of Finland, has provided interim solutions, but the Programme will terminate this year. It is recommended therefore, that urgent attention be given to the establishment of a permanent, independent, and international institution to provide scientific support to management of the Sanctuary and serve as an international advocate for conservation of the site's universal values. There is also a need to immediately establish, as indicated in the Master Plan, a Trust Fund for Machu Picchu, to facilitate the collection, transparent management, and distribution of revenues in accordance with the priorities and strategies outlined in the Master Plan.

An accident during filming of a commercial, that caused a portion of the Intihuatana sculpture at the centre of the Ciudadela to be split off, has demonstrated that current regulation of commercial use of the site is inadequate. Efforts are underway to augment both regulation and supervision of such activities in the future. Studies have been undertaken that indicate restoration of the damage to be feasible, but little can be done until the legal and administrative processes against the party causing the damage have been resolved. In the meantime, it would be useful to establish a technical commission to study the reports, and make a firm recommendation regarding the restoration

## 1. BACKGROUND TO THE MISSION

### 1.1. Inscription history

In 1982, the Government of Peru submitted the nomination of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu<sup>1</sup> for inscription on the World Heritage List. As a justification for the inscription, the following text was included in the nomination dossier:

---

<sup>1</sup> Note on the use of names:

In this report, the World Heritage property is referred to as *Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu* or *Sanctuary*. This is the area of 32,592 hectares that was established as a protected area in 1981 under the name of the *Sanctuario Historico de Machu Picchu* (see map VI.3) and was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1983.

Two years later, in 1983, part of the Sanctuary was declared the *Archaeological Park of Machu Picchu*.

The best known and most important monument in the Archaeological Park is the *Ciudadela*, the ruins of the Inca city at the foot of the Huayna Picchu mountain.

The traditional access to the Ciudadela was via the *Camino Inca*, the Inca road from Cusco to the Ciudadela. The part through the Sanctuary is also known as the *Inca Trail*.

In the 1940s a railway was constructed along the river *Urubamba*. A village developed along the railway. This village is generally known as *Aguas Calientes*.

*“There is no doubt that Machu Picchu is one of the finest examples of the technical and creative abilities of the pre-Colombian peoples and constitutes one of the most important cultural attractions to be found in the Americas. The same area also contains other archaeological complexes in a setting of rare natural beauty which retains its original flora and fauna. In Machu Picchu Andean man displayed his technical skill and his sensitive ability to integrate his creations in its natural surroundings. (...)”*

In its evaluation of the nomination, ICOMOS recommended inscription on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria (i) and (ii) as follows:

*“Criterion (i): The working of the mountain, at the foot of Huayna Picchu, is a unique artistic achievement, an absolute master piece of architecture.  
Criterion (iii): Machu Picchu bears, with Cusco and the other archaeological sites in the valley of the Urubamba (...) a unique testimony to the Inca civilization.”*

IUCN stated in its evaluation that:

*“Machu Picchu qualifies for inclusion on the World Heritage List under natural criteria (ii) –as an outstanding example of man’s interaction with his natural environment- and (iii) –as an area containing superlative mountains, vegetation and watercourses.”*

Following these recommendations, the World Heritage Committee, at its seventh session in December 1983, decided to inscribe the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (HSMP) on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria N(ii) (iii) and C(i) (iii).<sup>2</sup> The decision of the World Heritage Committee reads as follows:

*“The Committee noted that this site is inscribed for both its cultural and natural values, as this property also meets natural criteria (ii) and (iii). The Committee furthermore recommended that to enhance the cultural and natural value of this property, the site should be extended to include the lower courses*

---

Not far from the village, a bridge over the river Urubamba ( the bridge is known as **Puente Ruinas**) leads to the **zig-zag road** that provides access to the Ciudadela.

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that since the inscription of Machu Picchu on the World Heritage List, the World Heritage Committee has revised the criteria for cultural and natural properties. At the time of the inscription the relevant criteria were formulated as follows (*Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, WHC/2 Revised November 1983):

*N (ii) be outstanding examples representing significant ongoing geological processes, biological evolution and man’s interaction with his natural environment (...);  
N (iii) contain superlative natural phenomena, formations or features, for instance outstanding examples of the most important ecosystems, areas of exceptional natural beauty or exceptional combinations of natural and cultural elements;*

*C (i) represent a unique artistic achievement, a masterpiece of the creative genius;*

*C (iii) bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a civilization which has disappeared.*

*of the Urubamba river and the sites of Pisac and Ollantaytambo in the ‘Valley of the Gods’.*”

## **1.2. Examination of the State of Conservation by the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau**

Since 1996, the World Heritage Committee and its Bureau examined at various sessions the state of conservation of the Sanctuary, particularly in relation to planning and management and the possible construction of a cable car. The Committee repeatedly expressed its concern about the lack of integral management mechanisms, the lack of a Master Plan and about the possible impact of a project for a cable car system that would provide access to the Ciudadela of Machu Picchu (the ruins of the Inca city located on the saddle between Machu Picchu and Huayna Picchu Peaks).

At the request of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-first session (June 1997), a first expert mission IUCN/ICOMOS was undertaken in October 1997. Following this mission, the World Heritage Committee, at its twenty-first session in December 1997, expressed its concern about the deficient management arrangements and urged the Peruvian authorities to establish an adequate management structure for the site. It furthermore recommended they prepare a comprehensive Master Plan.

As a response, the Government of Peru prepared and adopted in October 1998 the Master Plan for the HSMP. In June 1999, the Government of Peru established the Management Unit for Machu Picchu.

As to the cable car project, the Government of Peru informed the Bureau of the Committee at its twenty-second session in June 1998 that the concession for the studies and design of the cable car had been granted, but that its construction would not be undertaken if the environmental impact studies demonstrated the project to be in conflict with the master plan for the Sanctuary.

At its twenty-second session in December 1998, the World Heritage Committee commended the Government of Peru for the actions it had taken, particularly the adoption of the Master Plan. It requested the Peruvian authorities to:

*“transmit all relevant documentation and provisions with regard to the management structure and Master Plan for the Sanctuary, the cable car system (Environmental Impact Study, detailed plans etc.), as well as other works or projects that are or will be considered for implementation within the boundaries of the site as soon as they become available, to the World Heritage Centre.(...) The Committee urged the Government of Peru not to take any decision on projects that could have considerable impact on the World Heritage values of the park prior to a possible IUCN-ICOMOS mission. Prior consultations with the World Heritage Committee as recommended in paragraph 56 of the Operational Guidelines should also be envisaged.”*

Following the examination of the state of conservation of the Sanctuary at its twenty-third session in July 1999, the Bureau requested

*IUCN, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre to undertake a second expert mission to Machu Picchu to assess:*

- 1. the implementation and effectiveness of the Master Plan and management arrangements for the Sanctuary (with particular reference to tourism);*
- 2. the status of the project of the cable car system and its possible impact on the World Heritage value of the Sanctuary, as well as the viability of alternatives to the cable car system;*
- 3. the status of the eventual extension or modification of the hotel at Machu Picchu and other major works that may be planned inside or outside the site, as well as their possible impact on the World Heritage value of the Sanctuary;*
- 4. options for extensions to the site, and to bring forward recommendations in this respect;*
- 5. the overall state of cultural and natural conservation of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu.*

The mission undertaken in October 1999 concluded that it was too early to assess the effectiveness of the Master Plan and the Management Unit. However, having analysed the tourism and demographic pressure on the Sanctuary and more particularly on the landscape surrounding the Ciudadela, the mission concluded that any new construction or infrastructure in this area would very seriously affect the World Heritage values, authenticity and integrity of the Ciudadela and its surrounding landscape. The mission recommended the undertaking of detailed studies on the carrying capacity of, and the means of access to, the Sanctuary and its components, the reorganization and, if possible, the reduction of visitor facilities in the area surrounding the Ciudadela, and for overall planning for the village of Aguas Calientes. The mission report included a series of 16 specific recommendations for consideration by the World Heritage Committee and the Government of Peru.

The report of the mission was submitted to the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-third session in December 1999 and fully endorsed by it.

The Government of Peru submitted reports on the implementation of the recommendations of the mission to the sessions of the Bureau of the Committee in June and November 2000. At its session in June 2001, the Bureau welcomed the decision of the government to suspend the cable car project and expressed the opinion that this should facilitate the undertaking of studies to define the carrying capacity of the site and to develop a well-considered approach to the management of an ever-increasing flow of visitors. On both occasions the Bureau urged the Government of Peru to address and implement all recommendations of the mission.

In June 2001, at its twenty-fifth session, the Bureau requested a third mission to be undertaken by UNESCO, IUCN and ICOMOS to assess the implementation of the recommendations of the mission of 1999 and, in response to damages caused to the Intihuatana sun-dial, to look into the policy for the commercial use of the site. The report of the mission should be submitted to the Bureau at its twenty-sixth session.

### **1.3. Justification for the mission**

The UNESCO-IUCN-ICOMOS mission was undertaken at the request of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee as indicated above. The dates of the mission (25 February to 1 March 2002) were defined in consultation with the Government of Peru. Detailed terms of reference for the mission were discussed and agreed upon at a briefing at the beginning of the mission (Annex I). The programme of the mission is provided in Annex II, and the members of the mission team are listed in Annex III.

The mission met with relevant national, regional and local authorities and institutions involved in the management of the Sanctuary, as well as with individuals with specific knowledge of the site (see programme in Annex II).

Preliminary observations and conclusions of the Mission Team were presented to representatives of the National Institute for Natural Resources (INRENA) and the National Institute for Culture (INC) at a de-briefing session at the end of the mission.

## **2 NATIONAL POLICY FOR THE PRESERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTY**

### **2.1. Legal framework**

The mission was not informed of any legal changes with respect to the HSMP; the description provided in the 1999 report remains accurate.

### **2.2 Institutional framework**

#### **2.2.1 Management of the site**

The Master Plan for the HSMP was prepared jointly by the National Institute for Natural Resources (INRENA) and the National Institute for Culture (INC) and adopted by INRENA on 21 October 1998.

The Master Plan outlines an institutional strategy for management of the site, which provides for the establishment of a joint INRENA-INC Management Unit. This Unit was formally created on 8 June 1999 (Decreto Supremo 023-99-AG). Initially, the Management Unit was under the direction and supervision of a Board of Directors composed of the national directors of INRENA and INC. In June 2001, both the Vice-Minister of Tourism and the President of the Interim Cusco Regional Government (CTAR) were added to the Board of Directors. Therefore, the Board of Directors now consists of:

- Director of INRENA
- Director of INC
- Vice-Minister of Tourism
- President of the Interim Cusco Regional Government (CTAR).

The Board of Directors of the Management Unit approved the Statutes for the Organization and Functions of the Management Unit on 28 March 2000 (resolution

01-2000-UGM-CD). The Board of Directors is presently presided by the Director of INRENA (June 2001 – June 2003).

The Supreme Decree of June 1999 establishes a Management Advisory Committee that presently consists of representatives of the following organisations:

- President of the Interim Cusco Regional Government (CTAR)
- Director of the National Institute for Culture- Cusco
- INRENA
- Regional Director of Industry and Tourism
- Rector of the San Antonio Abad National University in Cusco
- Governor of the Province of Urubamba
- Mayor of the District of Machu Picchu
- Representative of the National Chamber of Tourism (CANATUR).

The Bylaws for operation of the Management Advisory Committee were adopted in April 2001. At its session in June 2001, the Committee elected the representatives of the Cusco Regional Government as its President, the Machu Picchu Municipality as its Vice-President and the San Antonio Abad National University as a Member for a period of two years (June 2001 – June 2003).

### **2.2.2 Machu Picchu Programme (MPP)**

The Machu Picchu Programme (MPP) is financed under a dept-swap arrangement between the Governments of Peru and Finland, signed in 1996. It was originally implemented through PROFONANPE (National Fund for Protected Areas) and FONCODES (Fund for Social Development), but since 2000, full implementation has been assigned to PROFONANPE. Implementation started in 1997 and was scheduled for completion by the end of 2000. An evaluation mission of the parliament of Finland (April, 2000) concluded that the greatest part of the Programme had not been implemented as scheduled due to conflicts among the Peruvian authorities. An external technical evaluation undertaken at the end of 2000 noted that there was still the potential for the Programme to reach its objectives if institutional cooperation could be improved and a clear consensus on institutional roles achieved. Subsequently, the Programme was extended for two years until the end of 2002.

The minutes of the most recent meeting of the Advisory Council of the MPP (17 December 2001) reported a 37% implementation rate for the year 2001, due to delays in the execution of projects and a lack of 'political will'. The Advisory Council formulated a number of recommendations for management of the Sanctuary and implementation of the Master Plan. In spite of the difficulties and delays in implementation, the Programme has undertaken numerous activities in support of the planning and management of the site, particularly in relation to the Camino Inca, fire prevention, regularization of land ownership within the Sanctuary, establishment of a GIS system, a rural assessment, development of Aguas Calientes, solid waste management, analysis and mitigation of natural disasters in Machu Picchu – Aguas Calientes, and an architectural competition for the design of a public complex, which will incorporate a bus station, interpretive centre, and handicrafts market.

At present, the Programme is developing the terms of reference for development of a Public Use Plan for the Sanctuary (see section 4.1).

### **3 ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE UNESCO-IUCN-ICOMOS MISSION OF OCTOBER 1999**

#### **3.1. Planning and management arrangements**

##### **3.1.1 Master Plan**

###### Background

A Master Plan for the HSMP was adopted and published in 1998 after a long process of discussion and revision that was supported at critical times by UNESCO. It is a strategic document that presents general policies and guidelines. It does not, however, outline specific programmes of action or human and financial resource requirements, nor does it include physical planning for infrastructure. As a result, complementary planning instruments are required before actual investments can be planned and executed in an orderly manner. Such instruments should include programme plans, which present the actions required to implement the strategic guidelines of the master plan. These actions should be expressed in terms of specific activities, priorities, and associated human and financial resource requirements. Where infrastructure is needed to implement specific activities, physical planning requirements should be considered and integrated into an overall physical development plan. Finally, annual operations plans should be developed to translate the programme plans into an integrated budget request for the current fiscal year, establish work priorities and time frames, assign human and financial resources, and establish indicators of success.

The 1999 UNESCO Mission made two recommendations concerning the Master Plan:

###### Recommendations, 1999 Mission:

- Short and middle term operational plans for the strategies of the Master Plan to be prepared by the Management Unit with indication of priority actions and ensure their implementation.
- Establish mechanisms for monitoring the effective and timely implementation of the Master Plan.

###### Actions Taken

While the Master Plan is widely cited as the guiding document for management of the Sanctuary, in practice it is often ignored, and only a few elements of the strategic guidelines have been implemented. Short-term operations plans have been prepared to guide the work of the Management Unit, but they do not constitute realistic guidelines for implementing the strategies of the Master Plan, nor are monitoring mechanisms in place to track actual progress (see section for 4.2 for details). At the end of 2000, Programme Plans were developed for fire prevention (by the MPP and

INRENA), and urban planning (through the MPP) and disaster mitigation for the village of Aguas Calientes (by the Municipality, CTAR, UNDP, and the MPP). Information provided to the Mission indicates, however, that few elements of these plans have actually been implemented.

### Assessment

The Master Plan was developed in 1998. It was suggested in the Plan that it be revised after a period of 5 years, and indeed, it is already obvious that several elements of the Plan need to be rethought. Thus, if a revised Plan is to be adopted in 2003, following a participatory process, work on it must be started soon.

It should be noted that management of the HSMP revolves around tourism. Indeed, tourism activities were well established before the HSMP was created. Thus, management of tourism in the Sanctuary is the central challenge, and yet, no Programme Plan has been developed to guide public use. Terms of reference for development of the Public Use Plan are currently being developed by the MPP so that a bidding process can be organized, and the work begun (see section 4.1).

During the mission, questions arose regarding the sacred nature of the Sanctuary, its symbolic importance to traditional Andean communities, and its use for mystical tourism. None of the planning documents for the Sanctuary addresses these aspects, either in terms of ethical considerations or management guidelines. Thus, the sacred dimension of the site require further study, so that specific management measures can be identified to:

- encourage respect for the sacred values of the site;
- relate with sensitivity to the cosmo-vision of traditional Andean communities; and,
- regulate mystical tourism on its own terms, rather than as part of a mass tourism product.

### **Recommendations, 2002 Mission:**

- 1. Revise the Master Plan to take into account the present status of the natural and cultural resources of the Sanctuary, the evolving institutional framework, and new information that has been developed through research.**
- 2. Document the sacred values of the Sanctuary and their relevance to traditional Andean Communities, and to groups associated with mystical tourism.**
- 3. Incorporate management guidelines into the revised Master Plan for sacred sites within the Sanctuary to regulate use by the general visiting public, traditional communities, and mystical tourism groups.**

### 3.1.2 Management Unit

#### Background

The Management Unit for the HSMP was established in June 1999. Its Executive Director (*Gerente Técnico*) was appointed in August, and the two Deputy-Directors (the Director of the Archaeological Park on behalf of INC and the Director of the Historic Sanctuary on behalf on INRENA) in September of the same year. At the time of the 1999 mission it was too early to assess the effectiveness of the Management Unit in fulfilling its responsibility for the implementation of the strategies contained in the Master Plan. However, the 1999 mission made the following recommendations:

#### Recommendations, 1999 mission:

- Provide necessary human and financial resource to the Management Unit for the HSMP for it to be able to ensure the effective and timely implementation of the Master Plan;
- Ensure full support to the Management Unit from the National Institute for Natural Resources (INRENA), the National Institute for Culture (INC) and all other authorities, agencies and institutions involved, at the national, regional and local level;
- Establish clear and effective mechanisms of communication and authority between the Management Unit, INRENA, INC and other authorities, agencies and institutions, for the Management Unit to be effective in undertaking its tasks.

#### Actions taken

Since the 1999 mission, several administrative arrangements have been made for the Management Unit to become operational, e.g. the establishment of the Management Advisory Committee and the adoption of Bylaws for the Board of Directors and the Management Advisory Committee. As indicated in point 2.2 above, the Board of Directors was expanded to include the Vice-Minister of Tourism and the President of the Government of the Cusco Region. Both the Board of Directors and the Management Advisory Committee meet regularly. Reports on the deliberations of these bodies from June 2001 onwards were made available to the mission.

As to the staffing of the Management Unit, it should be noted that the Executive Director and the Deputy-Director for cultural heritage were replaced in the course of 2001 and that the Executive Director was appointed as Director of INC – Cusco in September 2001. To date, he fulfils both functions. Personnel employed by the Management Unit include a legal adviser, secretaries, particularly for the reservations for the Camino Inca, and 12 inspectors for the Camino Inca.

As to the planning of the activities of the Management Unit, an Operational Plan was prepared for 2001. The Operational Plan 2002 is presently under discussion in the Board of Directors. For an assessment of the Operational Plans see point 4.2. below.

## Assessment

The Management Unit was a new mechanism for integrating the management of the natural and cultural heritage of the Sanctuary. There is no doubt that its existence has contributed to a better coordination between INC and INRENA and that some important activities have been implemented. However, there is a broad consensus that the Management Unit in its present form does not function well or perform properly. Perceptions regarding the reasons for this vary considerably. Among the reasons that were mentioned to the mission are the following:

- The Management Unit does not have and cannot operate its own budget. Financing comes mainly from INC-Cusco and all purchases and expenditures need to be approved and implemented by INC-Cusco.
- There is a dichotomy in the structure of the Management Unit. The Executive Director is under the authority of the Board of Directors, whereas the Deputy-Directors are under the authority of the regional offices of INC and INRENA. This makes it very difficult for the Executive Director to be executive.
- During certain periods of its existence, the coordinating role of the Management Unit was not fully recognised by other institutions, and there was a lack of political support at the highest level of government.
- The Management Unit has concentrated its efforts on solving ad-hoc problems instead of on its core task; that is, the *'integral management of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu and the coordination of the implementation of the strategies of the Master Plan'* (Article 1 of the Supreme Decree 023-99-AG on the establishment of the Management Unit).

The proposed solutions to the above situation vary considerably from abolishment of the Management Unit, to reinforcing its coordinating capacities, to converting it into an autonomous executing entity. The Mission was informed that the Board of Directors is considering the strengthening of the Management Unit by modifying the Supreme Decree that created it.

While it is not the mission's role to propose a model for future operations of the Management Unit, it is important to underline the following:

### **Recommendations, 2002 Mission:**

- 4. The recommendations of the 1999 report regarding strengthening of the Management Unit remain valid, and the authorities are again urged to take the required measures.**
- 5. As a World Heritage site, the conservation of Machu Picchu is a matter of national interest, requiring the involvement of the highest levels of Government.**

### 3.2. Access to the Historic Sanctuary and to the Ciudadela

#### Background

At the time of the 1999 mission, most attention focused on the matter of the proposed cable car project to connect the village of Aguas Calientes with the Ciudadela. The mission, however, analysed access to the Sanctuary and the Ciudadela in the context of the overall planning and management of the Sanctuary. The mission made the following recommendations:

#### Recommendations, 1999 mission:

- Undertake, as a matter of urgency, studies to define the carrying capacity of the total and each of the components of the Sanctuary (Camino Inca, Ciudadela, Aguas Calientes among others);
- Once the carrying capacity is defined, undertake a study on the means of access to the Sanctuary and the Ciudadela, in function of the established maximum number of visitors (analysis of present facilities, options for improvement, alternative solutions, mechanisms to regulate and manage number of visitors);
- Pending the completion of these studies, do not introduce any new means of access to the Sanctuary or the Ciudadela;
- As to the Ciudadela and its wider environment, undertake a study for the reorganization and reduction of functions and facilities. In the meantime, do not permit any new constructions or infrastructure in this area.

#### Actions taken

##### *Roads*

The road Aguas Calientes – Puente Ruinas –Ciudadela remains in a bad state and no actions or studies have been taken for its improvement. The transport from the new Aguas Calientes railway station to the entrance to the Ciudadela is provided by a consortium of bus operators for a price of US\$ 9.00 per person. The Municipality of Aguas Calientes is a shareholder in the operation, and derives an important part of its income from the bus service revenues.

##### *Railway*

The railway Cusco – Ollantaytambo – Aguas Calientes is operated by a concessionaire (Peru Rail S.A.) with the same equipment and material that was used before by the state railway company. The price of a ticket from Cusco to Aguas Calientes is US\$ 70 per tourist. Local people can make use of a special train service with reduced prices. Only a few days before the mission, the railway was blocked by a series of landslides as a consequence of which communication with, and visits to, Machu Picchu were interrupted for some days. The Mayor of Aguas Calientes informed the mission of a considerable increase in the rates for transportation of materials to the village and for the removal of solid wastes from the Sanctuary. Previously the fares were lower and in fact ‘subsidized’ by the company. The INC is now absorbing the full costs of solid waste removal.

### *Helicopter flights*

Some two months ago, the helicopter flights Cusco – Aguas Calientes were interrupted by the company. Only a few days before the mission, a landslide completely destroyed the helicopter landing area.

By resolution 002-99-UGM-CD dated 30 December 1999, the Board of Directors of the Management Unit decided to prohibit all flights, with or without motor, within a radius of one kilometre of the Ciudadela.

### *Camino Inca*

On 8 May 2000 the Board of Directors issued regulations for visitor use of the Camino Inca within the boundaries of the Historic Sanctuary (resolution 002-2000-UGM-CD). Article 1 of the regulations stipulates that the objective of the ordinance is to contribute to the preservation and conservation of the cultural and natural heritage of the Sanctuary by defining norms and rules for the adequate use of the Camino Inca. The regulation establishes conditions for the use by tour operators, guides and visitors. It defines the capacity of the Camino Inca at a maximum of 500 per day for the year 2000 and provides for the closing of the Camino Inca during the month of February of each year for maintenance and recuperation. Finally the regulation establishes the entry fee at US\$ 50 per visitor (US\$ 25 for students and children) and US\$ 10 each for support personnel (guides, porters, cooks, etc.). Finally, the regulation stipulates that all funds collected as entry fees be invested in the Sanctuary, and that the difference between the fee established in the regulation (US\$ 50), and the previous fee charged by INC (US\$ 17), be used for the implementation of the annual operational plans of the Management Unit in accordance with the strategies established in the Master Plan.

On 21 December 2001, Congress approved a law concerning working conditions of the porters who carry luggage and equipment, the so-called '*porteadores*'. Among other things the law established a minimum age for *porteadores* (18 years, or if the person is physically and mentally fit for it, 16 years) and a maximum weight of 20 kilograms. With personal belongings the maximum weight to be carried is 25 kilograms.

### *Cable car project*

By Ministerial Resolution no 141-2001-ITINCI/DM dated 12 July 2001, the Minister of Industry, Tourism, Integration and International Commercial Negotiations declared the cancellation of the contract for the concession of the cable car between Aguas Calientes and the Ciudadela. This decision was welcomed by the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee at its twenty-fourth session. This decision should, according to the Bureau, facilitate the undertaking of studies to define the carrying capacity of the site and develop a well-considered approach to the management of an ever-increasing flow of tourists.

### *Carrying capacity and limits of acceptable change*

The mission was informed that the MPP commissioned a study on the carrying capacity for the Camino Inca. The *Baseline Study of Social and Environmental Conditions at the Inca Trail using the Limits of Acceptable Change Framework* was undertaken by Gregory C. Jones of Yale University School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, and was concluded in December 2000. The study, based on the concept of limits of acceptable change, was made available to the mission.

The study includes recommendation on facilities, communication and education, campsite impacts, alternative routes and daily visitor limits. On this last point, the study states that

*“(...) because expanding campsites is an undesirable option from social and environmental perspectives, physical capacity alone imposes a limit on the number of people who should be permitted along the Inca Trail per day. The new regulations proposed for the Inca Trail (El Peruano - Normas Legales, 2000), proposes a limit of 500 per day and takes strong steps towards many of the other changes mentioned above, but much depends upon the way the new regulations are implemented and enforced. Information collected to date is not adequate to establish a specific daily limit based on ecological indicators, (...). A monitoring program in 2001 and beyond will help to determine whether impacts rise or fall. If problems persist on the trail, further future reductions in daily limits will be needed.”*

For the Ciudadela, the INC has established a carrying capacity of 2000, which was referred to in the 1999 mission report. In the report to UNESCO that the Government of Peru submitted in December 2001, a carrying capacity of 2,500 at one time, and 3,400 per day is stated. No studies to substantiate these figures were made available to the mission. As a consequence, the mission is not in a position to validate or make observations on these figures.

### Assessment

Important progress has been made in the management of the Camino Inca with the adoption of the regulation referred to above and the reservation system managed by the Management Unit. The adoption of the law on the porters is an important and commendable step in the process of improving the working conditions of the porters. However, while the entry fee for the Camino Inca was raised from US\$ 17 to US\$ 50 (this includes the US\$ 20 entry fee for the Ciudadela), it appears that during the period of closure of the Camino Inca, no major improvements have been implemented.

The mission commends the Government of Peru for its decision to cancel the cable car and recalls that in the view of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee this decision should facilitate the undertaking of studies to define the carrying capacity of the site and develop a well-considered approach to the management of an ever-increasing flow of tourists.

The Mission notes, however, that the recommendations of the 1999 Mission have only been addressed in part. Thus, the following recommendations:

#### **Recommendations, 2002 Mission:**

**6. The Mission reiterates the need for full consideration of the issues, and implementation of specific measures, relating to carrying capacity and visitor access, both for the Sanctuary as a whole, and for its different components.**

**7. The Mission endorses all recommendations of the 1999 mission regarding new visitor facilities, and further recommends that they be considered in the context of the Public Use Plan.**

### **3.3 Visitor services and facilities**

Visitor services and facilities have remained relatively static since the 1999 Mission. Plans for construction of a cable car, and expansion of the Machu Picchu Hotel at the entrance to the Ciudadela, which were contentious issues for the 1999 Mission, have been abandoned for now. New visitor facilities have been limited to Aguas Calientes where additional hotels and restaurants, and a new train station, have been constructed.

#### **3.3.1 Visitor services**

##### Background

The management of a protected area is an exercise in the management of human activity within and around a specific resource complex. Thus, real on-the-ground management of the Sanctuary will remain illusive until: (1) the regulation of all visitor services is brought under the effective control of the Management Unit, and (2) there is acceptance by all stakeholders that commercial use of the natural and cultural resources of the HSMP is subject to concessionary agreements between the Management Unit and the service provider.

##### Assessment

These basic preconditions for management do not exist at present because of the myriad ad-hoc and uncoordinated institutional arrangements that have grown up over the years, many of which were set up before the Sanctuary was established:

1. The Hotel located at the entrance to the Ciudadela is a concession let by the Interim Regional Government (CTAR).
2. The so-called "Visitor Centre" (bar, restaurant, disco, and first aid station) at Wiñayhuayna is a concession let by the Ministry of Industry and Commerce.
3. The railroad from the Sanctuary boundary near Ollantaytambo to Aguas Calientes is a monopoly concession let by the Ministry of Transport.
4. The hotels, restaurants, and arts and crafts vendors in Aguas Calientes, and the busses from Aguas Calientes to the Ciudadela, do not operate as concessions and are essentially unregulated.

5. Tour operators that bring tourist groups into the Sanctuary are not subject to concession, and are only recently regulated with respect to use of the Inca Trail.
6. Tour guides are not subject to certification by the Sanctuary and anyone can serve as a guide.
7. The hydroelectric complex that has major infrastructure both to the east and the west of Aguas Calientes and the Ciudadela is a concession regulated by the Ministry of Energy and Mines.

**Recommendations, 2002 Mission:**

- 8. Develop a consultation process between the Management Unit and relevant Ministries to identify workable mechanisms for sharing concessionary and regulatory authority, and where necessary, promote enabling executive decrees.**
- 9. Establish a guide certification and review process specific to the HSMP that is based on satisfactory completion of training courses, adherence to Sanctuary regulations, and annual performance reviews linked to quality standards.**

### 3.3.2 Plan for the Village of Aguas Calientes

#### Background

As is stated in the 1999 Mission report on the Urban Plan for the village of Aguas Calientes, two recommendations were made:

**Recommendations , 1999 Mission:**

- Urgently prepare an overall plan for the village of Aguas Calientes in compatibility with the Master Plan for the Sanctuary. Ensure that the plan includes detailed ordinances for constructions (height, surface, materials, etc.). Adopt and implement such a plan as a matter of urgency. Introduce adequate mechanism and administrative arrangements for its implementation and monitoring.
- In the context of the plan for Aguas Calientes and considering the precarious conditions of the village and its environment, define the number of tourists that can be absorbed and design and implement a policy for the creation of hotels, guest houses, etc,

#### Actions Taken

A plan for the Village of Aguas Calientes has been developed by Architect Augusto Ortiz de Zevallos, under the supervision of the local College of Architects (CRSO-Cusco), and with coordination and financing by the Machu Picchu Programme. This Urban Plan (Plan de Ordenamiento Urbano del Poblado de Machu Picchu) was presented and approved by the Municipality of Aguas Calientes on November 30 of 2000.

## Analysis

The plan is composed of three parts: The first part makes reference to Aguas Calientes' legal and physical situation. It includes a socio-economic assessment, and considers certain aspects of the natural and geologic environment and the impact of tourism activities on the village as a whole, as well as on specific areas. It identifies some of the conflicts that arise and what they mean for planning of the Village.

The second part is the Urban Plan itself. It specifies objectives and a general zoning plan including its organization and strategies. This part is well illustrated by a series of maps on the area's geology, topography, vegetation and hydrology that illustrate the proposal. It also presents proposed regulations, which will be useful in implementing the plan.

The document's final part is made up of four annexes. They explain how the different maps were developed, the geology of potential complementary tourist centres, a list of 21 priority construction projects, and a series of photographs.

Several problems have arisen with respect to the proposed Plan:

1. It has yet to be approved by the competent authority, the Urubamba Provincial Municipality.
2. While it includes specifications as to the height, surface, materials, and densities of constructions in the village, as per the recommendation of the 1999 Mission, these standards have not been applied in the interim.
3. With the US\$2 that it receives for each tourist from the INC entrance fee, the municipality of Aguas Calientes has started the construction of a sports field, a cultural centre, that includes a satellite TV antenna, and of a potable water treatment plant.

As for the follow up to the second recommendation of the 1999 Mission, the Urban Plan suggests a potential population density for each zone and sector of Aguas Calientes, depending on its characteristics as a commercial, residential, tourism or cultural sector. This village is restricted to an urban area of 20.6 hectares, with a maximum carrying capacity of 2,300 to 2,500 inhabitants.

### **Recommendations, 2002 Mission:**

- 10. Seek expeditious approval and implementation of the Urban Plan by the competent authority, the Urubamba Provincial Municipality.**
- 11. Urge the municipal authorities of Aguas Calientes to enforce the Urban Plan in order to stop all unplanned growth and chaotic development of the town, especially the regulations regarding construction.**

### 3.3.3. Landslides, Ciudadela Area

#### Background

In 1996 a landslide occurred on the zigzag road that leads from Aguas Calientes to the Ciudadela. This was probably due to heavy rainfall and to the vibrations caused by buses, going up and down the road several times a day. These events brought on the following recommendation:

#### Recommendation, 1999 Mission:

- Study the stability of the mountain slopes of the Machu Picchu Ciudadela.

#### Actions Taken

INRENA and the INC, in collaboration with Professor Kyoji Sassa from the disaster Prevention Research Institute of the University of Japan at Kyoto, developed a preliminary study regarding landslide risk at Machu Picchu,

#### Analysis

The results of the study were presented at a symposium in January 2001 in Tokyo, Japan. Edwin Benavente of INC and the UGM, and Marcos Pastor of INRENA and the UGM, attended this symposium. In their opinion the study by Professor Sassa is not sufficiently clear as to the research objectives and the methodology used, and they consider further studies are in order.

Other studies are available and include those by Dr. Massami Fujisawa from the Technological University of Tsukuba; those by Dr. Zenon Aguilar and Milagros Castro Cuba and Patricia Gibu Yague, and those by a geologist from the Universidad Nacional San Antonio Abad at Cusco. It is clear that the available reports do not set forth definitive results and that more research and discussion is necessary. At the moment, 12 extensometers are placed at different parts of the Ciudadela. INRENA records periodic readings, and sends them to professor Sassa in Japan for analysis.

#### Recommendations, 2002 Mission:

- 12. Continue the geological and soil studies in the Ciudadela and its surroundings, in order to determine the possibilities of another landslide in the future and how to prevent it.**
- 13. Measure the impact of the buses on the access road to the Ciudadela in relation to landslide potential.**
- 14. Form a team of specialists to further review landslide dangers in and around the Ciudadela..**

## Background

Biological studies undertaken within the HSMP indicate that the area contains an extraordinary level of biological diversity. Yet, taking into account that almost half of the Sanctuary has been altered by human settlement, fires, tourism, the introduction of exotic species, and the clearing of archaeological resources, and that these processes continue, it is questionable as to whether it will be impossible to preserve all elements of the natural ecosystems in the long run.

The 1999 Mission noted the need to increase the area of the Sanctuary, but supported the strategy outlined in the Master Plan, which assigns priority to completing a cadastral survey of land ownership within the Sanctuary before proposing the annexation of new areas. It was recommended that studies on the expansion of the Sanctuary be initiated, however, in order to facilitate decisions at the appropriate moment.

### Recommendation, 1999 Mission:

- Proceed with preparatory activities in order to facilitate, at the appropriate moment, the proposal for the extension of the World Heritage site.

## Action Taken

The MPP is undertaking studies to identify the alternatives for expanding the Sanctuary, or at least, for establishing complementary land management regimes in critical areas around the Sanctuary. This effort is to be lauded and supported.

## Assessment

Yet, with each passing year, it will become more difficult to extend the boundaries of the Sanctuary, or create land use regimes that will guarantee the continuity and integrity of natural ecosystems in adjacent critical areas. In light of the rate of land use change, both within the Sanctuary, and in surrounding areas, it is perhaps time to take decisive action to protect critical areas that encompass the remaining natural landscapes. Time is not on the side of preservation.

### **Recommendations, 2002 Mission:**

- 15. Complete studies of management alternatives for achieving the preservation of intact ecosystems in critical areas adjacent to the HSMP.**
- 16. Give priority to adopting specific actions to implement the technical recommendations that result from the studies of critical areas adjacent to the Sanctuary.**

### 3.5.1 Natural heritage

#### Background

The Team had limited time in the field, and thus this review of the state of conservation of the natural heritage of the Sanctuary is based almost exclusively on interviews and recent reports by the MPP. These sources agree that the underlying causes that have led to the conversion of natural ecosystems have yet to be resolved, and destructive practices continue.

The 1999 Mission noted environmental problems seen along the railway line, the Inca Trail, and the zigzag road to the Ciudadela, all of which are associated with heavy visitor use; the introduction of foreign species; wildfires; and wastes generated in Aguas Calientes and by visitor facilities in the Ciudadela, and recommended the following:

#### Recommendations, 1999 Mission:

- Raise knowledge of the ecosystem and biotope of the Sanctuary through inventories and research.
- Study the stability of the slopes of the mountain of the Ciudadela of Machu Picchu.

#### Action Taken

Since 1999, many of these topics have been studied by the MPP and reports have been completed on the following:

- grazing;
- introduced species - "gordura" grass and eucalyptus trees;
- wildfires;
- restoration of vegetation in critical areas;
- potential solutions for the Sanctuary's 247 poor squatter families;
- institutional and management options;
- agricultural options;
- social, economic, and legal options;
- environmental options; and,
- landslide danger around the Ciudadela.

## Assessment

While these studies have provided important inputs to inform the decision-making process, they have not, in general, led to concrete action. This is yet another indication of the inoperability of the management system for the HSMP.

### **Recommendations, 2002 Mission:**

**17. Through the Management Unit, establish specific goals, priorities, an implementation schedule, and indicators of success for reversing deterioration and restoring the natural environment of the Sanctuary.**

**18. Develop mechanisms to assure that the funding needed to reverse the deterioration of the natural environment is provided to INRENA.**

## **3.5.2 Cultural heritage**

### Background

During the 1999 Mission, two recommendations were made on the conservation of Cultural heritage:

#### Recommendations, 1999 Mission

:

- Establish archaeological reserves within the archaeological park as a means to portray the ruins conditions as when they were found and to preserve for future research.
- Review restoration criteria for archaeological sites and structures in accord with the criteria of minimum intervention , as proposed in the Master Plan.

### Actions Taken

During the mission, the Ciudadela and a short segment of the Camino Inca were visited and it was observed that the state of conservation of the archaeological structures is good. Workers give regular maintenance to the buildings by shoring up walls and removing undesirable vegetation. As for the walkways and paths, to avoid erosion, they were improved and protected by applying a layer of a compact clay mixture.

At the time of the Mission, the Camino Inca was closed to the public for maintenance, and it was clean and in good condition. Nevertheless, most of the people interviewed indicated that when the Camino is in use, several problems arise. Garbage and human feces are common at many tourist campsites and along the route, as services are not available and maintenance is at a minimum. Available services are makeshift and insufficient. A bar at the so-called “Visitor Centre” at the Wiñayhuayna visitor services area serves beer and drinks, which runs counter to the strategies outlined in the Master Plan.

## Analysis

The archaeological sites along the short segment of the Camino Inca that were visited, (Wiñayhuayna, Choquesuysuy, Intipunko); all are in good condition, clean and restored.

The second recommendation of this section of the 1999 Mission Report proposes the establishment of archaeological reserves in order to preserve areas for future explorations and to convey to the visitor the original state of the ruins. During this mission, it was indicated that no new excavations have been made and it was observed how the lower structures of the urban sector of the Ciudadela have been preserved as an archaeological reserve.

As for the recommendation, which states that restoration must follow the criteria of minimum intervention, as proposed by the master plan, it was found that no major exploration has taken place at the site. A small domestic unit that was explored, in opinion of the Team, presents a well-executed, proper restoration.

### **Recommendations 2002 Mission:**

- 19. Continue to preserve the reserved archaeological areas for future research.**
- 20. Limit the number of campsites on the Camino Inca.**
- 21. Install well-designed, ecologically friendly services in order to control the accumulation of garbage and human waste on the Camino Inca.**
- 22. Keep the number of visitors within the carrying capacity estimated for the Ciudadela and the Camino Inca.**

## **4. ASSESSMENT OF ADDITIONAL ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY THE WORLD HERITAGE BUREAU AND/OR THE UNESCO-IUCN-ICOMOS MISSION OF FEBRUARY 2002**

### **4.1 Public Use Plan**

#### Background

The Public Use Plan is scheduled for development by a consultant team during 2002, following a participatory process. This Plan is central to management of the Sanctuary and, to be of maximum utility for management, should provide sufficient detail to guide investments. Ideally, this should outline priorities, establish an implementation schedule, and provide cost estimates, personnel requirements, and the physical distribution and disposition of infrastructure.

## Assessment

Much of the HSMP is geologically unstable and vulnerable to natural disasters, especially catastrophic landslides, landslips, and floods. Thus, vulnerability to natural disasters is a determining factor for the location of access routes and physical infrastructure, and the Public Use Plan should reflect this.

Since the Public Use Plan will be a decisive document that will touch all vested interests, it should be prepared through a participatory approach that includes an adequate period for stakeholder review and revision. It has been suggested that UNESCO participate actively in the review process.

### **Recommendations, 2002 Mission:**

**23. Develop the Public Use Plan in sufficient detail to guide investment of management effort and capital investment by establishing priorities, laying out an implementation schedule, estimating human and financial requirements, and providing physical planning guidelines.**

**24. In developing the Public Use Plan, provide adequate time and resources to identify zones that are vulnerable to natural disasters, and thoroughly evaluate the alternatives for access and the construction of visitor facilities.**

**25. Once a draft is completed by the Consultant Firm, consider requesting UNESCO's assistance to review and evaluate the Public Use Plan, and provide recommendations for improvement.**

## **4.2 Operational Plans of the Management Unit**

### Background

Copies of the 2001 and 2002 Annual Operations Plans for the Management Unit were reviewed. They are quite different, and probably reflect the change of Director. The 2001 Operations Plan is noteworthy in that it does not relate to the Sanctuary Master Plan nor does it review the accomplishments of the Unit during 2000. The 2002 Operations Plan relates closely to the Master Plan, and while it notes some of the most severe obstacles to management, it does not review or evaluate the accomplishments of the Unit during 2001.

## Assessment

The 2002 Plan is extremely ambitious, and puts into doubt the validity of the planning exercise. For example, it is proposed that the Management Unit grow from the 21 persons that currently make up the staff, to a full complement of 254 employees. It would seem that this is more an expression of an overall need than a plan of action for 2002.

### **Recommendation, 2002 mission:**

**26. Relate the Annual Operations Plan to a monitoring and evaluation system that makes it possible to track the progress of the Management Unit in terms of the objectives and strategic guidelines outlined in the Mater Plan, identify lessons learned, and insure accountability.**

## **4.3 Landslide Danger, Aguas Calientes Area**

### Background

The Government of Peru and UNESCO have given significant attention to the potential for landslips and landslides that could affect the integrity of the archaeological resources of the Ciudadela. Less attention has been directed to the village of Aguas Calientes, which is located in a zone that is even more vulnerable to potentially catastrophic landslides, landslips, and flooding. Since the 1999 UNESCO Mission, research has been carried out on this issue, and a plan for disaster mitigation has been developed and incorporated into the urban development plan. Few of the fundamental elements of these plans have been implemented, however, and the level of vulnerability remains high for significant portions of the village.

### Assessment

Perhaps the most basic responsibility for a protected area management agency is to ensure the safety of residents and visitors alike, *even when safety measures run counter to the economic and political interests of important stakeholders*. Thus, the 2002 UNESCO Mission would be remiss if it did not clearly and unequivocally note that the disaster mitigation study indicates that there is a **significant danger to residents and visitors posed by Aguas Calientes' vulnerability to catastrophic disasters**. It should also be noted that the same study indicates that, even with the implementation of the measures outlined in the mitigation plan, the safety of Aguas Calientes cannot be assured. There is little doubt that the current situation calls for **immediate action to implement all of the risk mitigation projects** that have been identified. Existing evidence would even seem to suggest that it would be prudent to defer further investment in visitor facilities in Aguas Calientes, and actively and decisively promote alternatives that will limit future use of the village as a tourism destination and distribution centre.

It is fully recognized, however, that measures designed to reduce over time the use of Aguas Calientes for tourism will be exceedingly unpopular, and energetically resisted

by key stakeholders. At the same time, it should be recognized that the village is not a community in the traditional sense. The local population is highly unstable as people migrate to the village in search of economic opportunity, and then later move on.

A major natural disaster affecting Aguas Calientes would not only result in an unfortunate loss of life and immediate material damage, but might also trigger major economic setback for the Cusco region, and for Peru as a whole, from the loss of tourism revenues. Thus, there can be little doubt that this is very touchy issue that must be examined in light of the best available scientific advice. The 2002 UNESCO Mission did not include experts in geodynamics, risk evaluation, or disaster preparedness, and thus is unable to evaluate the technical merits of the vulnerability studies with any degree of confidence. It is important, however, that the Government of Peru obtain the best informed technical opinion on this issue and make an explicit decision as to whether or not Aguas Calientes should continue to serve as a tourist destination and distribution point.

**Recommendations, 2002 Mission:**

**27. Immediately implement all of the preparedness measures outlined in the disaster mitigation plan for Aguas Calientes, and regularly monitor and test these measures.**

**28. Compose a high level Panel of Experts to review the vulnerability and disaster preparedness studies, and to make specific technical recommendations to Government as to the viability of Aguas Calientes as a tourism destination and distribution point.**

**29. Consider requesting assistance from UNESCO to incorporate international scientists in the Panel of Experts.**

**30. During the Master Plan review process, evaluate the evidence regarding the vulnerability of Aguas Calientes, and if warranted, incorporate specific strategies to reduce its use as a tourism distribution Centre to that which is absolutely indispensable.**

**31. As part of the process for developing the Public Use Plan, identify less vulnerable sites for visitor facilities in the HSMP, and outline incentives to develop these alternative sites and disincentives for the use of Aguas Calientes and other vulnerable sites.**

#### **4.4 Scientific and financial support**

##### **4.4.1 Scientific support**

The MPP has played a critical role in generating the scientific and technical underpinnings for management of the HSMP. The Programme is scheduled to conclude during the current year, however, and this critical capacity will be lost. What is needed over the long-run is the creation of an independent, international, scientific and technical institution that can fill the void, and play a permanent role in developing knowledge, building local capacity, mobilising international financial support, and serving as an independent voice for the preservation of the universal

values of the Sanctuary. Though representatives of the government institutions responsible for the management of the Sanctuary might serve on the Board of Directors, the institution itself need not play a role in actual management of the Sanctuary, but rather serve as a non-governmental support institution. The Darwin Foundation plays a similar role with respect to the Galápagos Islands World Heritage Site, and might be used as a model. This concept has been discussed in recent years, but no concrete actions have been taken.

**Recommendation, 2002 Mission:**

**32. Consider entering into discussions with UNESCO to study the feasibility of establishing a permanent, independent, international, scientific and technical institution to support the protection of the universal values of the Machu Picchu World Heritage Site.**

**33. If Government interest is confirmed, form a UNESCO Team to work with the Management Unit, and other interested institutions, to develop a feasibility study that would be submitted for the consideration of the Government of Perú and UNESCO.**

#### **4.4.2 Financial support**

Financial support for the management of the HSMP is a chronic problem that underlies the inoperability of the Sanctuary. The problem is not one of income, but of financial management. It is calculated that the entrance fees for the year 2001 alone generated upwards of US\$11.4 million. However, only a small fraction of this is currently invested in management programmes. The MPP further estimates that if all sources of funding were fully tapped (entrance fees, concessions, earmarked taxes, rights-of-way, etc.) upwards of US\$32 million could be generated annually. What is needed are mechanisms to assure that this potential is captured, managed in a transparent way, and distributed according to formulas that respond to legislative requirements, the strategies of the Master Plan, and negotiated agreements among the relevant institutions.

The Master Plan called for the development of a financial plan for the Sanctuary within in a period not to exceed 10 months from the time of approval of the Master Plan. While this has not happened, the urgency indicated in the Master Plan is as valid today as it was when it was written. The plan also called for the establishment of a permanent fund for the Sanctuary that would be administered through a contract with PROFONANPE, the Peruvian Fund for Protected Areas. PROFONANPE has considerable experience in establishing and managing trust funds and has earned a reputation for transparency and sound management. PROFONANPE not only would be capable of managing the quite significant income potential of the Sanctuary, but could also use this income as matching funds for international donations.

**Recommendation, 2002 Mission:**

**34. Implement as a matter of urgency the recommendations of the Master Plan regarding the development of a financial plan for the Sanctuary and the establishment of a trust fund.**

**4.5 Policy for the Use of the Site for Commercial Purposes**

INC policies allow filming and photography at archaeological sites. Permits are subject to the approval of a detailed technical proposal. This approval can be granted by the Archaeologist of the National Archaeological Commission in charge of the site, or by the responsible Commission Director. The approval indicates what is permitted at the site, such as to the use of lights and flash, the areas open to this activity, the sort of equipment to be permitted within the site, etc.

Two documents have been developed to guide use of the site for commercial purposes. The 2001 Guide to Services indicates the type of services available from INC at archaeological sites administered by them, and the rates to be charged. Nevertheless, the parameters are not always clear, and in fact, some seem quite arbitrary. A second document, "INC Requirements and Procedures for Photography and Filming within the Machu Picchu Archaeological Park", provides detailed guidelines for this activity.

Unfortunately, neither one of these documents are clear as to what is permitted or forbidden during photography or filming sessions. For example, the type of equipment and personnel permitted at the sites when executing cultural and commercial films includes actors and scenery, the use of balloons, cranes, helicopters, light planes, etc., and the only limitation, is the approval of the archaeologist or the Director responsible. There are no clear criteria, and everything is permitted, it seems.

During an interview with the Executive Director of INC and her team, it was indicated that they would review the 2001 Guide to Services, and that they are preparing three other complementary instruments:

1. A restructuring of the INC's Administrative set-up.
2. A revision of the descriptions of functions of personnel.
3. Modification of the Manual on Administrative Procedure

**Recommendations, 2002 Mission:**

**35. Continue the process of updating, and making more specific, the INC Guide to Services.**

**36. Include strict regulations within the Guide that will not be open to personal interpretations or subject to misunderstandings.**

#### **4.6 State of Conservation of the Intihuatana**

The Intihuatana is probably the most important feature at Machu Picchu, due to its position within the site. It is located at the highest point of the urban sector, situated on top of a stepped platform, which measures 1.15 m., and is cut in the rock. It is sculptured in one piece, from a tapering granite rock outcrop. It has a rectangular base of 0.55 m. by 0.39 m. and a height of 0.69 m.

Today the Intihuatana is damaged. How did this occur? It was indicated that the Cecilia Castillo Advertising Company received permission from the INC to film the sunrise and sunset at Machu Picchu, for a beer commercial on the 8th of September 2000. Arriving at the site at around 5 a.m. the Advertising Company personnel and equipment headed for the Ciudadela, to start filming. Included in the equipment was a 780 kg. crane in parts packed in boxes, so as for the guards not to notice it. That day around 12:30 p.m. the cranes' arm hit the upper part of the central element of the Intihuatana sculpture, chipping off its southwest upper corner. After the accident, the INC sent a commission of specialists to evaluate the damage. The INC later initiated administrative and legal proceedings against the responsible parties.

Two reports evaluate the damage to the sculpture. One, from the commission of specialists sent by the INC, and the other by Cleere Conservation Limited, a company specialized in the conservation of statuary, and sent by UNESCO. Both documents were available and were reviewed for this evaluation. In the opinion of Cleere Conservation Limited, the Intihuatanas' general condition is good. Lichens cover it, but no decay from biological colonization was found. As for the damage the sculpture suffered, the piece chipped off from the top S.W. edge of the Intihuatana has a pyramidal form, and measures 12 cm. by 7 cm. on the south face; 4.8 cm. by 7 cm. on the east face; and 12 cm. by 4 cm. on the top. It is important to mention that due to the stone's composition, granite with crystals of different materials such as feldspar, quartz and mica, the piece which fractured from the sculpture was broken into 17 small sized pieces that range from 0.5 cm. to 6 cm. in size.

Two alternatives have been proposed for restoration of the sculpture. Both technical reports state that restoration is possible, and one also provides the names of the possible adhesives and chemical products to be used to glue the fragments together. Nevertheless, the discussion centres on whether the Intihuatana should be restored or not. One position, with which the ICOMOS Team Member personally agrees, is that the sculpture should be fixed and pieced together. The other holds that it should not be pieced together, due to its sacred character, and that in order to remember the error, it should not be restored.

Restoration of the Intihuatana sculpture is clearly becoming a political issue, and it should not be seen as such. At this time the most important issue at hand is to conclude the legal and administrative procedures, as the sculpture's restoration cannot be undertaken until they are completed.

#### **Recommendations, 2002 Mission:**

- 37. Form a committee of specialists to discuss restoration alternatives for the Intihuatana, and decide the procedure to follow.**
- 38. Supervise more closely all filming and photography projects undertaken in the Ciudadela, and forbid the use of heavy equipment.**

The 2002 UNESCO-IUCN-ICOMOS Mission of February 2002 visited the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu, reviewed relevant documentation, and held discussions with key stakeholders.

Since the 1999 Mission, the Government of Peru has taken decisive action to deny permission for the construction of a cable car, as proposed, between Aguas Calientes and the Ciudadela, and the enlargement of the Hotel at the entrance to the Ciudadela. These decisions were extremely important for the conservation of the World Heritage values of Machu Picchu. There has been some progress in developing the capacities and work programme of the Management Unit. Studies have completed on the carrying capacity of the Camino Inca, and some mechanisms have been put into place to regulate use of this trail. The MPP has supported the development of an urban plan for Aguas Calientes, and a series of other studies on the natural environment. It is developing a Geographic Information System, which will help organize and facilitate the analysis and presentation of information for management of the Sanctuary. It is also studying the different alternatives for conserving critical habitats adjacent to the Sanctuary. UNESCO has assisted in developing studies regarding the stability of the slopes of the Ciudadela.

The Mission finds, however, that there is a continuing need to fully implement 10 of the 16 recommendations made by the 1999 Mission. These include the following, expressed in abbreviated form:

- Provide necessary human and financial resource to the Management Unit.
- Ensure full support to the Management Unit.
- Establish clear and effective mechanisms of communication among the institutions involved.
- Develop short and medium term operational plans to implement the strategies outlined in the Master Plan, and insure their implementation.
- Establish mechanisms for monitoring the effective and timely implementation of the Master Plan.
- Undertake studies to define the carrying capacity of the Ciudadela and Aguas Calientes.
- Undertake a study to determine the best means of access to the Sanctuary and the Ciudadela, based on the carrying capacity defined.
- Undertake a study for the reorganization and reduction of the facilities at the Ciudadela.
- Proceed with preparatory activities for enlargement of the Sanctuary.
- Review restoration criteria for archaeological sites and structures in light of the minimum intervention proposed in the Master Plan.

The Mission has identified a series of other issues that require urgent attention as well. Thus, the 2002 Mission recommends that the Peruvian authorities consider the following recommendations:

## **Master Plan**

1. Revise the Master Plan to take into account the present status of the natural and cultural resources of the Sanctuary, the evolving institutional framework, and new information that has been developed through research.
2. Document the sacred values of the Sanctuary and their relevance to traditional Andean Communities, and to groups associated with mystical tourism.
3. Incorporate management guidelines into the revised Master Plan for sacred sites within the Sanctuary to regulate use by the general visiting public, traditional communities, and mystical tourism groups.

## **Management Unit**

4. The recommendations of the 1999 report regarding strengthening of the Management Unit remain valid, and the authorities are again urged to take the required measures.
5. As a World Heritage site, the conservation of Machu Picchu is a matter of national interest requiring the involvement of the highest levels of Government.

## **Access to the Historic Sanctuary and the Ciudadela**

6. The Mission reiterates the need for full consideration of the issues, and implementation of specific measures, relating to carrying capacity and visitor access, both for the Sanctuary as a whole, and for its different components.
7. The Mission endorses all recommendations of the 1999 mission regarding new visitor facilities, and further recommends that they be considered in the context of the Public Use Plan.

## **Visitor Services**

8. Develop a consultation process between the Management Unit and relevant Ministries to identify workable mechanisms for sharing concessionary and regulatory authority, and where necessary, promote enabling executive decrees.
9. Establish a guide certification and review process specific to the HSMP that is based on satisfactory completion of training courses, adherence to Sanctuary regulations, and annual performance reviews linked to quality standards.

## **Plan for the village of Aguas Calientes**

10. Seek expeditious approval and implementation of the Urban Plan by the competent authority, the Urubamba Provincial Municipality.
11. Urge the municipal authorities of Aguas Calientes to enforce the Urban Plan in order to stop all unplanned growth and chaotic development of the town, especially the regulations regarding construction.

### **Landslides, Ciudadela area**

12. Continue the geological and soil studies in the Ciudadela and its surroundings, in order to determine the possibilities of another landslide in the future and how to prevent it.
13. Measure the impact of the buses on the access road to the Ciudadela in relation to landslide potential.
14. Form a team of specialists to further review landslide dangers in and around the Ciudadela.

### **Potential extension of the World Heritage site**

15. Complete studies of management alternatives for achieving the preservation of intact ecosystems in critical areas adjacent to the HSMP.
16. Give priority to adopting specific actions to implement the technical recommendations that result from the studies of critical areas adjacent to the Sanctuary.

### **State of conservation: natural heritage**

17. Through the Management Unit, establish specific goals, priorities, an implementation schedule, and indicators of success for reversing deterioration and restoring the natural environment of the Sanctuary.
18. Develop mechanisms to assure that the funding needed to reverse the deterioration of the natural environment is provided to INRENA.

### **State of conservation: cultural heritage**

19. Continue to preserve the reserved archaeological areas for future research.
20. Limit the number of campsites on the Camino Inca.
21. Install well-designed, ecologically friendly services in order to control the accumulation of garbage and human waste on the Camino Inca.
22. Keep the number of visitors within the carrying capacity estimated for the Ciudadela and the Camino Inca.

### **Public Use Plan**

23. Develop the Public Use Plan in sufficient detail to guide investment of management effort and capital investment by establishing priorities, laying out an implementation schedule, estimating human and financial requirements, and providing physical planning guidelines.
24. In developing the Public Use Plan, provide adequate time and resources to identify zones that are vulnerable to natural disasters, and thoroughly evaluate the alternatives for access and the construction of visitor facilities.
25. Once a draft is completed by the Consultant Firm, consider requesting UNESCO's assistance to review and evaluate the Public Use Plan, and provide recommendations for improvement.

## **Operational Plans for the Management Unit**

26. Relate the Annual Operations Plan to a monitoring and evaluation system that makes it possible to track the progress of the Management Unit in terms of the objectives and strategic guidelines outlined in the Master Plan, identify lessons learned, and insure accountability.

## **Landslide danger: Aguas Calientes Area**

27. Immediately implement all of the preparedness measures outlined in the disaster mitigation plan for Aguas Calientes, and regularly monitor and test these measures.

28. Compose a high level Panel of Experts to review the vulnerability and disaster preparedness studies, and to make specific technical recommendations to Government as to the viability of Aguas Calientes as a tourism destination and distribution point.

29. Consider requesting assistance from UNESCO to incorporate international scientists into the Panel of Experts.

30. During the Master Plan review process, evaluate the evidence regarding the vulnerability of Aguas Calientes, and if warranted, incorporate specific strategies to reduce its use as a tourism distribution Centre to that which is absolutely indispensable.

31. As part of the process for developing the Public Use Plan, identify less vulnerable sites for visitor facilities in the HSMP, and outline incentives to develop these alternative sites and disincentives for the use of Aguas Calientes and other vulnerable sites.

## **Scientific and financial support**

32. Consider entering into discussions with UNESCO to study the feasibility of establishing a permanent, independent, international, scientific and technical institution to support the protection of the universal values of the Machu Picchu World Heritage Site.

33. If Government interest is confirmed, form a UNESCO Team to work with the Management Unit, and other interested institutions, to develop a feasibility study that would be submitted for the consideration of the Government of Perú and UNESCO.

34. Implement as a matter of urgency the recommendations of the Master Plan regarding the development of a financial plan for the Sanctuary and the establishment of a trust fund.

35. Continue the process of updating, and making more specific, the INC Guide to Services.

36. Include strict regulations within the Guide that will not be open to personal interpretations or subject to misunderstandings.

## **State of conservation of the Intihuatana**

37. Form a committee of specialists to discuss restoration alternatives for the Intihuatana, and decide the procedure to follow.

38. Supervise more closely all filming and photography projects undertaken in the Ciudadela, and forbid the use of heavy equipment.



**MISION AL SANTUARIO HISTORICO DE MACHU PICCHU (PERU)**

**24 de febrero al 1° de marzo 2002**

TERMINOS DE REFERENCIA

Antecedentes: Decisiones del Comité del Patrimonio Mundial

La Mesa del Comité del Patrimonio Mundial en su 23 sesión de julio 1999, solicitó al IUCN, ICOMOS y al Centro del Patrimonio Mundial llevar a cabo una misión de expertos a Machu Picchu para evaluar:

1. La puesta en ejecución y la eficacia del Plan Maestro y los arreglos administrativos para el Santuario (con particular referencia al turismo);
2. El estado del proyecto del teleférico y su impacto potencial en el valor del patrimonio mundial del santuario, como también la viabilidad de las posibles alternativas de un teleférico;
3. El estado de extensión eventual o modificación del hotel en Machu Picchu y de otras obras importantes que podrán ser planeadas dentro y fuera del sitio, y su impacto potencial en el valor del patrimonio mundial del santuario;
4. Posibilidades para la extensión del sitio, y formular recomendaciones al respecto;
5. El estado de conservación cultural y natural del Santuario Histórico de Machu Picchu.

La misión se realizó del 10 al 15 de octubre de 1999. El informe de la misión fue examinado por el Comité del Patrimonio Mundial en su 23 sesión (diciembre 1999) que en esa ocasión respaldó sus conclusiones y recomendaciones.

El Gobierno del Perú presentó informes sobre el estado de conservación del sitio a las sesiones del Comité y de su Mesa en los años 2000 y 2001. La Mesa del Comité del Patrimonio Mundial en su 25 sesión (junio 2001) solicitó a UNESCO-UICN-ICOMOS, llevar a cabo una misión de seguimiento para evaluar:

1. El estado de la implementación de las recomendaciones de la misión de 1999.
2. La política para el uso del sitio con fines comerciales.
3. La restauración del Intihuantana.
4. La investigación que se está realizando – que está planificada – sobre los riesgos de derrumbamiento de tierra.

El informe de la misión deberá ser presentado a la Mesa del Comité en su 26 sesión (abril 2002).

Términos de referencia de la Misión:

Para realizar la evaluación de los cuatro puntos arriba señalados, la misión:

1. Analizará el estado de la implementación de las conclusiones y recomendaciones de la misión de 1999 en los siguientes rubros:
  - a. Arreglos para la planificación y gestión del sitio (punto 3.1. del Informe 1999).
  - b. Acceso al sitio (punto 3.2 del Informe 1999).
  - c. Gestión del turismo (punto 3.3.1. del Informe 1999).
  - d. Gestión del pueblo de Aguas Calientes (punto 3.3.2. del Informe 1999).
  - e. Extensión del sitio (punto 3.4. del Informe 1999).
  - f. Estado de conservación general que incluirá el análisis de factores con mayor impacto en el sitio tales como el estado de las investigaciones de los derrumbamientos de tierra en Machu Picchu y los arreglos y propuestas que se hayan definido a tal efecto, incendios forestales, y otros (punto 3.5 del Informe 1999)
2. Evaluará la situación actual del uso del sitio para fines comerciales en términos de reglamentación, control y supervisión.
3. Evaluará el estado de conservación del Intihuantana, las investigaciones que se han realizado y las propuestas que hayan sido formuladas y/o las decisiones que hayan sido tomadas al respecto.

La misión realizará las evaluaciones en base a los informes presentados por el Gobierno de Perú durante los años 2000-2001, la documentación que será puesta a disposición de la misión durante su estadía en el país, y opiniones expresadas por personas y organizaciones en entrevistas con la misión.

La misión preparará un informe que incluirá la evaluación de los tres puntos arriba mencionados, así como también conclusiones y recomendaciones.

Las conclusiones y recomendaciones preliminares de la misión serán examinadas con las autoridades pertinentes al final de la misión. El informe de la misión será transmitido al Gobierno de Perú para sus comentarios y será puesto a consideración de los miembros de la Mesa del Comité del Patrimonio Mundial durante su 26 sesión, que tendrá lugar en París entre el 8 y 13 de abril de 2002.

**UNESCO-IUCN-ICOMOS Machu Picchu Mission  
25 February – 1 March, 2002**

**SCHEDULE**

**Friday 22 and Saturday 23**

Arrival of team members in Lima

**Sunday 24**

Arrival of Team in Cusco; team briefing and organising meeting; informal meeting with Patricia Uribe, UNESCO Representative in Perú.

**Monday 25**

09h00 Meeting (Allen Putney and Alejandro Martínez) with Federico Haselbruger, International Co-Director, and Jesus Arias, Coordinator, of the Machu Picchu Programme, Cusco Office.

10h00 Meeting (Allen Putney and Alejandro Martínez) with Marcos Pastor, Director of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu, INRENA, at the Cusco Office of the Machu Picchu Programme.

11h00 Meeting (Allen Putney and Alejandro Martínez) with Ricardo Campana, Regional Director of Tourism and Commerce, Cusco Office.

15h00 Meeting (full Team) with the Machu Picchu Management Unit at the Cusco Offices of the National Institute for Culture.

Participants:

Edwin Benavente, Director of the Management Unit, and Regional Director of the National Institute for Culture.

Fernando Astete, Assistant Director of Cultural Heritage of the Management Unit, and Director of Machu Picchu for the National Institute for Culture.

Marcos Pastor, Assistant Director for Natural Heritage of the Management Unit, and Director of the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu for INRENA.

17h00 Meeting (full Team) with Ramiro Valdez, President of the Interim Regional Government (CTAR), Cusco.

19h00 Further meeting (full Team) at the offices of the Machu Picchu Programme, Cusco, to see a demonstration of their Geographical Information System.

## **Tuesday 26**

08h00 Travel by van from Cusco to Ollantaytambo.

10h10 Travel by train from Ollantaytambo to Aguas Calientes.

11h20 Travel to Machu Picchu by bus from Aguas Calientes; visit to the Ciudadela guided by Fernando Astete and Marcos Pastor.

17h00 Return to Aguas Calientes by bus.

18h30 Meeting with Dr. Soto, Mayor of Aguas Calientes.

## **Wednesday 27**

07h30 Travel by bus to the Ciudadela. Hike to Wiñayhuayna along the Inca Trail.

14h30 Return to Aguas Calientes by bus.

15h45 Meeting of Team to discuss findings.

17h00 Travel by train to Ollantaytambo.

18h30 Travel by van to Cusco.

## **Thursday 28**

09h00 Return to Lima by air.

14h00 Working session (full Team) at UNESCO Offices in Lima.

17h00 Meeting (full Team) with the Ramiro Salas, Vice Minister of Tourism, and his Advisor, Andrea Martínez, at the offices of the Ministry of Commerce and Tourism.

## **Friday 1**

08h00 Working session (full Team) at UNESCO Offices.

09h30 Meeting (Herman van Hooff) with Alberto Carrión, Ministry of Foreign Relations.

11h00 Meeting (full Team) with Mikko Pyhala, Ambassador, Embassy of Finland.

16h30 Debriefing meeting (full Team) in the Lima Offices of the National Institute for Culture:

Participants:

Gustavo Suárez, Director of National Parks and Wildlife, National Institute for Renewable Natural Resources

Maria Elena Cordova, Executive Director, National Institute for Culture

Denise Pozzi-Escot, National Museum of Archaeology, Anthropology, and History of Perú

**Saturday 2**

01h00 Departure of Herman van Hooff.

09h00 Working sessions (Alejandro Martínez and Allen Putney)

19h00 Working dinner (Alejandro Martínez and Allen Putney) with José Koechlin, President of the Peruvian Association for Adventure Tourism and Ecotourism.

**Sunday 3** Departure of Alejandro Martínez (Putney flight cancelled).

**Monday 4** Departure of Allen Putney



**MISSION TEAM**

**UNESCO World Heritage Centre**

Herman van Hooff (Team Leader)  
Adviser for World Heritage in Latin America and the Caribbean  
Adviser for Culture in Mercosur, UNESCO Montevideo

**IUCN**

Allen D. Putney (United States)  
Independent Consultant on Protected Areas  
Leader, Task Force on Non-Material Values,  
IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas

**ICOMOS**

Alejandro Martínez Muriel (México)  
National Coordinator for Archaeology,  
National Institute for Anthropology and History of México