SUMMARY

This document contains information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. The World Heritage Committee is requested to review the reports on the state of conservation of properties contained in this document. In certain cases, the World Heritage Committee may wish to decide to discuss in detail the state of conservation reports which are submitted for adoption without discussion.

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

The full reports of reactive monitoring missions requested by the World Heritage Committee are available at the following Web address in their original language: http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM/
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REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2001
Criteria
(ii) (iv) (vi)
Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
N/A
Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.50; 32 COM 7B.48; 33 COM 7B.44
International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 6,932: Technical Assistance for the rehabilitation of the Lamu Waterfront, in 2004. UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A
Previous monitoring missions
Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Lack of approved management plan and accompanying action plan;
b) Lack of risk preparedness, especially in the case of fire;
c) Lack of adequate sewerage, waste disposal, and overall infrastructure, and risk to limited fresh water supplies;
d) Uncontrolled development
e) Lack of resources;
f) Urban and industrial development pressure, including possible new port and of oil exploration;
g) Inadequate buffer zone.
Illustrative material
http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1055

Current Conservation Issues

At its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to invite a joint WHC/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission to the property in 2010 and to submit a State of Conservation Report on the property by 1 February 2011 for discussion at its 35th
session. Subsequently, due to reports that a proposed port project near Lamu was potentially imminent, the mission schedule was accelerated and a mission took place from 6 to 9 May 2010. The schedule for the State Party report, however, was not changed, and therefore, no report has yet been submitted.

Given the situation outlined above, this report deals with only four important issues in regard to the property; the proposed Lamu Port project, the need to protect the fragile water resources of the property, the need for a clear property boundary and adequate buffer zone, and the need to complete the management plan. Other issues such as the need for a more comprehensive sustainable development plan for Lamu Island, the state of conservation of buildings at the property, uncontrolled developments, etc. will be considered in a follow-up state of conservation report when the State Party has had the opportunity to submit its own report.

a) The proposed Lamu port project

During the mission, the State Party informed the members that there was no definitive project yet for the port, and that a feasibility study had yet to be carried out. It was stated that until a more definitive project was ready, it would not be possible to give more information in regard to the size and scope of the proposed port, its details and possible impacts. Nevertheless, a large number of newspaper articles have been written on the topic, and information was obtained by the mission at a stakeholder meeting organized by the National Museums of Kenya (NMK) and through discussions with various stakeholders. Subsequent to the mission, a regional development plan was obtained by the mission experts as well as other reports of the proposed developments. From this information, the following can be ascertained.

The proposed site of the new port would be on the mainland of Manda Bay approximately 15 to 20 km from Lamu Town and is meant to serve an area including Ethiopia, southern Sudan, Somalia, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi and the eastern part of the DRC. A Japanese consultant had been engaged to make a feasibility study. It was said that there would, potentially, be room for up to 22 berths for large tanker ships and that the entire development area could stretch as far as 25 kilometres along the coast. In addition to the port, it has been reported that other infrastructure such as a railway, highway, pipeline, oil refinery, and oil storage tanks could be included in the project as well as the necessary housing, warehouses, and other infrastructure necessary to support these activities. It was further reported that development could begin within a year. It was not clear from the documents and discussions if the State Party had completely abandoned the idea of oil exploration as had been reported previously to the World Heritage Committee.

It is important to emphasize that the above description is based on newspaper articles, the stakeholder meeting, conversations that took place during the mission, and a few documents obtained after the mission, rather than through official information provided directly by the State Party. It cannot, therefore, be verified, and it is not clear how much of the proposed development the State Party plans to carry out. It is clear, however, that any large port development project would bring in unprecedented new levels of population growth and put strong pressures on both the cultural and natural values of the region.

The mission experts, after having visited the potential site and obtaining the information in circulation, were concerned that the potential size and scope of the project could have a profound impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Potential negative impacts could include (although may not be limited to) disruption of traditional fishing practices which are part of Lamu’s traditional role as a port; damage to the setting of the property and its marine environment / ecosystem, thereby diminishing its integrity; significant
development pressures caused by the influx of population and economic activity could put pressure on both the traditional architecture and on the fragile natural resources such as fresh water; and major social and cultural disruptions caused by the population influx could have a severe impact on the living cultural and religious traditions associated with the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note first that the State Party has not yet provided information to the World Heritage Committee, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, on the details of this major new project and its potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Given the priority which the project apparently has, according to numerous sources, there is particular concern that this information comes early enough in the decision-making process to ensure that the Committee “may assist in seeking appropriate solutions to ensure that the outstanding universal value of the property is fully preserved” (paragraph 172). In addition, a thorough Environmental and Cultural Impact Assessment, to evaluate the impact of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property should be carried out in full cooperation with the National Museums of Kenya, and the results submitted to the World Heritage Centre for examination by the Advisory Bodies.

b) The Water Catchment Area and Developments at the Shela Sand Dunes

As has been reported at earlier Committee sessions, the presence of fresh water, on which the property (and Lamu Island as a whole) relies for its continued viability, is threatened by encroachment and illegal development. In 2002 a small part (approximately 900 ha) of the sand dune system of Lamu Island which acts as the water catchments area for the property was gazetted, and in 2003 the Water Resources Management Authority was set up to manage and protect these delicate resources. This organisation has been working closely with the NMK since then, and a report was prepared in 2008 on the situation regarding fresh water which notes the following serious concerns: depletion and overuse of the groundwater; seawater intrusion into the groundwater system; pollution caused by human waste and activities; reduction of natural vegetation covering the dunes; and reduction of surface area of the dunes due to illegal constructions (two houses have already been constructed, a hotel development has been stopped after construction began, and a number of plots have been fenced off). The report recommended that the entire water catchment area, measuring approximately 19 square kilometers be gazetted to protect this fragile water source. Requests have also been made to the Chief Registrar of Lands, Ministry of Lands, to cancel title deeds that had been issued for some of the dune areas in order to deal definitively with the encroachment issue. A donor conference held in 2008 recommended that the entire dune system be incorporated into the buffer zone of the World Heritage property to ensure its integrity. The World Heritage Committee recommended this at its 33rd session (Seville), but the State Party has not yet taken action in this regard.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain very concerned about the encroachments on the sand dunes at Shela which represent a potential problem for viability of the World Heritage property. Without access to fresh water, Lamu town would cease to be the living town that was inscribed on the World Heritage List. The National Museums of Kenya and the Water Resources Management Authority should be congratulated on doing the necessary scientific studies on the water situation and also making the findings widely available to the local community and to decision makers at the local and national levels. Efforts still need to be made, however, to ensure that the encroachments stop, that the title deeds that were issued are revoked, that the remaining land of the dunes system is gazetted, and that the dunes are incorporated into the buffer zone of the property. These actions will take a concerted effort of various institutions within the State Party including the National Museums of Kenya, the Ministry of State for National Heritage and Culture, the Ministry of Lands, the Ministry of the Environment, and others.
c) Demarcation of the Boundaries of the Property and Enlargement of the Buffer Zone

In discussions with staff of the National Museums of Kenya, the boundaries of the site were indicated as being those found in the area marked “limits of designated conservation area” on a map in Annex 2 of the nomination dossier titled, “Development Plan for the Conservation Area”. This map was prepared in the late 1980s and was not specifically made for the World Heritage nomination and nothing on the map (or in the nomination dossier) specifically equates the conservation area with the boundaries of the World Heritage property. For clarity, the mission therefore suggested that the State Party should resubmit this map clearly labelling the conservation area as the boundaries of the World Heritage property.

At the same time, there has been ongoing discussion as to the necessary boundaries of the buffer zone in order to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The original nomination submission indicated a red square around the property as the buffer zone but this did not correspond to any geographical features. From the time of inscription there have been several requests from the World Heritage Committee to extend this buffer zone to offer more effective protection to the property. The request has changed over time with variations including requests for the buffer zone to include the whole of Lamu Town, Shela and the sand dunes; the whole island of Lamu; the mangroves of Manda Island, Ras Kitau and Manda Island; and also all the islands of the Lamu archipelago inclusive of Paté Island.

The recommendation of the mission was that the best solution would be to have the buffer zone expanded to include all of the islands of the Lamu archipelago. This larger buffer zone would ensure the integrity of the property. If that does not prove feasible, the mission considered that at least the whole of Lamu and Manda islands should be included. The whole of Lamu Island should be a part of the buffer zone to protect the fragile sand dunes and to better help control unplanned development around the property, and Manda Island should be included to protect the visual integrity of the property, and natural features such as the mangrove ecosystem which are important to Lamu’s role as a port.

Further complicating the issue, the National Museums of Kenya has indicated that it has enlarged the buffer zone, but has not informed the World Heritage Centre of this larger area.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies concur with the results of the mission, and consider that an extension of the buffer zone could help the State Party to better plan for the protection of the property, especially in the light of the potential large developments being discussed.

d) The finalization of the management plan

In response to a previous request by the World Heritage Committee for the preparation of a management plan, a process was begun in 2006 that has lead to a draft management plan for the property. An International Assistance request has been submitted by the State Party to carry out some additional stakeholder meetings and finalise the plan for approval by the appropriate ministries and the District Development Committee.

As set out above, there remain a number of other issues of importance to the state of conservation of the property that will need to be dealt with in the normal course of State of Conservation reporting. These include: changes to the architectural heritage, unplanned
development around the property that is impacting on it, a number of development projects planned for inside the property, enlargement of informal settlements, changes of ownership, and sustainable development. The mission considered that these issues should be reviewed on the basis of information provided by the State Party as part of the state of conservation report that has been requested by the Committee for submission by 1 February 2011.

**Draft Decision:** 34 COM 7B.46

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add.2,

2. Recalling Decision 33 COM 7B.44, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),

3. Expresses its strong concern at the apparent scope and scale of the proposed new port project near Lamu Island;

4. Requests the State Party at the earliest possible opportunity to inform the World Heritage Centre in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines as to their intentions with regard to the proposed port project and to provide the necessary details of the project for evaluation by the Advisory Bodies, including a full heritage impact assessment of the potential impact of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, before any formal commitment to the project has been made;

5. Also requests the State Party to involve the National Museums of Kenya, as an integral stakeholder, in the heritage impact assessment;

6. Encourages the State Party to carry out the necessary actions to protect the entirety of the Shela Sand Dunes/ water catchment system in line with the recommendations of the mission report;

7. Further requests the State Party to submit a map to the World Heritage Centre clearly demarcating and labelling the boundaries of the property;

8. Also encourages the State Party to resolve the issues related to the enlargement of the Buffer Zone to include the whole of the Lamu Archipelago, and at a minimum the whole of Lamu and Manda Islands, and to submit the agreed upon area for examination by the World Heritage Committee as a minor modification;

9. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit the final management plan to the World Heritage Centre as soon as it is completed for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;

10. Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2011, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property including issues related to the proposed port, the water catchment area, the boundaries and buffer zones, the management plan, the changes to the architectural heritage, unplanned and planned development projects in and around the property, enlargement of informal settlements, changes of ownership, and sustainable development and also other points raised in the reactive monitoring mission of May 2010, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.
49. Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1991

Criteria
(iv) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions:
31 COM 7B.48; 32 COM 7B.51; 33 COM 7B.46

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 150,000 for preparatory assistance, emergency assistance and technical cooperation. 2009: 75000 USD for an Emergency Assistance following the Jokwe cyclone.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount provided to the property: Japan Funds in Trust: USD 1,108,078; UCCLA: USD 526,015 and Portugal/IPAD: USD 397,122.; Flanders Funds in Trust: USD 270,000; Netherlands Funds in Trust: USD 729,729; World Heritage Cities Programme (Netherlands): USD 50,000; IPAD: USD 89,000; Africa 2009: USD 23,175; FDPA: USD 13,450.

Previous monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Management Plan not yet finalized;
b) Growing number of collapsed or seriously dilapidated buildings;
c) Threats to authenticity through unsympathetic repairs;
d) Lack of development control;
e) Lack of adequate sewage and water systems;
f) Lack of adequate financial and human resources;

Illustrative material
http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/599

Current conservation issues
At its 33rd session in 2009 (Seville), the World Heritage Committee expressed satisfaction of the efforts of the State Party in regard to the first phase of rehabilitation of San Sebastian Fortress and the considerable work to deal with damage caused by Cyclone Jokwe. At the same time, the Committee expressed ongoing concern about the conditions of historic structures in the town and the lack of adequate planning instruments which were affecting the authenticity of the property. The Committee also indicated that in the absence of substantial progress, it might consider inscribing the property on the World Heritage List in Danger at its 34th session.

The World Heritage Centre received a report on the state of conservation of the property from the State Party on 19 February 2010, which detailed the progress in response to recommendations made by the 33rd session of World Heritage Committee.

In April of 2010, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission was invited by the State Party to assess progress of the Emergency action plan as well as the steps for implementation of the recommendations of the previous monitoring mission. Due to the ash cloud over Europe in April 2010, the experts from the World Heritage Centre and ICCROM were unable to travel to Mozambique, and the mission, therefore, was carried out only by the ICOMOS expert.
a) **Ongoing rehabilitation of the Saint Sebastian Fortress**

The State Party reports that the first phase of the rehabilitation of the Saint Sebastian Fortress was completed successfully in 2009, including the removal of damaging vegetation, the structural repair and reinforcement of the walls and other structures, the repair of the roof and water collection system, and the restoration of part of the fort for use as an administrative wing and visitor centre. Before beginning the next phase, a provisional management committee for the fortress has been established to be overseen by the Museum of the Island of Mozambique.

The mission visited the fortress and confirmed that the majority of work had been carried out positively. The mission did report, however, some ongoing problems with vegetation as well as with leaking roofs. The State Party indicated that they were aware of the problems and were pursuing solutions. The mission also pointed out the need to ensure that the local population is able to utilize the fortress for community-based activities in addition to its role as a tourist site.

b) **Human and financial resources for conservation and management**

In regard to human resources, the State Party reports that two technicians, an architect and a tourism specialist, were recruited in 2009 for the Island of Mozambique Conservation Office (GACIM), made possible by additional funding provided to the GACIM by the Government of Mozambique. The State Party also reports that 4 technicians took part in internships in heritage management in Portugal funded by the Portuguese Institute for Development Assistance (IPAD). IPAD also financed two architects (one Portuguese and one Danish) to reinforce the staff at the GACIM. A short mission was also undertaken to Denmark to collect documentation from the 1980s by the School of Architecture of Aahrus. Staff from the GACIM is also active in the Organization of World Heritage Cities network.

The mission reported positively on the additional staff already recruited, and noted that an additional five technicians were scheduled to be employed in the near future. The mission also noted, however, that even with this additional staff, the GACIM is still short of the full contingent necessary for the proper management of the property.

The mission further noted that the amount of financial resources for conservation and conservation-related activities seems to have risen since the last mission. It stated that while most of these did not come directly from the State Party, it was important that the State Party was able to harness funding from a variety of sources for ongoing work. It cautioned, however, that there was a need to ensure coordination to avoid duplication and ensure that the true priorities of the property are dealt with first.

c) **Degradation of the historical fabric and the collapse of buildings**

In regard to rehabilitation of the historic fabric, the State Party reports that 25 private and public buildings have undergone restoration work. In addition, there were 20 worksites in operation at the time of the report, and 12 additional requests for permits being considered. Owners with buildings in advanced states of disrepair were notified in writing of the need to prepare a plan for rehabilitation of those buildings.

The mission found that the situation in regard to collapsed buildings had improved considerably since the last mission with no collapses in the intervening period. It reported that the State Party had also made strong efforts to clean and clear those buildings that had collapsed previously. The mission did report, however, that there had been some collapses of fencing walls.

The mission further reported that the GACIM and Municipality had become stricter in regard to repairs and constructions not in conformity with the historic environment in the Stone
Town. The mission reported several projects that were stopped and/or demolished. Such actions have served as examples for those implementing projects at the property.

The mission did report, however, that there were still serious problems in relation to the transformations of urban space in the Macuti Town, affecting both the urban layout and traditional layout of individual houses, and to the use of modern building materials, both of which affect the authenticity of the property. The GACIM and the municipality have yet to be able to implement the necessary planning controls to stop illegal development which has a negative effect on this part of the property. In addition, the question of building materials is of particular importance as there is an ongoing conflict between the use of the traditional materials and the need for a more sustainable development and improvement of quality of life for residents. These issues will need to be resolved in order to ensure a better state of conservation for the property as a whole.

d) Improvement of infrastructure, and in particular sewage and water systems
The State Party reports that it is in the process of producing a sustainable development plan for the Macuti Town as per the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee. In the meantime, an inventory of existing sanitary infrastructure has been carried out, and 34 sanitation facilities (out of 166 foreseen) have been constructed in the Macuti Town. The World Bank and the Government of Australia are also currently funding a plan to modernize and augment the supply of potable drinking water to the island. A plan to pave the road from the San Sebastian Fortress to the port and other roads to be determined is also underway coordinated by the municipal council and financed by the National Authority for Roads.

The mission also reported on the various initiatives to improve both water supply and sewage, including those mentioned above and others being carried out by the government of Portugal and the municipality. The mission notes that these projects show a positive effort by the State Party to improve the situation. It does point out, however, that there is a need to better control and coordinate all of these efforts to ensure that they produce the maximum benefit for the local residents.

e) Implementation of stronger legal framework
The State Party reports that the legal framework for the protection of the heritage of the Island of Mozambique is under revision. It, however, gives no further details on the actions being undertaken.

f) Delineation of the buffer zone to include concern for underwater heritage
The State Party reports that there is ongoing discussion amongst the local and national authorities as well as local community on the need to create a buffer zone to protect the cultural and natural heritage in its entirety, including underwater archaeological sites. No further details are provided.

g) Finalization of the management plan and other planning controls
The State Party reports that through the financial and technical assistance of the AFRICA 2009 Programme and the Africa World Heritage Fund, the management plan is close to being completed. Three consultation meetings were held in 2009, and the mission reports that a final stakeholder meeting will take place in the near future to allow for its finalization. The mission was shown a copy of the draft plan and told that it should be ready for implementation in the near future.

The State Party also reports the organization of regular meetings of an inter-ministerial commission to discuss activities and projects that will affect the conservation of the Island of Mozambique. In addition, the GACIM has developed a master list of projects which may affect the state of conservation of the property.
The mission found that the development control situation had improved considerably in the past year. In addition to the work on the management plan and the coordination of activities by the inter-ministerial commission, the mission reports the existence of an advisory technical commission co-chaired by the municipality and the GACIM with membership of many key institutions on the island. This commission has allowed for a more open and transparent process of decision making. The only problem reported by the mission was the non-arrival of technical equipment which would make the planning control process easier.

The mission also reported that the State Party has recently put into force a new National Monuments Policy and National Cultural Policy. Both these documents have been approved at the Cabinet Level showing the commitment at the highest levels to conservation of the cultural heritage.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note the many positive steps taken by the State Party in the past year. Efforts have been made to implement the emergency action plan including stopping the collapse of historic urban fabric, cleaning the town, and stopping illegal developments. Improvements in sewage and water supply are also underway. Further, it should be noted that the State Party has funded two additional positions within the GACIM and are continuing with the completion of the management plan. A most valuable contribution to the management plan is the architectural survey on both Stone Town and Macuti Town, which was conducted in early 2010 by a Mozambican architectural consultant team with the support of Mozambican architecture students. With funding from the World Heritage Cities Programme (Netherlands) and the Flemish Government, the survey was produced together with a study on the vernacular architecture in Macuti Town and submitted to the World Heritage Centre in April 2010. Both documents should inform the management plan and should be duly taken into consideration for the finalization.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies remain concerned however, with the continued problems facing the Macuti Town in regard to illegal developments, the loss of open space, and the use of inappropriate materials. These issues need to be discussed fully and proper solutions developed to allow for necessary development, while ensuring that the authenticity of the property is not compromised further. For this reason, the State Party is encouraged to finish the sustainable development plan for the Macuti Town mentioned in its report. It is also hoped that these issues are covered within the management plan that is nearing its completion. In this regard, it would be useful for the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to have a copy of the draft management plan as soon as possible, to ensure that these issues are addressed.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies also note that steps have been made to coordinate the various development and conservation projects, but are concerned that such efforts still need to be strengthened to ensure that there is no wasted effort or overlap.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies also note that although the State Party reports on actions taken to improve the legislative framework and buffer zones, there is little information as to the substantive progress made.

In summary, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies feel an important progress has been made by the State Party in the past year, but more efforts are needed in order to consolidate gains and deal with serious problems (particularly in the Macuti Town) that still need to be addressed.
Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.49

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add.2,

2. Recalling Decision 33 COM 7B.46, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),

3. Commends the State Party for the ongoing measures taken to improve the state of conservation of the property and implement the emergency action plan including the hiring of additional staff, the improvement of the situation in relation to building collapses, the initiation of projects to improve the water and sewerage situation at the property, and the ongoing work on the management plan;

4. Expresses its concern about the uncontrolled development in the Macuti Town and encourages the State Party to finalize work on the sustainable development plan for the Macuti Town;

5. Requests the State Party to submit three copies of the draft management plan to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible for review by the Advisory Bodies;

6. Also encourages the State Party to continue efforts to increase the number of staff working in the Island of Mozambique Conservation Office (GACIM) to ensure there is sufficient capacity to deal with the management of the property;

7. Also requests the State Party to continue to implement the emergency action plan including the ongoing work to strengthen the legal framework and invites the State Party to enlarge the buffer zone;

8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2012, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress made in the ongoing implementation of the emergency action plan and the points raised above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

ASIA-PACIFIC

65. Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia) (C 1224rev)

See Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add.3
**ANNEX 1**

List of the reactive monitoring missions requested for adoption by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010)

A) Properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger (Item 7A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>WHC</th>
<th>ICOMOS</th>
<th>IUCN</th>
<th>ICCROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURAL PROPERTIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFRICA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL PROPERTIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARAB STATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat) (Iraq)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samarra Archaeological City (Iraq)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASIA-PACIFIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Islamic Republic of Iran)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines) (Cultural landscape)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coro and its port (Venezuela)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 10    7    4    1
### B) Properties on the World Heritage List (Item 7B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>WHC</th>
<th>ICOMOS</th>
<th>IUCN</th>
<th>ICCROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURAL PROPERTIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFRICA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainforests of Atsinanana</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas (Zimbabwe)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASIA-PACIFIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorentz National Park (Indonesia)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirin National Park (Bulgaria)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doñana National Park (Spain)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowstone National Park (United States of America)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve (Mexico)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manu National Park (Peru)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL PROPERTIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFRICA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARAB STATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra (Jordan)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyre (Lebanon)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASIA-PACIFIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodhgaya (India)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah’s Palace</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>WHC</td>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>ICCROM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Maiden Tower (Azerbaijan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (Cultural landscape)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral, Kiev Pechersk Lavra and Related Monastic Buildings (Ukraine)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cuzco (Peru)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**World Heritage Centre**

36 missions requested
Standard cost of each mission: USD 3.500 (travel, only, no fees)
Total cost: USD 126,000

**ICOMOS**

21 missions requested
Standard cost of each mission: USD 5.000 (travel and fees)
Total cost: USD 105,000

**IUCN**

17 missions requested
Standard cost of each mission: USD 5.000 (travel and fees)
Total cost: USD 85,000

**ICCROM**

5 missions requested
Standard cost of each mission: USD 4.000 (travel only, no fees)
Total cost: USD 20,000

**Great total of USD 336,000**