WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTY DATA

QUESTIONNAIRE
PREHISTORIC SITES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE TENTATIVE LIST

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

N	QUESTION	RESPONSE
1.1	**State Party**	
1.2	**Region**	Africa / Arab States / Asia and the Pacific / Europe and North America / Latin America and the Caribbean
1.3	**Name of property**	
1.4	**Type of property**	Cultural / Cultural Landscape / Natural / Mixed
1.5	**Identification number on the World Heritage List or Tentative List**	
1.6	**Year of inscription on World Heritage List/ year of submission to the Tentative List**	
1.7	**Year of inscription on World Heritage List in Danger, if applicable**	
1.8	**Year of removal from the World Heritage List in Danger, if applicable**	
1.9	**Criteria**	Current
		Former
1.10	**Approved extension of the property**	Entirely located within the territory of the State Party
		Transboundary
1.11	**Presence of serial components**	Not applicable
		Serial national
		Serial transnational
1.12	**Year(s) previous Periodic Reporting Cycle(s) submitted**	
1.13	**Person/entity completing this questionnaire**	**NAME:** **E-Mail:** **Telephone:** **Fax:** **Postal address:**

1.14	**Government institution responsible for the property**	**NAME:** **E-Mail:** **Telephone:** **Fax:** **Postal address:**
1.15	**Site manager / coordinator**	**NAME:** **E-Mail:** **Web address for site:** **Telephone:** **Fax:** **Postal address:**
1.16	**Geographical Information**	Province(s)
		Region(s)
		State (For Federal countries)
1.17	**Other International Conventions related to the site**	

2. OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE OF THE PROPERTY

N.	QUESTION	RESPONSE	
2.1	What are the major characteristics of the prehistoric site?	Sequences	
		Types of traces	
		Functions	
		Other (specify)	
2.2	How many recorded prehistoric settlements and/or ensembles are there on the property?		
2.3	What is the approximate chronology of the property?		
2.4	What is the current state of authenticity of the property?	Predominantly intact?	Yes/ No
		Partially degraded?	Yes/ No
		Degraded and impacting on the OUV?	Yes/ No
		Severely degraded?	Yes/ No
2.5	What is the current state of integrity of the property?	Predominantly intact?	Yes/ No
		Partially degraded?	Yes/ No
		Degraded and impacting on the OUV?	Yes/ No
		Severely degraded?	Yes/ No
2.6	Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to statement of outstanding universal value		
2.7	Can you mention any other site (related or not with this property) that could be considered for inclusion on the Tentative List or the World Heritage List?		

3. FACTORS AFFECTING THE PROPERTY

3.1	What are the main factors affecting the authenticity and integrity of the property?	Describe the major impacts:			
3.2	**Impact on buildings and development on the property**	**Positive impact** C=current P=potential	**Negative impact** C=current P=potential	**Property** C=current P=potential	**Buffer Zone** C=current P=potential
3.2.1	Housing				
3.2.2	Commercial development				
3.2.3	Industrial development				
3.2.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure				
3.2.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities				
3.3	**Impact on transportation infrastructure**				
3.3.1	Ground transport, public				
3.3.2	Ground transport, private				
3.3.3	Ground transport: trails				
3.3.4	Footpaths				
3.3.5	Air transport				
3.4	**Impact on utilities or service infrastructure**				
3.4.1	Water infrastructure				
3.4.2	Energy facilities				
3.4.3	Localized utilities				
3.4.4	Major linear facilities				
3.5	**Impact of pollution**				
3.5.1	Water pollution				
3.5.2	Air pollution				
3.5.3	Solid waste				
3.6	**Impact on biological activities**				
3.6.1	Change in land use				
3.6.2	Livestock in the area				
3.6.3	Wild animals in the area				
3.6.4	Crop production				
3.7	**Physical resource extraction**				
3.7.1	Mining				
3.7.2	Quarrying				
3.7.3	Oil/gas				
3.7.4	Water				
3.8	**Local conditions affecting physical fabric at prehistoric sites**				
3.8.1	Wind				
3.8.2	Relative humidity				
3.8.3	Temperature (heat and cold)				
3.8.4	Radiation / light				
3.8.5	Dust				
3.8.6	Water				
3.8.7	Insects				

3.8.8	Birds				
3.8.9	Small mammals				
3.8.10	Fungus				
3.8.11	Lichen				
3.8.12	Micro-organisms				
3.9	**Social/Cultural uses**	**Positive impact** **C=current P=potential**	**Negative impact** **C=current P=potential**	**Property**	**Buffer Zone**
3.9.1	Ritual/spiritual/religious and associative uses site				
3.9.2	Social value of the site to current community				
3.9.3	Indigenous use of the site				
3.9.4	Changes in traditional lifeways and knowledge				
3.9.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local community				
3.9.6	Positive impacts of tourism/visitors/recreation				
3.9.7	Negative impacts of tourism/visitors/recreation				
3.9.8	Research				
3.9.9	Public education programmes				
3.10	**Other human activities**				
3.10.1	Vandalism				
3.10.2	Illicit trafficking				
3.10.3	Camping / living in site perimeters				
3.10.4	Political attitudes				
3.10.5	War / terrorism / civil unrest				
3.11	**Climate and severe weather events affecting the site**				
3.11.1	Storms and wind				
3.11.2	Flooding				
3.11.3	Rising sea level				
3.11.4	Drought / desertification				
3.12	**Sudden ecological or geological events affecting the site**				
3.12.1	Volcanic eruption				
3.12.2	Earthquake				
3.12.3	Tsunami / tidal wave				
3.12.4	Avalanche / landslide				
3.12.5	Erosion / deposition				
3.12.6	Fire				
3.13	**Management and institutional factors**				
3.13.1	Legal framework				
3.13.2	Governance				
3.13.3	Management systems / Management Plan				
3.13.4	Financial resources				
3.13.5	Human resources				
3.13.6	Low impact research / monitoring activities				
3.13.7	High impact research / monitoring activities				
3.13.8	Management activities				

4. PROTECTION, MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING OF PREHISTORIC SITES

4.1	**Boundaries and buffer zone**		
4.1.1	Area of the property		
4.1.2	Area of the buffer zone, if applicable		
4.1.3	Total area		
4.1.4	Are the boundaries of the property adequate to maintain the outstanding universal value of the site?	Inadequacies make it difficult to maintain Boundaries could be improved Boundaries are adequate	Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No
4.2	**Measures to protect the site**		
4.2.1	What kind of legal protection is in place?		
4.2.2	Is the legal framework adequate to maintain the outstanding universal value, authenticity and integrity of the prehistoric remains?	The legal framework is inadequate The legal framework has some deficiencies The legal framework is adequate	Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No
4.2.3	Can the legislative framework be enforced?	Yes No	
4.3	**Management System / Management Plan**		
4.3.1	Is there a current management plan for the site?	The site management plan is in force	Yes/No
		It is in the process of approval	Yes/No
		It is in the process of revision	Yes/No
4.3.2	Is there a specific conservation plan for the site within the Management Plan?	It is part of the general Management Plan	Yes/No
		There is a separate chapter for conservation	Yes/No
		There are plans for individual settlements within the site	Yes/No
4.3.3	Is the management system/plan adequate to maintain the outstanding universal value of the property?	There is no system or plan in place	Yes/No
		The system/plan is not adequate	Yes/No
		The system/plan is partially adequate	Yes/No
		The system/plan is fully adequate	Yes/No
4.3.4	Is the management system/plan being implemented?	No current management system is in place	Yes/No
		The system/plan is not being implemented	Yes/No
		The system/plan is partially implemented	Yes/No
		The system/plan is fully implemented	Yes/No
4.3.5	Is the cooperation and relationship with the following groups excellent (4), average (3), poor (2), non-existent (1) or not applicable (0)?	Local communities/residents	
		Local authorities	
		Indigenous groups	
		Descendants of the artists	
		Landowners	
		Researchers	
		Tour operators	
		Industry and commercial companies	
4.3.6	Do the local communities residing in or near the property and/or	No local communities are resident nearby	Yes/No
		Local communities have no input	Yes/No

	buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the outstanding universal value of the site?	Local communities have some input, but no direct role in management	Yes/No
		Local communities contribute to decisions	Yes/No
		Local communities participate fully	Yes/No
4.3.7	Is there cooperation with industry (tourism, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding management of the property?	There is little or no contact	Yes/No
		There is contact but little co-operation	Yes/No
		There is contact but only some co-operation	Yes/No
		There is regular contact re management	Yes/No
4.3.8	How are prehistoric records kept?	Digital database	Yes/No
		GIS	Yes/No
		Paper files	Yes/No
		Digital photographs	Yes/No
		Slides and prints	Yes/No
4.3.9	Where are the original records kept?	Originals are kept at the WH property	Yes/No
		Copies are lodged elsewhere	Yes/No
		Originals are kept at another facility	Yes/No
4.4	**Financial and human resources**		
4.4.1	Is the conservation and management of the property part of the operating budget or is it a separate line item on the budget?	The management is outsourced	Yes/No
		There is no separate budget	Yes/No
		There is a separate budget	Yes/No
4.4.2	What percentage of the annual operating budget for the World Heritage Property was spent on the conservation / management of the property over the last 5 years (excl. salaries)?	Less than 0.5%	Yes/No
		Between 0.5 and 1%	Yes/No
		Between 1 and 5%	Yes/No
		Between 5 and 10%	Yes/No
		More than 10%	Yes/No
4.4.3	How much international assistance has been received for conservation and management for the property in 2005-2008?	Less than US$1000	Yes/No
		Between $1000 and $10,000	Yes/No
		Between $10,000 and $100,000	Yes/No
		More than $100,000	Yes/No
4.4.4	Is the current budget sufficient to manage the property effectively and retain the outstanding universal value of the prehistoric traces?	There is no budget for management	Yes/No
		The available budget is inadequate	Yes/No
		The available budget is acceptable but could be improved	Yes/No
		The available budget is sufficient	Yes/No
4.4.5	Does the local community receive economic benefits from the site?	The local community receives no direct economic benefits	Yes/No
		There are a few jobs for local people at the site	Yes/No
		The local community receives a percentage of profits	Yes/No
4.4.6	Are available resources such as equipment, facilities, vehicles and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?	There are little or no facilities or equipment	Yes/No
		Facilities and equipment are inadequate	Yes/No
		Facilities and equipment are adequate	Yes/No
		More sophisticated equipment is needed	Yes/No
4.4.7	How many people are involved in managing the property?	Total number employed:	
		Full-time contract	
		Full-time permanent	
		Part-time	

		Volunteer	
4.4.8	How many of the staff members listed in 4.4.7 have been trained in tourism, conservation or management?	Conservators/managers	
		Tourist guides	
		Researchers	
4.4.9	How many staff members who have not had formal training in tourism, conservation or management are employed to manage the site?	Tourist guides	
		Visitor administration	
		Site monitoring	
4.5	**Scientific Studies and Research Projects**		
4.5.1	Is there adequate knowledge about the property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that the outstanding universal value is maintained?	Researchers	Yes/No
		There's some research, but it is not planned	Yes/No
		There is a lot not research but it is not directed towards management needs or improving outstanding universal value	Yes/No
		There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of research	Yes/No
4.5.2	Are results from prehistoric research programmes disseminated to staff and local participants at the property?	Research results are not shared	Yes/No
		Shared, but no active outreach	Yes/No
		Shared with selected stakeholders	Yes/No
		Shared widely locally and internationally	Yes/No
4.5.3	Does the property have its own website?	Yes/No	
4.5.4	Is there specific information about the property on the website?	Yes/No When was it last updated?	
4.6	**Education, Information and Awareness-raising**		
4.6.1	Is there a planned education and awareness-raising programme linked to the outstanding universal value of the property?	There is no planned education and awareness–raising programme	
		The planned programme has not been implemented	
		The programme has been implemented	
4.6.2	What kinds of education and/or awareness-raising programmes are planned?	Guided tours to prehistoric sites	Yes/No
		Self-guided tours to prehistoric sites	Yes/No
		Information pamphlets	Yes/No
		Special programmes for local communities	Yes/No
		On-site signage and information	Yes/No
		Displays in an interpretation centre	Yes/No
		Information packs for schools and educators	Yes/No
		Films and TV programmes	Yes/No
4.6.3	Which of these programmes are already in place?	Guided tours to prehistoric sites	Yes/No
		Self-guided tours to prehistoric sites	Yes/No
		Special programmes for local communities	Yes/No
		Information pamphlets	Yes/No
		On-site signage and information	Yes/No
		Displays in an interpretation centre	Yes/No
		Information packs for schools and educators	Yes/No
		Films and TV programmes	Yes/No
4.6.4	Have images been used for branding the property?	Yes/No	
4.6.5	If yes, in what medium?	Posters	

	(Please underline relevant words)	T-shirts and clothing Caps and hats Table mats and cloths Postcards Mugs Jewelry Other (please specify)	
4.7	**Visitor Management**		
4.7.1	Are there statistics on visitation to the property?	Yes / No	
4.7.2	If so, please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years, or for the years for which the figures are available.	2004 - 2005 - 2006 - 2007 - 2008 -	
4.7.3	If separate figures are available, how many people visited the site(s) during the same years?	2004 - 2005 - 2006 - 2007 - 2008 -	
4.7.4	Is there a visitor use policy, plan or set of guidelines for the site(s)?	Yes / No	
4.7.5	Are commercial tour operators permitted to take visitors to the site(s) without a property staff member as a guide?	No Yes, but with strict protocols Yes, unrestricted access is allowed	
4.7.6	Are fees charged?	For entry to the property?	Yes/No
		With an additional fee to visit the site(s)?	Yes/No
4.7.7	Do the fees contribute directly to the conservation and management of the site?	Yes No, only indirectly No, the fees only go towards salaries	
4.7.8	Are visitors' books kept to record all visits to site(s) on the property?	Yes / No	
4.7.9	If so, approximately what percentage of visitors are local and what percentage are foreign?	% of visitors local % of visitors from State Party % of visitors from other countries	
4.7.10	Has the number of visitors to the site(s) increased or decreased since the property was inscribed?	Increased	Yes/No
		Decreased	Yes/No
		Not known	Yes/No
4.8	**Monitoring**		
4.8.1	Is there a conservation monitoring programme at the property?	Monitoring programme	Yes/No
		The programme has not been implemented	Yes/No
		The monitoring is done intermittently	Yes/No
		Monitoring is done regularly	Yes/No
4.8.2	Are original condition reports, photographs and monitoring forms archived about the property?	Originals are kept at the property	Yes/No
		Copies are lodged elsewhere	Yes/No
		Originals are kept at another facility	Yes/No
4.8.3	What kind of monitoring has been done in the last two years? (Please underline relevant words)	Temperature Humidity Dust Water / Frost / Ice / Snow Salts Insect activity Bird activity	

		Mammal activity Vegetation Human impacts Other (please specify)
4.8.4	If monitoring has been done, have any interventions been necessary?	Yes/No
4.8.5	If so, what kinds of interventions have been made? (Please underline relevant words)	Removal of graffiti Removal of fungus Removal of bird droppings Removal of mammal droppings Removal of insect tracks or nests Removal/addition of vegetation Removal/addition of rubbish bin Installation of a gate, fence or barrier Installation of a boardwalk or floor covering Installation of drip lines Change in visitation policy The site was closed to the public Other (please specify)
4.8.6	Who made the interventions?	Maintenance staff member Professional staff member Qualified consultant Researcher
4.8.7	Is there a written record of the interventions with before and after photographs?	Yes / No

5. GENERAL ISSUES ABOUT PREHISTORIC SITES AND WORLD HERITAGE

5.1	In your opinion, are there any themes or outstanding universal value concerning prehistoric sites that are not yet represented on the World Heritage List or Tentative List?	Yes / No
5.2	Has the inscription of prehistoric sites on the World Heritage List helped to increase public awareness and appreciation of prehistory?	Yes / No (please explain)
5.3	Has the inscription of prehistoric sites on the World Heritage List made them more vulnerable to damage?	Yes / No (please explain)