

## Periodic Report - Second Cycle

## Section II-Schokland and Surroundings

### 1. World Heritage Property Data

#### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Schokland and Surroundings

#### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

##### State(s) Party(ies)

- Netherlands

##### Type of Property

cultural

##### Identification Number

739


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

1995

#### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Schokland and Surroundings	52.639 / 5.772	1306	0	1306	1995
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>1306</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1306</b>	

#### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Schokland and surroundings, Scale of original: 1:25,000	30/09/1994	

#### 1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Rene Wokke  
Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands  
National Focal Point for Periodic Reporting

#### 1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Marcella Marinelli  
Municipality of Noordoostpolder  
Ms  
Development Unit  
Community Cluster

#### 1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- [Patrimonium-mundi.org](http://Patrimonium-mundi.org) : visit this site in [panophotographies - immersive and interactive spherical images](#)
- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- [Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek \(dutch only\)](#)
- [Werelderfgoed in Nederland \(dutch only\)](#)
- [Stichting Platform Werelderfgoed Nederland](#)

##### Comment

6. Worldheritage Schokland and surrounding (Werelderfgoed Schokland en omgeving), [www.schokland.nl](http://www.schokland.nl) 3. Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed, [www.cultureelerfgoed.nl](http://www.cultureelerfgoed.nl)

#### 1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)

### 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

#### 2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

##### Comment

The rSoOUV as approved bij ICOMOS and submitted to the Committee at the 37th annual meeting in 2013.

#### 2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed

(iii)(v)

#### 2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Prehistoric and early historic remains of wetland settlements (criterion iii) The island Schokland (criterion v) The surrounding agricultural landscape created as a result of the reclamation of the former Zuyder Zee (criterion v) Settlements, cemeteries, terps, dykes and parcel systems (criterion v)

#### 2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised

#### 2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value



































### 3. Factors Affecting the Property

#### 3.14. Other factor(s)

##### 3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

### 3.15. Factors Summary Table

#### 3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact	Origin			
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>					
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities	 				
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>					
3.3.1	Water infrastructure		  			
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>					
3.5.3	Land conversion		 			
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals		 			
3.5.5	Crop production	 				
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>					
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition	 				
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>					
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities		 			
3.13.2	High impact research / monitoring activities		 			
3.13.3	Management activities		 			
<b>Legend</b>	 Current	 Potential	 Negative	 Positive	 Inside	 Outside

### 3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

#### 3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>					
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities	localised	on-going	significant	low capacity	static
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>					
3.5.5	Crop production	extensive	on-going	significant	high capacity	increasing
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>					
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition	localised	on-going	significant	high capacity	increasing

### 3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

Visitors facilities: there is a plan to build a new museum with a shared message to the public  
Publication: Towards a sustainable future for Schokland, Dienst Landelijk Gebied, 10 juli 2012, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation. Recommendation: to elevate the average groundwater table and change use of land (from agriculture to extensive grazing or nature) in order to protect for the long term the archeological sites present in the southern part of the site

### 4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

#### 4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

##### 4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is no buffer zone, and it is not needed

##### 4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

##### 4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The property had **no buffer zone** at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

##### 4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

##### 4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The property had **no buffer zone** at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

##### 4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

#### 4.2. Protective Measures

##### 4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional)

**Note WHC (July 2012):**

**Please carefully review and update the information provided below.**

##### Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Friday, November 18, 2005

#### • Question 6.02

National:

- 1988 Monuments Act (Monumentenwet) 1988 (for the protection and conservation of archaeological monuments)
- Housing Act (Woningwet) (2003) (for establishing criteria for building aesthetics)
- Forestry Act (Boswet) (1961) (for the conservation and, where possible, extension of the acreage of forests and timberland)
- Flora and Fauna Act (Flora- Faunawet) (1998) (for the protection of wild animals and plants)

-Space/Space for Development Document (Nota Ruimte. Ruimte voor Ontwikkeling) (2004) (Ministries of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environmental Management (Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer - VROM), Agriculture, Nature Management and Food Quality (Landbouw, Natuurbeheer en Voedselkwaliteit - LNV), Transport, Public Works and Water Management (Verkeer en Waterstaat - V&W), Economic Affairs (Economische Zaken - EZ)).

As regards the central government's key planning decision 'National Spatial Policy', the document states, for example, that 'the central government has the international obligation and responsibility to realise the protection of the world heritage in its own country using existing tools'.

For the World Heritage, the built and archaeological monuments at the site are, in principle, sufficiently protected via the Monuments and Historic Buildings Act and the provincial and municipal regulations. The central government facilitates conservation through existing legal and financial tools for cultural heritage and nature'

Province of Flevoland:

- Regional plan for nature and landscape (Gebiedsplan voor natuur en landschap) (2002) (forms the basis for nature, forestry and landscape subsidy)
- Landscape Bye-Law (Landschapsverordening) (2002) (states that it is forbidden to place captions, announcements or, for example, advertising boards outside the built-up area of a town/city)
- Surrounds Plan (Omgevingsplan) (2000) (The plan defines 'Schokland and its surroundings' where the regionally-oriented policy applies. The plan also states that Schokland is an environmental protection area where the soil is concerned and, as such, undertakes to conserve its abiotic, biotic and cultural-historical values)
- Earth Removal Bye-Law (1997) (includes conditions regarding the granting or otherwise of permits for earth removal deeper than 0.3m below ground level)

Municipality of Noordoostpolder:

- Landscape Policy Plan (Landschapsbeleidsplan), adopted in 2003, defines the municipality's vision for the landscaping around Schokland
- Rural Area Zoning Plan (Bestemmingsplan landelijk gebied) (1978) (the land within the site is primarily for agricultural purposes). Also see 03.04.
- Art. 18 of the Draft Rural Area Zoning Plan (Ontwerp-Bestemmingsplan Landelijk Gebied) 2004 (under consideration) provides further conditions for 'cultural-historically valuable elements', indicating the designation for each element (relates to, for example, the former

harbour, the 'Lighthouse Keeper's House', the historic building referred to as the 'Misthoorn', the museum in Middelbuurt, the Zuidert (former residential terp), the 'church ruin' with terp at Zuidpunt  
 Art. 19 of the Draft Rural Area Zoning Plan (Ontwerp-Bestemmingsplan Landelijk Gebied) 2004 (under consideration) provides further conditions for 'cultural-historically valuable areas', which concern the conservation and reinforcement of remains of the former island of Schokland, such as dikes, terps and parcelling out patterns, in addition to conserving local archaeological and geological values  
 Art 21 of the Draft Rural Area Zoning Plan (Ontwerp-Bestemmingsplan Landelijk Gebied) 2004 (under consideration) provides further conditions concerning 'areas of archaeological value or expectation value'. Here, therefore, no work may be carried out on or in these areas, read land, over an area of 100m<sup>2</sup> or more, deeper than 0.5m under the water level and no deep-rooted plants may be planted or any ground raised or equalised unless the Municipal Executive has granted written permission to do so

-Monument bye-law (1996) to date not applicable to the site, as national government protection has priority over municipal protection)

Zuiderzeeland District Water Board:

- Water Level Decrees 'Schokland and surroundings' (Peilbesluiten 'Schokland en omgeving') (2002 and 2003) (regulate and determine the levels of the surface water at the site)

See further under 02.02, 05.01, 07.02 of 'Regional document'

**Comment**

National Spatial law (Nota Ruimte) 2006 Policy document Heritage and space (Visie Erfgoed en Ruimte, Kiezen voor Karakter) 2012 Heritage law, revision archeology (Wet op de Archeologische Monumentenzorg) 2007 Spatial planning law (Wet Ruimtelijke Ordening) 2008 Housing law (Woningwet) 2012 Province of Flevoland Landscape regulation (Landschapsverordening) 2005

**4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?**

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

**4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?**

The property had **no buffer zone at the time of inscription** on the World Heritage List

**4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the**

**Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?**

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

**4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?**

There is **acceptable** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

**4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures**

**4.3. Management System / Management Plan**

**4.3.1 - Management System**

**Note WHC (July 2012):**

**If a more recent management plan is in force, we will very much appreciate it if you could provide its 2 paper and electronic copies to the WHC. The submission should be accompanied by a cover letter to DIR/WHC. Thank you for your cooperation.**

**Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2**

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Friday, November 18, 2005

- **Question 5.02**  
Stering group or similar management committee has been set up to guide the management of the site
- **Question 5.03**

**Set up date:** 1998

**Function:** On 22 December 2004, the 'Regional Partners' (the administration of the Municipality of Noordoostpolder, the administration of the Flevolandscape Association, the administration of the Northern Agricultural and Horticultural Organisation Flevoland, the administration of the Zuiderzeeland District Water Board, the administration of the Province of Flevoland, the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, the Ministry of Finance and State Property Services IJsselmeerpolders) signed the Regional document Schokland and Surroundings with administrative agreements, 2004-2006, with the following objective: 'The Regional Partners take joint responsibility as defined in UNESCO's Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972), for preserving the World Heritage Schokland and surroundings, inscribed in 1995 on UNESCO's World Heritage List. They undertook to: '1. Protect, reinforce and develop the cultural-historical, landscape and natural values of Schokland and its surroundings as World Heritage 2. Increase its recognisability as World Heritage and increase public awareness of its existence'. The Regional document takes 2015 as its time horizon

**Mandate:** The Regional Partners are to elaborate on the 'regional document' according to their (public and political) responsibilities

**Constituted:** legal


- **Question 5.05**  
Overall management system of the site
  - Management under protective legislation

- Management under contractual agreement between the State Party and a third party
  - Consensual management
  - Other effective management system
- See 05.03

**Comment**

Current: World heritage site Schokland and surrounding. Managementplan 2010. The management plan has been agreed upon by all partners. In the management plan responsibilities are specified of each party involved. A new organisation structure is implemented. In 2013 a revision of the MP is ready, in which emphasis will be given to the financial situation. The regional partners have decided that a revision of the management plan will be executed every 6 years, following the periodic report cycl

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Beheersplan voor het reservaatgebied Schokland	N/A	Available	01/01/1993	

**Comment**

World heritage site Schokland and surrounding. Managementplan 2010.

**4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?**

There is **excellent coordination** between all bodies / levels involved in the management of the property

**4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?**

The management system/plan is only **partially adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

**4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?**

The management system is being **fully** implemented and monitored

**4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?**

An annual work / action plan exists and **most or all activities** are being implemented and monitored

**4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following**

Local communities / residents	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Good
Visitors	Fair
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Fair
Industry	Fair

**4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have**

**input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?**

Local communities **directly contribute** to some decisions relating to management

**4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?**

**No indigenous peoples** are resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone

**4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?**

There is **regular contact** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone and **substantial co-operation** on management

**4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training**

World heritage site Schokland and surrounding. Managementplan 2010. The management plan has been agreed upon by all the partners. In the management plan responsibilities are specified for each party involved. In 2013-2014 a revision is planned, in which more emphasis will be given to the financial situation. The regional partners have decided that a revision of the management plan will be executed every 6 years, coinciding with the periodic report. This will ensure regular evaluation.

**4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report**

Since 2010 the municipality of Noordoostpolder is siteholder. A new organisation structure is established. On a political and decision making level a siteholder group is formed, involving all regional parties, chaired by the mayor of Noordoostpolder. Next, a regional committee was created, involving all regional parties and inhabitants and landowners, chaired by Flevo-landschap. This committee prepares all decisions for the siteholder group. A coördinator was recruited to participate in both.

**4.4. Financial and Human Resources**

**4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)**

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	
Governmental (National / Federal)	5%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	5%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	60%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	30%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	

**Periodic Report - Second Cycle**

Other grants	
--------------	--

**4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)**

**Comment**

No international assistance has been received.

**4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?**

The available budget is **inadequate** for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage

**4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?**

The existing sources of funding **are secure** in the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

**4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?**

**Potential** economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed

**4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?**

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

**4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained?**

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

**4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure**

**4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)**

Full-time	
Part-time	100%

**4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)**

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	

**4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)**

Paid	80%
Volunteer	20%

**4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?**

A range of human resources exist, but these are **below optimum** to manage the World Heritage Property.

**4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines**

Research and monitoring	Good
-------------------------	------

**Section II-Schokland and Surroundings**

Promotion	Poor
Community outreach	Fair
Interpretation	Fair
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Poor
Conservation	Fair
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Fair

**4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines**

Research and monitoring	Medium
Promotion	Medium
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	Medium
Education	Medium
Visitor management	Medium
Conservation	Medium
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Medium
Tourism	Medium
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Medium

**4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?**

A capacity development plan or programme is **in place and fully implemented**; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, who are assuming leadership in management

**4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training**

In order to ensure a sustainable future for the property financial resources are needed to compensate for the restrictions in land use inside the site. Traditional agricultural landuse is no longer possible in part of the site, due to the archaeological remains.

**4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects**

**4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?**

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

**4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?**

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme of research**, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

## Periodic Report - Second Cycle

### 4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared with local participants and some national agencies**

### 4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report

The list has too many characters to fit in the answer field. There are about 45 publications. On request we will provide you the list by mail.

### 4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects

1. To find solution for the long term conservation of archaeological sites in relation to the agricultural use of the property 2. To enhance the tourist facilities on the island 3. To improve the information about the property for visitors, educational purposes and to obtain commitment

## 4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

### 4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?

In **one location and easily visible** to visitors

### 4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Excellent
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Excellent
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Average
Local businesses and industries	Poor

### 4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?

There is a planned education and awareness programme but it only **partly meets the needs** and could be improved

### 4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, **but it could be improved**

### 4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is **not adequately** presented and interpreted

### 4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

Visitor centre	Adequate
Site museum	Adequate

## Section II-Schokland and Surroundings

Information booths	Adequate
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Excellent
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Poor
Other	Not needed

### 4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building

It is not clear to all parties involved, nor the public, what exactly are the OUV of this site. This means that there is not a clear picture why Schokland is a world heritage site. Actions are taken to improve this.

## 4.7. Visitor Management

### 4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years

Last year	Static
Two years ago	Static
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Minor Increase

### 4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries
Visitor surveys
Other

### 4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

#### Comment

There is a public participation plan for the period 2010-2014 in progress. A new plan has been drawn up for the period 2014-2017. These plans comprehend: visitor research, stimulating local cooperation, activities to increase the number of visitors, and to create a coherent tourist management programme in the region.

### 4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is **effectively managed** and does not impact its Outstanding Universal Value

### 4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?

There is contact between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry but this is largely **confined to administrative or regulatory matters**

### 4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

The fee is collected, but it makes **no contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

**4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property**

As of 2013 a plan is put into action to ensure a comprehensive, and by all parties agreed upon, vision on tourism in the region. It answers questions as: What message do we want to send to the public and what activities are linked to that message? How can local inhabitants join in to these activities and profit from living in a world heritage site? Next, a regional programme to realise these goals will be started.

**4.8. Monitoring**

**4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?**

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme** of monitoring, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

**4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?**

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

**4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups**

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Average
Local communities	Average
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Average
Industry	Average
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

**4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?**

**No relevant** Committee recommendations to implement

**4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee**

**4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring**

**4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs**

**4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)**

Please refer to question 5.2



## 5. Summary and Conclusions

### 5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

#### 5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

	World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>					
<b>3.1.5</b>	<b>Interpretative and visitation facilities</b>	Measures are taken to develop better facilities and improve the coherent message to the public	Workshops and development plans	Until 2018	2013-2018	Municipality of Noordoostpolder no comments
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>					
<b>3.5.5</b>	<b>Crop production</b>	A plan is in action to research changing from traditional agriculture to nature use.	Regional partners and governmental partners are deliberating possibilities and searching for necessary funds	not relevant	2013-2018	Municipality of Noordoostpolder no comment
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>					
<b>3.11.5</b>	<b>Erosion and siltation/deposition</b>	This is the cause of the problem. Actions see 3.5.5	see 3.5.5	see 3.5.5	2013-2018	Municipality of Noordoostpolder no comment

### 5.2. Summary - Management Needs

#### 5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

<b>4.4 Financial and Human Resources</b>						
	Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
<b>4.4.3</b>	<b>The budget is inadequate for management needs</b>	- Regional partners need to commit to necessary budget - The regional partners are making an plan towards a change in organisation. This is needed to have funds and income flood back into the costs of maintenance, assuring a sustainable future	2013-2014	Municipality of Noordoostpolder and The Flevolandscap Association	no comments	
<b>4.7 Visitor Management</b>						
<b>4.7.5</b>	<b>Contact with the tourism industry is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters</b>	April 2013 workshops have started with all organisations involved and the local entrepreneurs to define what kind of message we want to bring tot the greater public, and what kind of activities that would entail. Goal: a coherent program and 1 theme.	2014	Municipality of Noordoostpolder and regional partners	For this project to work, a central coordination point is necessary. Therefore ideas are being formed towards a new visitorscentre, museum, as a startingpoint for the visitors. The succes of the project is mainly depended on achieving this goal.	
<b>4.7.6</b>	<b>Fees collected makes no contribution to the management of the property</b>	Part of the workshops mentioned at 4.7 is to have agreement on how fees collected (by entrepreneurs, the museum, etc.) can contribute structurally towards the management and maintenance of the property.	in progress	in progress	no comments	

Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff

**5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property**

**5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity**

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **preserved**

**5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity**

The integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

**5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value**

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **impacted** by factors described in this report, but this situation is being **addressed through effective management actions**.

**5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values**

Other important cultural and / or natural values and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

**5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property**

**5.4.1 - Comments**

**6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise**

**6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas**

Conservation	Positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	Very positive
International cooperation	No impact
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	No impact
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	No impact
Other (please specify)	No impact

**6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status**

There is an impact on land use due to the archeological sites in the subsoil. Farmers can, due to the restrictions involved protecting the archaeological sites, no longer have a sound cropyield. In future, land use will have to change from the production of vegetables into pasture land.

**6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report**

Governmental institution responsible for the property

**6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?**

yes

**6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire**

**6.6 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire from the following entities**

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Good
Advisory Body	Fair

**6.7 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?**

All required information was accessible

**6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following**

The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting

**6.9 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities**

UNESCO	Not Applicable
State Party	Not Applicable
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

**6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee**

- **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**  
Reason for update: The rSoOUV as aproved bij ICOMOS and submitted to the Committee at the 37th annual meeting in 2013.

**6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise**