

## 1. World Heritage Property Data

### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Lake Baikal

### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

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

- Russian Federation

#### Type of Property

natural

#### Identification Number

754



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

1996

### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Lake Baikal	53.174 / 107.663	8800000	0	8800000	1996
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>8800000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8800000</b>	

### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Baikal (WHC scan of the original, scale 1:1,250,000)	26/09/1995	
БУРЯТСКАЯ АССР, Scale 1:1,250,000	29/06/1995	

### 1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Grigory E. Ordzhonikidze  
Commission of the Russian Federation for UNESCO  
Executive Secretary

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

- Zinaida K. Muzileva  
The Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation

#### Comment

1. Baikalsky State Nature Biosphere Reserve - Vasily Sutula, tel: +7(301-38) 93725, vasilyu@mail.ru 2. Federal State Budget Institution «Zapovednoe Podlemorye» - Mikhail Ovdin, +7(30131) 91575, znp.ovdin@mail.ru 3. Federal State Budget Institution «Zapovednoe Pribaikalye» - Valentin Borodenko, +7(914) 0025378, borodenko680101@gmail.com

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

1. [Lake Baikal \(Friends & Partners\)](#)
2. [Baikal, the Pearl of Siberia \(Official Site of the Russian National Tourist Office\)](#)
3. [Greenpeace Russia](#)
4. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](#)
5. [Natural Heritage Protection Fund](#)

#### Comment

<http://www.nhpfund.org/>

### 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

Situated in south-east Siberia, the Lake Baikal is the oldest (25 million years) and deepest (1,700 m) lake in the world. It contains 20% of the world's total freshwater reserve. Known as the "Galapagos of Russia", its age and isolation have produced one of the world's richest and most unusual freshwater ecosystem, which is of exceptional value to evolutionary science.

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

(vii)(viii)(ix)(x)

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

The Lake Baikal as the most outstanding example of a freshwater ecosystem on the basis of natural criteria (vii), (viii), (ix) and (x). It is the oldest and deepest of the world's lakes containing nearly 20% of the world's freshwater reserve. The lake contains an outstanding variety of endemic flora and fauna, which is of exceptional value to evolutionary science. It is also surrounded by a system of protected areas that have high scenic and other natural values.

### 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>							
3.1.1	Housing							
3.1.2	Commercial development							
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure							
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities							
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>							
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure							
3.2.2	Air transport infrastructure							
3.2.3	Marine transport infrastructure							
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure							
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>							
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities							
3.3.4	Localised utilities							
3.3.5	Major linear utilities							
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>							
3.4.3	Surface water pollution							
3.4.4	Air pollution							
3.4.5	Solid waste							
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>							
3.5.1	Fishing/collecting aquatic resources							
3.5.2	Aquaculture							
3.5.6	Commercial wild plant collection							
3.5.7	Subsistence wild plant collection							
3.5.9	Subsistence hunting							
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production							
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Physical resource extraction</b>							
3.6.2	Quarrying							
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>							
3.7.1	Wind							
3.7.3	Temperature							
3.7.5	Dust							
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>							
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses							
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage							
3.8.3	Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting							
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system							
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community							
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation							
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Other human activities</b>							
3.9.1	Illegal activities							
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>							
3.10.1	Storms							
3.10.2	Flooding							

	Name	Impact				Origin	
3.10.3	Drought						
3.10.6	Temperature change						
3.10.7	Other climate change impacts						
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>						
3.11.2	Earthquake						
3.11.3	Tsunami/tidal wave						
3.11.4	Avalanche/ landslide						
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)						
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>						
3.12.1	Translocated species						
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species						
3.12.3	Invasive / alien freshwater species						
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>						
3.13.1	Low 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 Buildings and Development</b>						
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	medium capacity	static
<b>3.2 Transportation Infrastructure</b>						
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	restricted	frequent	minor	medium capacity	static
3.2.3	Marine transport infrastructure	restricted	frequent	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	increasing
<b>3.3 Services Infrastructures</b>						
3.3.4	Localised utilities	restricted	frequent	insignificant	high capacity	increasing
3.3.5	Major linear utilities	restricted	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	static
<b>3.4 Pollution</b>						
3.4.3	Surface water pollution	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.4.4	Air pollution	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.4.5	Solid waste	restricted	one off or rare	minor	high capacity	static
<b>3.5 Biological resource use/modification</b>						
3.5.1	Fishing/collecting aquatic resources	restricted	frequent	minor	medium capacity	static
3.5.7	Subsistence wild plant collection	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	high capacity	static
3.5.9	Subsistence hunting	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	high capacity	static
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production	restricted	one off or rare	minor	high capacity	static
<b>3.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>						
3.7.1	Wind	localised	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.7.3	Temperature	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
<b>3.8 Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>						
3.8.3	Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	high capacity	static
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	high capacity	increasing
<b>3.9 Other human activities</b>						
3.9.1	Illegal activities	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	high capacity	static

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.1	Storms	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.10.3	Drought	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)	restricted	one off or rare	minor	high capacity	static
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.1	Translocated species	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.12.3	Invasive / alien freshwater species	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	medium capacity	static

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

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

### 4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

#### 4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

#### 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 buffer zones of the World Heritage property **do not limit** the ability to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value **but they could be improved**

#### 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 buffer zones of the World Heritage property **are known** by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

#### 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)

Over 50 reserves and regional nature sanctuaries were created by the administrations of the constituents of the Russian Federation within the World Heritage property. The Federal Specially Protected Natural Areas (preserves, national parks, reserves) cover over 28% of the World Heritage property "Lake Baikal" and play vital role in the preservation of biodiversity and integrity of the property, as well as important economic, social and cultural roles. Native habitat, natural complexes and properties on the Specially Protected Natural Areas boast the highest degree of conservation, while populations of flora and fauna enjoy the maximal stability. In pursuance of art. 15 «Federal Authorities and Protection of Lake Baikal» of the Federal Law dated August 22, 2004, №122-FZ «On Amendments to the Legislative Acts of the

Russian Federation and Invalidation of Some Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation in Connection With the Adoption of Federal Laws «On Amendments to the Federal Law «On General Concepts of Legislative (Representative) and Executive State Bodies of the Constituents of the Russian Federation» and «On General Concepts of Local Government in the Russian Federation», as well as art. 15 of the Federal Law «On the Protection of Lake Baikal» regarding the formation of a coordinating body for concerted actions of concerned executive authorities in the protection of Lake Baikal, it is planned to create a Government Commission on Lake Baikal.

The federal law 'On the protection of Baikal Lake' is the most important legal document in regulating the economic activity and management on the Baikal natural territory and the property.

The laws of Buryat Republic 210-1 'On tourism' and the resolution dated 23.10.2006, and No. 340 'On approval of the republican purpose-oriented program "Tourism development in Buryat Republic during 2007-2010"' were amended in 2008. In addition, the resolution No. 474 'On registration of travel entities in the territory of Buryat Republic' was enacted. Tourism was declared one of the strategic directions of social and economic development of the republic by law No. 2595-III of 09.11.2007 "On social and economic development program of the republic during 2008-2010 and for the period till 2017 year".

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

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

Submitted on Saturday, December 17, 2005

##### • Question 6.02

the Federal Law «On the Protection of Lake Baikal» №94-FZ of 01.05.1999 was adopted; with Amendments set out by Federal Laws №150-FZ of 27.12.2000, №194-FZ of 30.12.2001, №176-FZ of 24.12.2000, №186-FZ of 23.12.2003.

The Federal Law «On the Protection of Lake Baikal» provides:

- Creation of the Baikal Natural Area (BNA) and its ecological zoning;
- Safety regulations of the BNA;
- Determination of normative standards for the maximum permissible detrimental effects on the unique ecological system of Lake Baikal;
- Governmental regulation in the field of the protection of Lake Baikal.

#### Comment

Correctly:"In pursuance of art. 120 of the Federal Law dated August 22, 2004, №122-FZ «On Amendments to the Legislative ..." Correctly: "...in the protection of Lake Baikal, it was formed a Interdepartmental Commission for the Protection of Lake Baikal (the Order of Ministry of Natural Resources of Russia dated April 25, 2007 № 114)."

#### 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?

An adequate legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are **some deficiencies in implementation**

#### 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?**

An adequate legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are **some deficiencies in implementation**

**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?**

An **adequate** legal framework exists for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, but **there are some deficiencies in its implementation** which undermine the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the property

**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**

The membership of the Interdepartmental Commission for the protection of Lake Baikal was approved in August 2007 and a Work Plan for 2007-2008 adopted. The Commission met in October 2007 to consider four main issues: (1) a draft amendment to conform all other legislative acts of the Russian Federation to "On the Protection of Lake Baikal"; (2) a draft federal target program "Protection of Lake Baikal and socio-economic development of the Baikal natural area," including tourism infrastructure development, and upgrading the monitoring system for Lake Baikal; (3) strengthened control over the Baikalsky Pulp and Paper Mill (BPPM); and (4) an environmental work plan for spatial planning and zoning of the central ecological zone.

The 'Travel Agency', an executive agency of governmental authorities, responsible for planning tourism development on the territory of the Burayt republic, was created under a governmental resolution dated 22.10.2007 No. 329.

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

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

Submitted on Saturday, December 17, 2005

- **Question 5.04** Plans in place to set up a "steering group: While no unified site "steering group" " of the World Heritage 8.8-million-ha property was created, there are agencies governing its separate areas. 1. Barguzinsky State Biosphere Preserve with the area of 374 322 ha. Established in 1916. Its functions are management of the preserve, protection of natural areas for the conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of the protected natural complexes and properties in their state of nature. 2. Baikalsky State Biosphere Preserve with the area of 65 724 ha. Established in 1969. Its functions are management of the preserve, protection of natural areas for the conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of the protected natural complexes and properties in their state of nature. 3. Baikalo-Lensky State Nature Preserve with the area of 660 000 ha.

Established in 1986. Its functions are management of the preserve, protection of natural areas for the conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of the protected natural complexes and properties in their state of nature. 4. Pribaikalsky National Park with the area of 418 000 ha. Established in 1986. Its functions are management of the national park, protection of natural areas for the conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of the protected natural complexes and properties in their state of nature. 5. Zabaikalsky National Park with the area of 246 000 ha. Established in 1986. Its functions are management of the national park, protection of natural areas for the conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of the protected natural complexes and properties in their state of nature. 6. Tunkinsky National Park with the area of 1 184 662 ha. Established in 1991. Its functions are management of the national park, protection of natural areas for the conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of the protected natural complexes and properties in their state of nature. 7. «Kabansky» Federal State Nature Reserve with the area of 12 100 ha. Established in 1974. Its functions are protection of natural areas for the conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of the protected natural complexes and properties in their state of nature. 8. «Frolikhinsky» Federal State Nature Reserve with the area of 109 200 ha. Established in 1988. Its functions are protection of natural areas for the conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of the protected natural complexes and properties in their state of nature. Over 50 reserves and regional nature sanctuaries were created by the administrations of the constituents of the Russian Federation within the World Heritage property. The Federal Specially Protected Natural Areas (preserves, national parks, reserves) cover over 28% of the World Heritage property "Lake Baikal" and play vital role in the preservation of biodiversity and integrity of the property, as well as important economic, social and cultural roles. Native habitat, natural complexes and properties on the Specially Protected Natural Areas boast the highest degree of conservation, while populations of flora and fauna enjoy the maximal stability. In pursuance of art. 15 «Federal Authorities and Protection of Lake Baikal» of the Federal Law dated August 22, 2004, №122-FZ «On Amendments to the Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation and Invalidation of Some Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation in Connection With the Adoption of Federal Laws «On Amendments to the Federal Law «On General Concepts of Legislative (Representative) and Executive State Bodies of the Constituents of the Russian Federation» and «On General Concepts of Local Government in the Russian Federation», as well as art. 15 of the Federal Law «On the Protection of Lake Baikal» regarding the formation of a coordinating body for concerted actions of concerned executive authorities in the protection of Lake Baikal, it is planned to create a Government Commission on Lake Baikal.

• **Question 5.05**

Overall management system of the site

- Management by the State Party
- Management under protective legislation
- Management under traditional protective measures or customary law

**Comment**

Wrong: "2. Baikalsky State Biosphere Preserve with the area of 65 724 ha." Correctly: "2. Baikalsky State Biosphere Reserve with the area of 165 724 ha." Correctly: "In pursuance of art. 120 of the Federal Law dated August 22, 2004, №122-FZ «On Amendments to the Legislative ...» Correctly: "...in the

protection of Lake Baikal, it was formed a Interdepartmental Commission for the Protection of Lake Baikal (the Order of Ministry of Natural Resources of Russia dated April 25, 2007 № 114)."

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

**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 coordination between the range of administrative bodies / levels involved in the management of the property **but it could be improved**

**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 **only partially** being implemented

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

An annual work / action plan exists and **many activities** are being implemented

**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	Non-existent
Landowners	Poor
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
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 have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in 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?**

Indigenous peoples have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role

**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 contact but only **some cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

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

**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**



It was organized Federal State Institution United Directorate «Barguzinsky State Biosphere Reserve and Zabaikalsky State Nature» (the Order of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation dated September 14, 2011 № 743) and Federal State Institution United Directorate «Baikalo-Lensky State Biosphere Reserve and Pribaikalsky State Nature Park» (the Order of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation dated July 18, 2013 № 251)

**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)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	76%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	2%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	22%

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

Title	Year	Amount	Link to source
Technical experts meeting for discussing conservation management issues in Lake Baikal region and preparing a nomination dossier for Lake Baikal	1990	15000.00	
Training Workshop for Russian and Trans-boundary World Natural Heritage Site Managers and Perspective Site Managers (4-10 July 1999, Lake Baikal, Russian Federation)	1998	48528.00	
<b>Total</b>		63528	

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

There is **no budget** for effective management of the World Heritage property despite an identified need

**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)?**

There is **some flow** of economic benefits to local communities

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

There are **some** adequate equipment and facilities, but deficiencies in at least one key area **constrain** management at the World Heritage property

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

There is **basic** maintenance of equipment and facilities

**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	100%
Part-time	0%

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

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	0%

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

Paid	95%
Volunteer	5%

**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	Fair
Promotion	Fair
Community outreach	Fair
Interpretation	Poor
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Fair
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	High
Promotion	High
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	High
Education	Medium
Visitor management	High
Conservation	Medium
Administration	High
Risk preparedness	High

Tourism	High
Enforcement (custodians, police)	High

**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 **partially implemented**; some technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally **but most of the technical work is carried out by external staff**

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

**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

**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**

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

**4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building**

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

In **many locations 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	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Poor
Local landowners	Poor
Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Excellent



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 been an **important influence** on education, information and awareness building activities

**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 adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

**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
Information booths	Poor
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Poor
Transportation facilities	Poor
Other	

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

**4.7. Visitor Management**

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

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

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

Entry tickets and registries
Accommodation establishments
Transportation services
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**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 managed but **improvements could be made**

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

There is **excellent co-operation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

**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, and makes **some 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**

**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 and key indicators have been defined but **monitoring the status of indicators could be improved**

**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	Poor
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Average
Industry	Poor
Local indigenous peoples	Poor

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

Implementation is **underway**

**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>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	Biodiversity	Observation and control	Measurement, checking and control	Periodically	Baikalsky Biosphere Reserve no
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	Biodiversity	Observation, control and fines	Regular visits for checking	regular	All Nature Reserves and National Parks of Baikal Lake territory no
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>					
3.3.4	Localised utilities	Biodiversity	Observation, control and fines	Regular visits for checking and control	Periodically	All Nature Reserves and National Parks of Baikal Lake territory no
3.3.5	Major linear utilities	Biodiversity	Observation and installing bird-protective structures on power lines	Regular visits for checking and control	Periodically	All Nature Reserves and National Parks of Baikal Lake territory no
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>					
3.5.1	Fishing/collecting aquatic resources	Biodiversity	Control over the special protection regime; fines.	Regular checking of the territory with help of volunteers, monitoring of social networks	Regular	All Nature Reserves and National Parks of Baikal Lake territory no
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>					
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	Biodiversity	Control over the special protection regime; fines.	Regular checking of the territory with help of volunteers, monitoring of social networks	Regular	All Nature Reserves and National Parks of Baikal Lake territory no

### 5.2. Summary - Management Needs

#### 5.2.1 - Summary - Management Needs

Answers provided have not outlined any serious management need.

### 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 has been **compromised** by factors described in this report

#### 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	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	No impact
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	Positive
Other (please specify)	Positive

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

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

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
Staff from other World Heritage properties
External experts

Advisory bodies
-----------------

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

no

#### 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	Fair
State Party Representative	Fair
Advisory Body	Fair

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

Most of the required information was accessible

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

The World Heritage Convention
The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

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

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Satisfactory

#### 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: Situated in south-east Siberia, the Lake Baikal is the oldest (25 million years) and deepest (1,700 m) lake in the world. It contains 20% of the world's total freshwater reserve. Known as the "Galapagos of Russia", its age and isolation have produced one of the world's richest and most unusual freshwater ecosystem, which is of exceptional value to evolutionary science.

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