

**1. World Heritage Property Data**

**1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property**

Natural System of Wrangel Island Reserve

**1.2 - World Heritage Property Details**

Russian Federation Europe and North American natural Marine & coastal 1023rev2004

**1.3 - Geographic Information Table**

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Natural System of Wrangel Island Reserve	71.189 / -179.715	916300	3745300	4661600	2004
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>916300</b>	<b>3745300</b>	<b>4661600</b>	

**Comment**

Total 2225650 hectares. It includes land mass is 795650 hectares (794520 hectares - about. Wrangel 1130 hectares - about. Herald) and 1430000 hectares - sea area. Russian Federation Buffer zone 3435950

**1.4 - Map(s)**

Title	Date	Link to source
Site Map - Natural System of Wrangel Island Reserve	01/01/2004	

**Comment**

No boundaries of the buffer zone

**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**

- Alexasandr Gruzdev  
GPZ "Wrangel Island" Natural State Reserve

**Comment**

Federal State Budget Institution "State Nature Reserve "Wrangel Island" Alexander Gruzdev, Telephone: 89246671429, 89265335356 Email: gruzdevar@mail.ru

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

1. [Natural Heritage Protection Fund](http://www.nhpfund.org)
2. [unep-wcmc.org](http://unep-wcmc.org)

**Comment**

<http://eng.ostrovwrangelya.org> <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**

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

(ix)(x)

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

CURONIAN SPIT WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTY  
RETROSPECTIVE STATEMENT OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE  
Element of Statement of OUV  
Retrospective (2000) SoOUV a. Brief synthesis i) Summary of factual information ii) Summary of qualities (values, attributes)  
There has been human occupation on this elongated peninsula of sand dunes, 98km long and 0.4-3.8km wide, since prehistoric times. Throughout this period it has been menaced by natural forces of wind and tide. Its survival to the present day has been made possible only as a result of ceaseless human efforts to combat the erosion of the Spit, which are dramatically illustrated by continuing stabilization and afforestation projects. The Spit retains the following outstanding items of cultural heritage: - Fishing settlements, where the works of man and nature are of outstanding universal value from the ethno-cultural, historical, and aesthetic points of view; - Architectural works that are unique in scale and which are of outstanding value from the historical, artistic, and scientific points of view; - Archaeological sites, most notably buried villages. The special significance of the Curonian Spit is expressed through the vivid combination of its natural and its cultural heritage. The latter relates not simply to material and spiritual aspects, but also to the experience accumulated by generations of local inhabitants, which has permitted the rehabilitation of natural systems of the Spit that had been lost. The landscape of the Curonian Spit appears as an excellent picture illustrating examples of harmonious interaction between men of the present generations and their natural environment. b. Criterion V (values and the attributes which manifest the values) The Curonian Spit is an outstanding example of a landscape of sand dunes that is under constant threat from natural forces (wind and tide). After disastrous human interventions that menaced its survival the Spit was reclaimed by massive protection and stabilization works begun in the 19th century and still continuing to the present day. c. Integrity at the time of inscription The Curonian Spit represents a united natural complex, which main components (forested and migrating dunes, plain and marshy forests, sea coasts) are uninterruptedly connected with each other due to their common origin, history and dynamics of their natural development. The whole complex of the interconnected natural elements of a spit and the whole landscape profile from the Baltic Sea shore to the shallow waters of the Curonian Lagoon, as well as adjoined water areas, is preserved in the Curonian Spit (Lithuania) and Kurshskaya Kosa (Russian Federation) National Parks and its buffer zone. Curonian Spit with its relatively small area can ensure the conservation and further natural development of a representative complex of landscapes that characterizes all the spits as well as all the Baltic Sea coasts. The boundaries of the National Parks are entirely coincident with the natural limits of the spit ecosystems. The latter circumstance along with presence of water body around it allows for legal integrity

of the Curonian Spit and preservation of its natural and cultural valuable objects. d. Authenticity at the time of inscription In landscape terms, the Curonian Spit has high value. It is an example of a special landform that is subject to changes owing to natural phenomena resulting from climate variations and from human interventions. The latter have been both catastrophic, as in the case of the drastic deforestation in the 16th century, and beneficial, as demonstrated by the creation of artificial barriers in the 19th century against further incursions by the sea. It is undoubtedly a continuing organic landscape, as defined in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. e. Management and protection requirements necessary to maintain Outstanding Universal Value i) Overall framework ii) Specific long-term expectations Both National Parks are state property. The Lithuanian Park is managed by its own administration, which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Forest and Protected Areas of the Ministry of Environment. There is a territorial management plan for the Curonian Spit covering the period to 2005, approved in 1994 by the Lithuanian Government. This forms the basis for a series of detailed plans relating to forestry management, recreational development, settlement improvement, and infrastructure development. The specific management plan for the "Kuršių Nerija" National Park includes provisions for the protection, rational use, and restoration of the cultural heritage and landscape and for ensuring the continuity of architectural traditions in developing settlements. Management of the Russian Park takes place at two levels. Overall responsibility is with the Federal Forestry Service, which works through the Forest Administration of the Kaliningrad Region. The General Development Plan of the "Kurshskaya Kosa" National Park of 1989 sets out measures for conservation, control, and use of the Park, as well as scientific research projects. Both Parks have clearly defined zones. The zoning categories are: Strict Nature Reserves; Limited access zones; Recreation zones; Settlements; Agricultural zones. For effective management of the outstanding universal value more close collaboration of all stakeholders in the States Parties is needed as well as between States Parties. To ensure conservation of the outstanding universal value, elaboration of a coordinated management mechanism is necessary.

**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>							
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure							
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities							
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>							
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities							
3.3.3	Non-renewable energy facilities							
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>							
3.4.5	Solid waste							
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>							
3.7.1	Wind							
3.7.2	Relative humidity							
3.7.3	Temperature							
3.7.4	Radiation/light							
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)							
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>							
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage							
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation							
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>							
3.10.1	Storms							
3.10.5	Changes to oceanic waters							
3.10.6	Temperature change							
3.10.7	Other climate change impacts							
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>							
3.11.5	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>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>				
3.3.3	<b>Non-renewable energy facilities</b>				
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>				
3.4.5	<b>Solid waste</b>				
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>				
3.7.1	<b>Wind</b>				
3.7.2	<b>Relative humidity</b>				
3.7.3	<b>Temperature</b>				
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>				
3.11.5	<b>Erosion and siltation/ deposition</b>				

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

#### 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 **are adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

#### 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)

The nominated site is federal property under the Ministry of Natural Resources. Under the Russian system of protected areas, the nominated site, including its terrestrial and marine component, is classified as a "Zapovednik" (IUCN Category Ia, Strict Nature Reserve). This accords it the highest level of protection and excludes practically all human activity other than for scientific purposes. The Zapovednik was established in 1976 as the Wrangel Island State Sanctuary by the State Planning Department of the USSR. At that time all buildings, structures and the reindeer herd were transferred from the Zapovednik by the Ministry of Agriculture. To provide better protection for marine mammals, and following a joint proposal by the Governor of the Chukot Autonomous Region and the State Committee for the Environment, the Reserve was

extended to the Territorial Sea (out to the 12 nautical mile limit) in 1997 by federal Decree. In 1999, the Government of the Chukot Autonomous Region recommended a further 24 nautical mile extension to the marine component of the reserve; however this proposal has not been approved at the Federal level.

#### 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

In July, 1997, the State Committee for Environmental Protection for the Government of the Russian Federation entered into an Agreement on protected areas with the Administration of the Chukot Autonomous Area (CAA). This delegated much of the authority for the administration of protected areas (including the Wrangel State Nature Reserve) to the CAA. In accordance with that agreement, the CAA is responsible for day-to-day operations of the nominated site, administration of non-Reserve territory, participation in the selection of the Reserve

Director, protection of the marine area and enforcement of the marine regulations.

**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 **fully 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	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities	Poor
Indigenous peoples	Poor
Landowners	Not applicable
Visitors	Fair
Researchers	Fair
Tourism industry	Fair
Industry	Not applicable

**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?**

**No local communities** are resident in or living near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone

**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 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**

**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)	1%
Governmental (National / Federal)	93%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	3%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	2%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	1%

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

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

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

**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 some **ad hoc** 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	99%
-----------	-----

Part-time	1%
-----------	----

**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	100%
Volunteer	0%

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

Human resources are **inadequate** for management needs

**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
Promotion	Poor
Community outreach	Fair
Interpretation	Non-existent
Education	Non-existent
Visitor management	Fair
Conservation	Fair
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Poor
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	High
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	High
Education	High
Visitor management	Medium
Conservation	Medium
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Medium
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 **considerable** research but it is **not directed** towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

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

Research results are **shared widely** with the local, national and international audiences

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

**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 and effective** education and awareness programme that contributes to the protection of the World Heritage property

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

**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	Major Increase (100%+)
Two years ago	Decreasing
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Decreasing
Five years ago	Minor Increase

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

Other
-------

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**Comment**

Regulation receiving cruise ships Rules of conduct on the territory zповednoy Program Spent environmental routes

**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 considerable monitoring but it is **not directed towards 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	Not applicable
Local communities	Not applicable
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Poor
Industry	Non-existent
Local indigenous peoples	Non-existent

**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**

No factor is both current and negative.

### **5.2. Summary - Management Needs**

#### **5.2.2 - 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 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 **maintained**.

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

Other important cultural and / or natural values are being **partially degraded** but the state of conservation of the World Heritage property has not been significantly impacted

**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)	

**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
Non Governmental Organization

**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 property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
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	None

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

- **Geographic Information Table**  
Reason for update: Total 2225650 hectares. It includes land mass is 795650 hectares (794520 hectares - about. Wrangel 1130 hectares - about. Herald) and 1430000 hectares - sea area. Russian Federation Buffer zone 3435950
- **Map(s)**  
Reason for update: No boundaries of the buffer zone

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