

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Studenica Monastery

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Serbia

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

389


Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Studenica Monastery	43.486 / 20.537	1.16	269.34	270.5	1986
Total (ha)		1.16	269.34	270.5	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Studenica Monastery - inscribed property	03/12/2009	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

Comment

Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia, Radoslava Grujica 11, 11118 Belgrade, SERBIA

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Vladimir Dzamic
Institute for protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia
Art Historian / Conservator
Department for research, protection and documentation

Comment

Additional telephone number - cell: +381(0)628828122
Alternative e-mail: vdzamic@gmail.com

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

Comment

<http://www.manastirstudenica.rs/>

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

Comment

Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property
European Convention on Architectural Heritage
European Convention on Archaeological Heritage
European Landscape Convention

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Comment

Under evaluation of UNESCO's advisory bodies.
Retrospective statement of OUV delivered to UNESCO in January 2012.

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

(i)(ii)(iv)(vi)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

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

No need to be revised.

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

No comments, conclusions or recommendations.

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	
3.1	Buildings and Development							
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities							
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure							
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure							
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure							
3.3	Services Infrastructures							
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities							
3.3.4	Localised utilities							
3.5	Biological resource use/modification							
3.5.3	Land conversion							
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals							
3.5.5	Crop production							
3.5.7	Subsistence wild plant collection							
3.5.9	Subsistence hunting							
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production							
3.6	Physical resource extraction							
3.6.2	Quarrying							
3.6.4	Water (extraction)							
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric							
3.7.1	Wind							
3.7.2	Relative humidity							
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)							
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage							
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses							
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage							
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							
3.9	Other human activities							
3.9.1	Illegal activities							
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events							
3.10.1	Storms							
3.10.2	Flooding							
3.10.3	Drought							
3.10.6	Temperature change							
3.10.7	Other climate change impacts							
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events							
3.11.2	Earthquake							
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)							
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species							
3.12.1	Translocated species							
3.12.6	Modified genetic material							
3.13	Management and institutional factors							
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities							

Name		Impact		Origin	
3.13.3	Management activities				
Legend	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	
3.3	Services Infrastructures					
3.3.4	Localised utilities	restricted	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	static
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	widespread	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	extensive	frequent	minor	medium capacity	increasing

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

3.17.1 - Comments

It is impossible to have high capacity management response because the management of cultural properties is not clearly governed by legal ruling.

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 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 Spatial Plan for National Park Golija (MAB Biosphere Reserve) which encompasses the monastery of Studenica as well, is in its final phase
- Decision on the buffer zone and the protection of the natural setting of Studenica Monastery was legally adopted in 1988

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Monday, October 31, 2005

• Question 6.02

Decision on the buffer zone and the protection of the natural setting of Studenica Monastery was legally adopted in 1988.

Comment

The Spatial Plan for National Park Golija and Studenica Biosphere Reservation (MAB Biosphere Reserve) was adopted in 2009: official Gazette Republic of Serbia, No. 16/2009; Decision on the property boundaries and areas was adopted in 2009: 33th session of The World Heritage Committee, Seville, 2009, decision: 34 COM 8D

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

The term World Heritage property is not recognized by the applicable national law (Law of Cultural Heritage 1994).

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

Steering group: legally constituted (1991)

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Monday, October 31, 2005

• Question 5.02

Steering group or similar management committee has been set up to guide the management of the site

• Question 5.03

Set up date: 1991

Function: Its function was to obtain the best ways of managing and protection of the World Heritage site and its natural setting.

Mandate: 4 years

Constituted: legal

• **Question 5.04** Plans in place to set up a "steering group": The activities of the Board for Studenica Monastery were interrupted by the economic crisis and war in former Yugoslavia. No plan for re-establishment of this Board exist at the moment.

• **Question 5.05**

Overall management system of the site

- Management under protective legislation
- Management under traditional protective measures or customary law

Comment

The WH site management is the responsibility of the Serbian Orthodox Church and the Government of the Republic of Serbia through Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia. Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia is preparing Management plan for the property.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

There is no management plan for this property. The Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia is working on it, but there is lot of difficulties, the most important is that there is no support in the Law of Cultural Heritage that would help creating and implementing document.

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 a range of administrative bodies / levels involved in management but there is **little or no coordination** between them for managing different aspects of the property

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

No management system / plan is currently in place to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system **is not being implemented**

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

No annual work / action plan exists **despite an identified need**

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	Poor
Visitors	Poor
Researchers	Fair
Tourism industry	Poor

Industry	Non-existent
----------	--------------

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

It could use some help in the education of focal points, site managers and other experts involved in the development of the management plan by the UNESCO's WHC and advisory bodies.

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


There is no significant changes.

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)	100%
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.)	0%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	0%

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

Title	Year	Amount	Link to source
Expert mission to assess threats to Studenica Monastery	1988	2500.00	

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

Expert mission for the preservation of the marble façades of Studenica Monastery	1990	9000.00	
Purchase of a computer and photographic equipment for the restoration of murals at Studenica Monastery	1991	51000.00	
Total		62500	

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 **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	0%
Part-time	100%

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

Permanent	0%
Seasonal	100%

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?

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

Section II-Studenica Monastery

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

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 drafted or in place, but is **not being implemented**

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 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 **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	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Non-existent
Local landowners	Poor
Visitors	Poor
Tourism industry	Average
Local businesses and industries	Non-existent

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

There is **no education and awareness programme**, despite an identified need

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 **partially influenced** 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 **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	Not provided but needed
Site museum	Poor
Information booths	Poor
Guided tours	Poor
Trails / routes	Poor
Information materials	Poor
Transportation facilities	Adequate
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	Minor Increase

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

Accommodation establishments

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?

There is **some management** of the visitor use of the World Heritage property

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?

No fees are collected

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	Poor

Local communities	Not applicable
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Poor
Industry	Non-existent
Local indigenous peoples	Poor

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	
3.3	Services Infrastructures						
3.3.4	Localised utilities	No criteria and attributes are effected directly.	Constant monitoring and the cooperation between relevant agencies and the Company mobile (owner of cell tower).	There is constant monitoring and the relevant agencies do not allow object like that (cell towers) to be build in the buffer zone.	There is no time frame, when technical capabilities allow a signal to the mobile phone without the tower, it will be removed from the buffer zone.	The Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia. The Institute for Nature Conservation of Serbia.	There is one cell tower in the buffer zone, that provides signal for cell phones for whole area. It can't be dislocated because the whole area (larger than the buffer zone) should lose signal for mobile networks.
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	No criteria and attributes are effected directly.	Workshops with old skills and crafts focused on the local population. Publications and Web pages (applications) that encourage the ancient and natural ways of living and working in the countryside.	Provide constant monitoring of migration, changes in lifestyle and work.	3-5 years.	The Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia. The Serbian Orthodox Church (owner of the property).	There is significant migration of the local population. Modern life has crowded out the knowledge of traditional crafts, old ways of farming and even the old way of life.
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	No criteria and attributes are effected directly.	Relevant agency together with the owner should provide training for tourist guides, and affect the completion of facilities for visitors to print brochures and other content that explain the reasons why the property is inscribed on the WHL.	Provide constant monitoring of the number of visitors as well as on their behavior and interests during a visit.	2-3 years	The Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia. The Serbian Orthodox Church (owner of the property).	There is a significant increase in the number of visitors, but not content to visitors, as well as the lack of information on the monument as property inscribed on World Heritage List.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building						
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
4.6.3	There is no education and awareness programme	It is necessary to organize training for tourist guides and those who care for visitors at the Worl Heritage Site. It must be organized with co-operation with the owner of the property (The Serbian Orthodox Church).	1-2 years.	The Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia. The Serbian Orthodox Church (owner of the property).	Guides and those who care for visitors do not have adequate knowledge of the values that led to the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.	
4.6.4	World Heritage status has partially influenced education, information and awareness building activities	Special classes in which the students were be informed of the importance of property inscribed on theWorld Heritage List in their surroundings should be organized within the school hours in the local community, .	3-5 years.	The Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia.	World Heritage status is partially influenced education but it can be improved in cooperation with local school authorities.	
4.6.5	The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is not adequately presented and interpreted	It is necessary to provide better information for tourist guides and those who care for visitors at the World Heritage Site about OUV of the property through brochures and web applications.	2 years.	The Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia.	The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is presented fair but could be improved.	
4.7 Visitor Management						

4.7.4	Some management of visitor use of the property but this could be improved	Site museum should be expanded and enriched with new content (which exist in the property). It is necessary to provide audio guidance through site (especially because of the increasing number of foreign visitors).	2-3 years.	The Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia.	Facilities for visitor use of the property are fair but this could be improved, especially when it comes to the site museum and audio guidance through site.
4.7.5	Contact with the tourism industry is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters	Developing content that is not directly related to the monument, but that can contribute to the overall tourist offer of the site. This could lead to an increase in the time that visitors spend at the site.	4-6 years.	The Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia. National Tourism Organization of Serbia. The Serbian Orthodox Church (owner of the property).	There is good cooperation between owner, tourism companies and local authorities, but this could be improved, especially in the segment of time that visitors will spend at the site, which is relatively short.

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

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

Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff

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	Poor

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 concept of 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

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

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Unsatisfactory
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: Under evaluation of UNESCO's advisory bodies. Retrospective statement of OUV delivered to UNESCO in janary 2012.

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