

## 1. World Heritage Property Data

### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Göreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia

### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

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

- Turkey

#### Type of Property

mixte

#### Identification Number

357

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

1985








### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
Göreme National Park , Turkey	38.667 / 34.85	9572	?	9572	1985
Karain site , Turkey	38.595 / 34.999	0.77	?	0.77	1985
Karlık site , Turkey	38.574 / 34.998	0.51	?	0.51	1985
Yeşilöz site , Turkey	38.554 / 35.004	0.58	?	0.58	1985
Soganli site , Turkey	38.411 / 34.904	309	?	309	1985
Subterranean city of Kaymakli , Turkey	38.469 / 34.78	0.7	?	0.7	1985
Subterranean city of Derinkuyu , Turkey	38.406 / 34.758	0.25	?	0.25	1985
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>9883.81</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9883.81</b>	

#### Comment

WHC Decision of 36.COM.8D on clarification of boundaries of "Göreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia" has not been linked into the web page of the property.

### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Goreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia. Map showing Goreme National Park	05/12/2011	
Goreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia. Map showing Karain site	05/12/2011	
Goreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia. Map showing Karlık site	05/12/2011	
Goreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia. Map showing Yesiloz site	05/12/2011	
Goreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia. Map showing Soganli site	05/12/2011	
Goreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia. Map showing the subterranean city of Kaymakli	05/12/2011	
Goreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia. Map showing the subterranean city of Derinkuyu	05/12/2011	

### 1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

#### Comment

Ministry of Culture and Tourism (General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums, General Directorate of Investment and Establishments) Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs (General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks) Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation (General Directorate of Conservation of Natural Heritage)

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

- Evrim Ulsan  
Ministry of Culture and Tourism / General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums  
Specialist, Urban Planner, M. Sc.

#### Comment

Evrım Ulsan Specialist, Urban Planner, M. Sc. Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü II.TBMM Ulus 06100 Ankara Turkey Telephone: +90 312 508 61 94 Fax: +90 312 508 61 15 Email: evrim.ulsan@kulturturizm.gov.tr

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

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
2. [Göreme](#)
3. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](#)
4. [Turkey on the World Heritage List](#)

#### Comment

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/357>  
<http://www.kvmgm.gov.tr/TR,44433/goreme-millli-parki-ve-kapadokya-nevsehir.html> <http://www.muze.gov.tr/museums>

### 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

#### Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

##### Brief synthesis

Located on the central Anatolia plateau within a volcanic landscape sculpted by erosion to form a succession of mountain ridges, valleys and pinnacles known as "fairy chimneys" or hoodoos, Göreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia cover the region between the cities of Nevşehir, Ürgüp and Avanos, the sites of Karain, Karlık, Yeşilöz, Soğanlı and the subterranean cities of Kaymaklı and Derinkuyu. The area is bounded on the south and east by ranges of extinct volcanoes with Erciyes Dağ (3916 m) at one end and Hasan Dağ (3253 m) at the other. The density of its rock-hewn cells, churches, troglodyte villages and subterranean cities within the rock formations make it one of the world's most striking and largest cave-dwelling complexes. Though interesting from a geological and ethnological point of view, the incomparable beauty of the decor of the Christian sanctuaries makes Cappadocia one of the leading examples of the post-iconoclastic Byzantine art period. It is believed that the first signs of monastic activity in Cappadocia date back to the 4th century at which time small

anchorite communities, acting on the teachings of Basileios the Great, Bishop of Kayseri, began inhabiting cells hewn in the rock. In later periods, in order to resist Arab invasions, they began banding together into troglodyte villages or subterranean towns such as Kaymaklı or Derinkuyu which served as places of refuge.

Cappadocian monasticism was already well established in the iconoclastic period (725-842) as illustrated by the decoration of many sanctuaries which kept a strict minimum of symbols (most often sculpted or tempera painted crosses). However, after 842 many rupestral churches were dug in Cappadocia and richly decorated with brightly coloured figurative painting. Those in the Göreme Valley include Tokalı Kilise and El Nazar Kilise (10th century), St. Barbara Kilise and Saklı Kilise (11th century) and Elmalı Kilise and Karanlık Kilise (end of the 12th – beginning of the 13th century).

**Criterion (i):** Owing to their quality and density, the rupestral sanctuaries of Cappadocia constitute a unique artistic achievement offering irreplaceable testimony to the post-iconoclastic Byzantine art period.

**Criterion (iii):** The rupestral dwellings, villages, convents and churches retain the fossilized image of a province of the Byzantine Empire between the 4th century and the arrival of the Seljuk Turks (1071). Thus, they are the essential vestiges of a civilization which has disappeared.

**Criterion (v):** Cappadocia is an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement which has become vulnerable under the combined effects of natural erosion and, more recently, tourism.

**Criterion (vii):** In a spectacular landscape dramatically demonstrating erosional forces, the Göreme Valley and its surroundings provide a globally renowned and accessible display of hoodoo landforms and other erosional features, which are of great beauty, and which interact with the cultural elements of the landscape.

#### **Integrity**

Göreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia, having been extensively used and modified by man for centuries, is a landscape of harmony combining human interaction and settlement with dramatic natural landforms. There has been some earthquake damage to some of the cones and the pillars, but this is seen as a naturally occurring phenomenon. Overuse by tourists and some vandalism have been reported and some incompatible structures have been introduced.

The erosional processes that formed the distinctive conical rock structures will continue to create new fairy chimneys and rock pillars, however due to the rate of this process, the natural values of the property may still be threatened by unsustainable use. The cultural features, including rock-hewn churches and related cultural structures, mainly at risk of being undermined by erosion and other negative natural processes coupled with mass tourism and development pressures, can never be replaced. Some of the churches mentioned by early scholars such as C. Texier, H.G. Rott and Guillaume de Jerphanion are no longer extant.

#### **Authenticity**

The property meets the conditions of authenticity as its values and their attributes, including its historical setting, form, design, material and workmanship adequately reflect the cultural and natural values recognized in the inscription criteria.

Given the technical difficulties of building in this region, where it is a matter of hewing out structures within the natural rock, creating architecture by the removal of material rather than by putting it together to form the elements of a building, the underlying morphological structure and the difficulties inherent

in the handling of the material inhibited the creative impulses of the builders. This conditioning of human effort by natural conditions persisted almost unchanged through successive periods and civilizations, influencing the cultural attitudes and technical skills of each succeeding generation.

#### **Protection and management requirements**

The World Heritage property Göreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia is subject to legal protection in accordance with both the Protection of Cultural and Natural Resources Act No. 2863 and the National Parks Act No. 2873. The entire territory between the cities of Nevşehir, Ürgüp and Avanos is designated as a National Park under the Act No. 2873. In addition, natural, archaeological, urban, and mixed archaeological and natural conservation areas, two underground towns, five troglodyte villages, and more than 200 individual rock-hewn churches, some of which contain numerous frescoes, have been entered into the register of immovable monuments and sites according to the Act No. 2863.

Legal protection, management and monitoring of the Göreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia fall within the scope of national and regional governmental administrations. The Nevşehir and Kayseri Regional Conservation Councils are responsible for keeping the register of monuments and sites, including carrying out all tasks related to the legal protection of monuments and listed buildings and the approval to carry out any restoration-related works. They also evaluate regional and conservation area plans prepared by the responsible national and/or local (i.e. municipal) authorities. Studies for revision and updating of the existing land use and conservation plan (Göreme National Park Long-term Development Plan) of 1981 were completed in 2003. The major planning decisions proposed were that natural conservation areas are to be protected as they were declared in 1976. Minor adjustments in the peripheral areas of settlements and spatial developments of towns located in the natural conservation sites including Göreme, Ortahisar, Çavuşin, Ürgüp and Mustafapaşa will be strictly controlled. In other words, the Plan proposes to confine the physical growth of these towns to recently established zones. Hotel developments will take into account the set limits for room capacities. Furthermore, the plan also suggested that local authorities should be advised to review land use decisions for areas that have been reserved for tourism developments in the town plans.

Preparation of conservation area plans for the urban and/or mixed urban-archaeological conservation sites within the historic sections of Göreme are in place and provide zoning criteria and the rules and guidelines to be used in the maintenance and restoration of listed buildings and other buildings which are not registered, but which are located within the historic zones. Similar planning studies for the towns of Ortahisar and Uçhisar are in place. Once finalised, a conservation area plan for the urban conservation area in Ürgüp will be in place. All relevant plans are kept up to date on a continuing basis.

Appropriate facilities aimed at improving the understanding of the World Heritage property have been completed for the subterranean towns of Kaymaklı and Derinkuyu, and are required for Göreme and Paşabağı.

Monuments in danger due to erosion, including the El Nazar, Elmalı, and Meryemana (Virgin Mary) churches, have been listed as monuments requiring priority action. Specific measures for their protection, restoration and maintenance are required at the site level.

While conservation plans and protection measures are in place for individual sites, it is recognised by the principal

parties responsible for site management that an integrated Regional Plan for the Cappadocia Cultural and Tourism Conservation and Development Area is required to protect the World Heritage values of the property. Adequate financial, political and technical support is also required to secure the management of the property.

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

(i)(iii)(v)(vii)

**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**

**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							
3.1.4	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							
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure							
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>							
3.3.1	Water infrastructure							
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							
3.4.5	Solid waste							
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>							
3.5.3	Land conversion							
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals							
3.5.5	Crop production							
<b>3.6</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							
3.8.4	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>							
3.10.3	Drought							
3.10.4	Desertification							
3.10.6	Temperature change							
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>							
3.11.4	Avalanche/ landslide							
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							

Name	Impact	Origin
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>					
3.1.1 Housing	localised	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities	localised	on-going	significant	low capacity	static
<b>3.2 Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
3.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure	localised	on-going	catastrophic	low capacity	increasing
3.2.4 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	localised	on-going	catastrophic	low capacity	increasing
<b>3.3 Services Infrastructures</b>					
3.3.2 Renewable energy facilities	localised	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.3.4 Localised utilities	localised	on-going	minor	low capacity	static
<b>3.4 Pollution</b>					
3.4.3 Surface water pollution	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.4.5 Solid waste	restricted	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
<b>3.5 Biological resource use/modification</b>					
3.5.3 Land conversion	restricted	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.5.5 Crop production	restricted	on-going	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
<b>3.6 Physical resource extraction</b>					
3.6.2 Quarrying	restricted	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	static
<b>3.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>					
3.7.3 Temperature	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.7.5 Dust	widespread	on-going	significant	no capacity and / or resources	static
<b>3.8 Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>					
3.8.2 Society's valuing of heritage	widespread	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.8.4 Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.8.5 Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.8.6 Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
<b>3.9 Other human activities</b>					
3.9.1 Illegal activities	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
<b>3.10 Climate change and severe weather events</b>					
3.10.3 Drought	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.10.4 Desertification	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.10.6 Temperature change	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
<b>3.11 Sudden ecological or geological events</b>					
3.11.4 Avalanche/ landslide	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.11.5 Erosion and siltation/ deposition	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
<b>3.13 Management and institutional factors</b>					
3.13.3 Management activities	widespread	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

3.2. Quality of the products, services and architectural structures of trade facilities within the site is low. 3.1.4 Horse riding, baloon and cycling have positive effects while "atv" use has negative. Factors which are crucial for reformation of natural structures (temperature, erosion, avalanche, dust etc) are sometimes the obstacles for implementation of conservation projects.

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

### 4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

#### 4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is no buffer zone, but there is a need for one

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

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

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by the management authority but **are not known by local residents / communities / landowners.**

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

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

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

Extension for the world heritage boundaries will be considered in future in order for inclusion the sites which are indispensable components within the property's historical development. Additionally, in depth surveys for clarification underground city boundaries are needed.

## 4.2. Protective Measures

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

In 1976 a defined area within the Cappadocia region became "a site to be conserved" by a special preservation law.

In 1986 a Historical and National Park was defined in the region, until in 2004, a new boundary for the Cultural and Tourism Conservation and Development Area was determined.

All these areas are subject to their own legislations within their own boundaries.

Protection arrangements are considered sufficiently effective. In 2006, Conservation, implementation and monitoring units were to be established within the local authorities in accordance with the revised conservation legislation.

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

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

Submitted on Thursday, November 24, 2005

##### • Question 6.02

- in 1976 by a special preservation law, a defined area within the Cappadocia region became "a site to be conserved",
  - in 1986 a Historical and National park was defined in the region,
  - in 2004 a new boundary for the Cultural and Tourism Conservation and Development area was determined.
- All these areas are subject to their own legislations within their own boundaries.

#### Comment

-The site has been conserved by the Conservation Act since 1976 and many areas are designated as "sites to be conserved" considering their archaeological, natural and urban characteristics. - In 1986 a Historical National Park was defined for Göreme, - In 2004 a new boundary for the Cultural and Tourism Conservation and Development area was determined within Göreme site. All these areas are subject to their own legislations within their own boundaries.

#### 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?

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

#### 4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

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 are **major deficiencies** in capacity/resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property



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

Each conservation status within the site brings different provisions for its utilization which may obstruct the management of the site. Current national designation status do not actually correspond the unique values of Cappadocia; therefore, a new site-specific conservation term is needed.

**4.3. Management System / Management Plan**

**4.3.1 - Management System**

No management plan has been submitted yet and no on-site manager/coordinator appointed. A Steering Group was mentioned in 2006, but the WHC has not been informed of its creation yet. Its creation was to go hand in hand with the establishment of a Management Plan. New long term city and regional plans are being made by various national bodies; all plans prepared by the municipalities in the eleven towns of the heritage site have to be integrated. The current management system is not considered sufficiently effective.

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

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

Submitted on Thursday, November 24, 2005







• **Question 5.04** Plans in place to set up a "steering group":  
The set up of a steering group will be considered during the preparation stage of the management plan.

• **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
- Consensual management

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
The International Campaign to safeguard the Sites and monuments of Istanbul and Goreme. Final Report, ca 1984	N/A	Available	01/00/1984	
Draft Outlines of a National Plan for Promotion and Financing within the Framework of the international Campaign (International Campaign to Safeguard the historic Quarters and Monuments of Istanbul and the Site of Goreme)	N/A	Available	01/00/1985	
Göreme project: UNESCO / Istanbul - Göreme Campaign	N/A	Available	01/00/1987	
The International Campaign to Safeguard the Sites and Monuments of Istanbul and Goreme. Final Report. Working group	N/A	Available	01/01/1984	
The International Campaign to Safeguard the Historic Quarters and Monuments of Istanbul and the site of Goreme. Draft Outlines of a National Plan for promotion and financing within the framework of the international Campaign	N/A	Available	01/01/1985	
Goreme Project. UNESCO / Istanbul - Goreme Campaign	N/A	Available	01/01/1987	

**Comment**

An overall management plan does not exist.

**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?**

**No management system** is currently in place

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

**No annual work / action plan** exists

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

Local communities / residents	Good
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Poor
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
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?**

Local communities have **no input** into decisions relating to the management

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

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

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

There is **little or no contact** 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**



Long Term Development Plan for Göreme National Park was approved on the 8th of March, 2013. - Long Term Development Plan for Göreme National Park prepared by the Ministry of Forestry and Water Affairs was approved in the 8th of March, 2013. - Conservation Plans for historical sites within the National Park have been approved since the last PR respectively: Sulusaray - 12/12/2007 Mustafapaşa - 25/09/2008 Avanos - 28/06/2012 Plan studies for Ürgüp, Göreme, Ortahisar and Uçhisar conservation sites

**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)	70%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	10%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	20%
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
Financial contribution for the monitoring of the site of Göreme	1992	1200.00	
Financial assistance for the organization of an international seminar to discuss the problems of site management of Göreme	1992	20000.00	
<b>Total</b>		21200	

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

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

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

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

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

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 **adequate** equipment and facilities

**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	60%
Seasonal	40%

**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	Fair
Promotion	Fair
Community outreach	Not applicable
Interpretation	Poor
Education	Poor
Visitor management	Poor
Conservation	Fair
Administration	Poor
Risk preparedness	Non-existent
Tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

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

Research and monitoring	Medium
Promotion	Medium
Community outreach	Not applicable
Interpretation	Low
Education	High
Visitor management	Low
Conservation	High
Administration	High
Risk preparedness	Not available
Tourism	High
Enforcement (custodians, police)	High



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

No capacity development plan or programme is in place; management is implemented by external staff and skills are not transferred

**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**

Research results are presented at national and international scale but not shared within local scale.

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

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

There is 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 not influenced education, information or 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	Adequate
Information booths	Not provided but needed
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Excellent
Transportation facilities	Not needed
Other	Not needed

**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?**

Entry tickets and registries
Accommodation establishments
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 not being actively managed despite an identified need

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

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

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

The fee is collected, 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 **small amount** of monitoring, but it is not planned

**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 to define key indicators, **but this has not been done**

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

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Average
Local / Municipal authorities	Poor
Local communities	Non-existent
Researchers	Poor
NGOs	Non-existent
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

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

**No relevant** Committee recommendations to implement

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

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

**4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs**

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

Please refer to question 5.2

## 5. Summary and Conclusions

### 5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

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

	World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>						
<b>3.2.1</b>	<b>Ground transport infrastructure</b>	i, iii, v, vii	Closing the roads within the national park for the motor vehicle transportation if transportation would be possible by alternative roads, not enlarging the current roads and not opening the new roads	Nevşehir Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural Heritage	Long term	Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs (Gen. Direc. of Nature Conservation and National Parks) Ministry of Culture and Tourism (Gen. Direc. of Cultural Heritage and Museums, Gen. Direc. of Investment and Establishments)	-
<b>3.2.4</b>	<b>Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure</b>	i, iii, v, vii	Closing the Göreme-Ortahisar road and the part of the Ürgüp-Avanos road passing through the Dervent Valley for motor vehicle transportation	Nevşehir Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural Heritage	Lon term	Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs (Gen. Direc. of Nature Conservation and National Parks) Ministry of Culture and Tourism (Gen. Direc. of Cultural Heritage and Museums, Gen. Direc. of Investment and Establishments)	By this way, negative effects arising from vibration would be removed and physical integrity of the site would be ensured.
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>						
<b>3.7.5</b>	<b>Dust</b>	i, vii	Prohibiting all kind of vehicle transportation within valleys	Nevşehir Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural Heritage	Long term	Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs (Gen. Direc. of Nature Conservation and National Parks) Ministry of Culture and Tourism (Gen. Direc. of Cultural Heritage and Museums, Gen. Direc. of Investment and Establishments)	Vehicle transportation within valleys are already forbidden and only pathways are allowed by the Long Term Development Plan.
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>						
<b>3.8.4</b>	<b>Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system</b>	i, iii, v, vii	Taking necessary precautions for managing changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system in case they affect the conservation of the site and social and economic life of the local community.	Monitoring will be systemized in the context of monitoring mechanism which will be formulized during management planning process.	Long term	Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs (Gen. Direc. of Nature Conservation and National Parks) Ministry of Culture and Tourism (Gen. Direc. of Cultural Heritage and Museums, Gen. Direc. of Investment and Establishments) Related municipalities	This issue will be studied in detail during management planning process.
<b>3.8.5</b>	<b>Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community</b>	i, iii, v, vii	Taking necessary precautions for managing changes in local population in case they adversely affect the conservation of the site and social and economic life of the local community.	Monitoring will be systemized in the context of monitoring mechanism which will be formulized during management planning process.	Long term	Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs (Gen. Direc. of Nature Conservation and National Parks) Ministry of Culture and Tourism (Gen. Direc. of Cultural Heritage and Museums, Gen. Direc. of Investment and Establishments) Related municipalities	This issue will be studied in detail during management planning process.
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>						

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.10.3	Drought	i, iii, v, vii	Taking necessary precautions against drought which may adversely affect the conservation of the site and social and economic life of the local community.	Monitoring will be systemized in the context of monitoring mechanism which will be formalized during management planning process.	Long term	Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs (Gen. Direc. of Nature Conservation and National Parks) Ministry of Culture and Tourism (Gen. Direc. of Cultural Heritage and Museums, Gen. Direc. of Investment and Establishments)	This issue will be studied in detail during management planning process.

## 5.2. Summary - Management Needs

### 5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones							
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.1.4	The boundaries of the World Heritage property are not known by local residents / communities / landowners	Placing signboard in the site entrances Placing informative and routing signboards inside and outside of the site Pronouncing WHS in printed and mass media frequently	Ongoing	Ministry of Forest and Water Affairs (Gen. Direc. of Nature Conservation and National Parks) Ministry of Culture and Tourism (Gen. Direc. of Cultural Heritage and Museums, Gen. Direc. of Investment and Establishments)	.		
4.3 Management System / Management Plan							
4.3.3	Little or no coordination between administrative bodies	Establishing a council constituted by related central and local authority representatives	Short term	Min. of Forest and Water Affairs Min. of Culture and Tourism Min. of Environment and Urbanisation Related local governmental institutions	This council may take healthy and quick decisions and resolve lack of coordination among authorities.		
4.3.4	No management system / plan is currently in place	Preparation, approval and implementation of management plan	Long term	Min. of Forest and Water Affairs Min. of Culture and Tourism Min. of Environment and Urbanisation Related local governmental institutions	A management plan should be prepared in coordination among authorities to resolve the problems stemming from the multi-agency administrative system.		
4.3.5	No management system in place	Establishing a reasonable site management model in a capacity to remove the authority conflict in the site.	Long term	Min. of Forest and Water Affairs Min. of Culture and Tourism Min. of Environment and Urbanisation Related local governmental institutions	-		
4.8 Monitoring							
4.8.1	Some monitoring, but it is not planned	Structuring a joint monitoring system	Long term	Min. of Forest and Water Affairs Min. of Culture and Tourism Min. of Environment and Urbanisation Related local governmental institutions	This issue will be studied in detail during management planning process.		
4.8.2	Key indicators have not been defined	Defining key indicators for monitoring the site's conservation status regularly according to universal scientific standards	Long Term	Min. of Forest and Water Affairs Min. of Culture and Tourism Min. of Environment and Urbanisation Related local governmental institutions	This issue will be studied in detail during management planning process.		

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

#### 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
Local community
Advisory bodies
Others

#### 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

A simpler questionnaire with clear questions would be more effective to explain it to local stakeholders.

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

UNESCO	Very good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Very good

#### 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

##### • Geographic Information Table

Reason for update: WHC Decision of 36.COM.8D on clarification of boundaries of "Göreme National Park and the Rock Sites of Cappadocia" has not been linked into the web page of the property.

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