





































































































































































































































In the absence of a state of conservation report from the State Party, there is a lack of any indication that the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee or those arising from earlier sessions have been addressed. These relate in particular to the following concerns:

- The incomplete archaeological and urban mapping to enable identification of site resources and enable their management, including the definition of the site boundary and its buffer zones;
- The intended progress of the highway construction work affecting archaeological resources;
- The continued degradation of the cultural resources due to climatic conditions, failing past interventions and urban encroachment;
- The potential reinstatement of the moratorium on new development on government owned properties on, and in the vicinity of, the site (expired in 2009);
- The status of plans for the new marina development and underwater protection scheme for the entire island of Tyre;
- The lack of a conservation and site management plan for identification of priorities, responsibilities, time lines, clear targets and indicators.

Information was received by the World Heritage Centre indicating that important works were currently undertaken in the port of Tyre, in contradiction with Decision **28 COM 15 B.48**. A letter was addressed by the World Heritage Centre to the State Party on 29 March 2011 requesting detailed information on these alleged developments. No answer was received at the time of drafting this report.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would like to reiterate that no report has been submitted by the State Party and that the joint mission requested by the World Heritage Committee at its last session could not be organized. They note the lack of management measures for the property and the threats to its Outstanding Universal Value as identified in the Reactive Monitoring Mission Report of 2009, which describes “the overall state of conservation of the site of the Ancient City is in an alarming condition.”

None of the recommendations of the 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission appear to have been addressed, nor the decisions of the World Heritage Committee at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006), 31st (Christchurch, 2007), 32nd (Quebec City, 2008), 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions.

### **Draft Decision:      35 COM 7B.51**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.57**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010);*
3. *Regrets that the State Party has not responded to the recommendations of the 2009 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission;*
4. *Also regrets that the State Party has not provided a state of conservation report for the property, nor additional information on the management plan, on improved institutional*

*mechanisms, and information and studies related to ongoing developments at the property, as requested since 2006, and specifically Decisions **32 COM 7B.60, 33 COM 7B.57 and 34 COM 7B.57**;*

5. *Strongly encourages the State Party to establish as soon as possible a buffer zone to protect the property from excessive development and to submit a request for boundary modification to this end according to paragraphs 163-165 of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property in order to assess any changes in the state of conservation of the property since the 2009 mission;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

## **52. Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab) (Lebanon) (C 850)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1998

Criteria  
(iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**27 COM 7B.103**

International Assistance  
Total amount (up to 2000) : 62.500 US dollars.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
June 2003: World Heritage Centre reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Absence of legislative framework and comprehensive management plan;
- b) Absence of coordination mechanisms;
- c) Illegal constructions and encroachments;
- d) Degradation of the mural paintings and the buildings;
- e) Touristic development and absence of visitors management

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/850>



### Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a state of conservation report which was requested by the World Heritage Centre by a letter dated 26 November 2010 in response to information received on the existing situation of the property. The property was last examined by the World Heritage Committee at its 27th session (Paris, 2003). At the time, the State Party was requested to establish an appropriate legal framework for the property, to develop and implement a management plan and to address the integrity of the property by taking the required measures to ensure its protection from illegal constructions and unplanned development.

The retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) for the property was adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). In this Statement, it is noted that although the elements of the site existed to meet the conditions of integrity and authenticity, their state of conservation was in some cases precarious and that the visual integrity continued to be threatened by human settlements, illegal constructions and tourism developments. As for protection and management, it is stated that new town and buildings plans had been approved and that the Management Plan had been updated in 2007-2008, tools which would provide for better protection of the attributes of the property. However, in the Report on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Arab States presented during the World Heritage Committee meeting in Brasilia in 2010, the State Party indicated that urgent implementation of the management plan for the property was still needed, as well as adequate visitor management and the establishment of a buffer zone in which regulations were properly enforced.

During 2010, several reports, including by the Department of Antiquities of the State Party, were received regarding the state of conservation of the property. Factors that threaten the OUV of the property include illegal constructions and commercial and touristic ventures, management of solid waste, pollution, unmanaged public use and visitation, among others. In its April 2010 answer, the World Heritage Centre had encouraged the State Party to urgently submit an International Assistance request in order to revise the Management Plan so as to make it operational, as well as to provide expertise in the field of cultural landscapes and legal issues to reinforce the means of control in the property.

On 26 November 2010, the World Heritage Centre requested official information from the State Party as to actions being implemented to address the situation and announcing the presentation of this report to the next session of the World Heritage Committee, but no official response was received.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the poor state of conservation of the property and the limited recent efforts made to address the conditions at the property which have been highlighted since the time of inscription and in the subsequent reactive monitoring mission. The lack of systematic implementation of the management plan and conservation interventions, as well as the lack of enforcement of existing regulations, appear to threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They consider that the World Heritage Committee may wish to send a reactive monitoring mission to assess the current state of conservation of the property.

**Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.52**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **27 COM 7B.103**, adopted at its 27th session (UNESCO, 2003),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit the requested state of conservation report;
4. Expresses its deep concern regarding the state of conservation of the property, in particular the lack of implementation of the Management Plan and conservation interventions, as well as the lack of enforcement of existing regulations, which appear to threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
5. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

**53. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1982

Criteria  
(ii) (iii) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**31 COM 7B.63 ; 33 COM 7B.58 ; 34 COM 7B.58**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
January 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; August 2008: World Heritage Centre mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Need to complete the Management Plan in order to co-ordinate actions in the short- and medium-term;
- b) Need to provide a detailed map at the appropriate scale showing the boundaries of the property and buffer zone;
- c) Threat to rock-hewn monumental tombs as a result of inadequate protection, leading to vandalism and the development of agricultural activities in the rural zone and urban constructions;
- d) Inappropriate earlier restoration work;

- e) Problem of discharge of sewage from the modern town into the Wadi Bel Ghadir;
- f) Inadequate on-site security and control systems;
- g) Need for a presentation and interpretation system for visitors and the local population.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/190>

Current conservation issues

During its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to complete the Management Plan already under preparation, to provide a map indicating the precise boundary of the property and to inform the World Heritage Centre of any new project, in particular as regards the establishment of a new urban settlement adjacent to Shahat. The State Party was also requested to reinforce the staff of the Department of Antiquities at the property and to avoid all harsh cleaning treatments and over restoration of monuments which may have a negative impact on the authenticity and integrity of the property.

No report was transmitted by the State Party neither at the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee nor at the 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). At the time of drafting the present document, the State Party has not transmitted a report and no recent information has been received otherwise. The State Party not having participated in the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Arab States, the World Heritage Centre possesses no information on the state of conservation of the property or progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies wish to highlight the absence of management measures for the property, including security and control for the protection of the monuments, the need for appropriate conservation and interpretation, as well as capacity-building in order to fully respond to the issues of conservation and management of the property.

**Draft Decision:      35 COM 7B.53**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.58**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Notes that the State Party has not submitted a state of conservation report to its 31st (Christchurch, 2007), 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions;*
4. *Urges the State Party to implement its earlier decisions and the measures recommended by the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission of January 2007;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of its Decision **31 COM 7B.63**, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

## 54. Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 287)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

### Criteria

(iii)

### Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**33 COM 5A ; 34 COM 7B.59**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

January 2011: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Vandalism

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/287>

### Current conservation issues

At its 33rd and 34th sessions, the World Heritage Committee was informed of the acts of vandalism that occurred at the property in April 2009 and requested a joint reactive monitoring mission. The World Heritage Committee also urged the State Party, in consultation with the mission, to undertake a detailed assessment of the damage in order to identify priorities and strategies for conservation and recovery of the vandalized sites, and also to explore how to improve long term protection of the property (enhancing the management system through improving collaboration with the local communities, developing promotion of the area's significance and vulnerability for those involved with tourism, and improving conditions for control of on site access and visitation). While the State Party was requested to provide a state of conservation report for this property by 1 February 2011, no report had been received at the moment of drafting this document.

The joint reactive monitoring mission took place from 10 to 16 January 2011. As planned, ten of the vandalized sites were visited and their condition and physical context systematically recorded and analysed. For each site, information was obtained on morphology, conditions of the visit, size, dating indicators, iconographic symbols displayed, nature of rock support, painting methods and materials, engraving methods and technologies, prior alterations to the art itself or to the rock surfaces to which it is applied, and damage related to the recent vandalism. The site-specific analysis brought forward certain key observations:

- While damage to the ten sites studied is considerable, all of the rock art examples on the property are experiencing various forms of deterioration, given the long life of the

site (in some cases 10,000 years) and the great variability in substrate conditions, micro-climate and the great range of forms of artistic expression.

- The variability in substrate conditions, micro-climate, and application technologies and materials suggests that efforts to test cleaning agents on the vandalized sites will need to be adjusted to suit the particular conditions of each site, and each site element.
- Any conservation strategy for the property should address the broad range of conditions and deterioration mechanisms to be found across the property, not just on the vandalized sites.

The mission report proposes detailed methodologies for conservation-restoration interventions on the paintings and engravings, and for cleaning and recovering the damaged sites.

The mission report also comments on the challenges faced by the Department of Antiquities in managing the property, notably recent initiatives to establish a strong tourism industry inspired by the country's many cultural resources of great significance and interest, but not yet constrained to protect these resources. The mission noted a World Bank project under development to provide the Department of Antiquities with the resources to better manage the country's cultural heritage; the immediate objective of the project being to define a long term strategy to open the country to tourism.

The mission report notes that since inscription in 1985, property boundaries have not been clarified and that this ambiguity has contributed to much of the confusion surrounding property management. Equally the mission report recognised the interrelationship between natural and cultural values and the need to ensure that this broader understanding of the site and its relationships underpins management.

The mission report notes that uncontrolled tourist access and the limited presence of the Department of Antiquities on the site together produce a number of threats to the property; these include anarchic circulation which mars the natural environment of the property and leaves behind growing visitor pollution at key stopping points in tourist itineraries. The report notes that the nearby Tuareg communities respect the integrity of the property as do the archaeological missions but that oil industry operators use part of the site to route their operations. The report also underlines the necessity for the authorities to strongly increase the presence of qualified staff on this immense property, through development of large training and capacity building efforts supported by the State Party and the World Bank project referred to above.

Following completion of the mission report and in response to the changing political conditions within the country which followed, the mission team prepared a "Complementary Note" to its report which addresses these changing conditions noting that the current grave political crisis had made any scientific or technical intervention on the property impossible.

The report then outlines some recommendations important to consider when the overall situation improves:

- a) Restore the ten rock art sites vandalized in April 2009, through enlisting participation of qualified experts with first hand site knowledge, their efforts focussed through a steering committee set up to manage participation and guide the process. A provisional 5 year plan is detailed in the report.
- b) Reinforce the presence and means of the Department of Antiquities, principally by improving the support provided to monitoring posts (doubling personnel available for each post, ensuring access to a generator, satellite communications and a vehicle);
- c) Organise a meeting of the Department of Antiquities with site experts and managers, representatives of local Popular Committees, UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies, and the World Bank in order to define a simple action plan to improve control of touristic

activity on the property, to be immediately followed by a conference bringing together key representatives of all tourism companies in the country to assist in implementing the above action plan through voluntary agreement on key principles.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the mission underlines the threats that face the property and the difficulties in reversing the damage caused by the vandalism at the rock art sites which will require considerable resources, time and management structures. In the future, the workshop proposed by the mission team in its Complementary Note could devise a multi-faceted strategy for the property, considering means to improve control of tourism activity, reinforcing the presence of the Department of Antiquities on the property, and initiating a process for restoration of the vandalized sites

### **Draft Decision:        35 COM 7B.54**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.59**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Encourages the State Party when conditions permit to implement the recommendations contained in the mission report, and in particular to consider a stakeholder workshop to be organized with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to address the many dimensions of an appropriate conservation strategy for the property;*
4. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the above-mentioned issues, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

## **57. Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) (C 1073)**

Year of inscription on the List of World Heritage  
2003

Criteria  
(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**27 COM 8C.31 ; 34 COM 7B.63**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 68,900 for Technical Assistance.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2004, 2006, 2007: World Heritage Centre missions; 2001: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Deterioration as a result of exposure to difficult environmental conditions such as wind with sand and floods;
- b) Urban encroachment;
- c) Absence of a management plan with government commitment.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1073>

Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a state of conservation report which was requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). However, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission visited the property from 25 February to 4 March 2011, as requested by the World Heritage Committee in the same decision. The mission report is available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>.

*a) Deterioration as a result of exposure to difficult environmental conditions*

Although earlier mission reports have suggested significant conservation issues at the archaeological sites and individual structures including severe weathering, wind erosion, and structural instability, the mission team found that these impressions were most likely based more on initial visual perception rather than on careful monitoring and study of the property over time. The mission team compared photographs taken in 2004 during a World Heritage Centre mission with the current situation at the property and found that apparently the state of conservation has not significantly deteriorated over the last 5 years. The mission recommended that an effective monitoring system be set up at all five individual sites that make up this property, taking into account early and more recent photographic evidence to serve as a baseline comparison for future monitoring. The mission also recommended that no major conservation interventions be planned or implemented until such time as more accurate information on the deterioration can be obtained and a more broad-based consensus be obtained with national and international expertise.

The mission team found that the mural paintings in the Temple of Mut at Gebel Barkal and the tombs of King Tanwetamani and Queen Qalhata at El Kurru currently seem stable. The only exception seems to be the impact of bats and insects, in particular termites, which would warrant specific conservation action based on passive control methods, avoiding the use of any chemicals that may have a detrimental impact on the paintings. Concern was raised about a lack of a visitor management strategy, especially as it relates to the increased humidity levels which could have an impact on the mural paintings. The mission recommended that studies on the carrying capacity of the sites be carried out so that a maximum number could be set for daily visitors.

*b) Management plan for the property*

The mission team found that the management plan for the World Heritage property, finalized on 10 November 2007 and subsequently approved by the Sudanese authorities, has not yet been implemented. This situation is due to the lack of human and financial resources of the National Corporation of Antiquities and Museums (NCAM) as well as the lack of an effective executive summary and related action plan in Arabic. While a detailed and consolidated plan of action with timelines has been prepared in 2007, there is concern that it may not be in line with the current capacities and resources available. The mission therefore recommended a

capacity building session for staff of the NCAM and local stakeholders to cover issues related to the implementation of the management plan.

*c) Urban encroachment and other development projects*

While a previous project for the construction of a hotel at Gebel Barkal has been avoided, there is still pressure for tourism developments within the property and its potential buffer zone. A new hotel project is currently being planned and preparation works have begun at a location within view of the World Heritage property. The mission noted that the perimeters of the buffer zones had not yet been finalized and that there were no planning regulations for control within these buffer zones. The mission team considered it crucial that the buffer zones be finalized, and that they remain free of construction to ensure there is no adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. The mission recommended, based on discussion with local authorities, that a letter be sent by the World Heritage Centre stressing the need to develop planning controls to ensure that the property and its surroundings remain clear of any new construction or development projects. Such letter was sent on 14 April 2011.

The mission furthermore discussed the negative impact of the road several dozen meters from the pyramid field of Gebel Barkal, negatively impacting upon the site's spiritual and associated values. The mission suggested that a new road be planned at the edge of the buffer zone.

The mission also examined potential impacts from a dam construction on the Nile river at the fourth cataract. It found that while no direct visual impacts would result for the World Heritage property, there was a need for ongoing monitoring of the sites, in particular to look for changes in temperature and humidity levels due to the changes in the water table. The mission also recommended that cumulative impacts of the dam project be examined for more long-term effects which might have a negative impact on the OUV of the property.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the findings of the mission which indicate that the state of conservation of the structures and archaeological sites seem to be stable at the present time. They nevertheless underline the recommendations of the mission that there is an urgent need both to make the management plan operational and to develop a comprehensive monitoring system in order to better understand the long term conservation needs of the property. In addition, there is a need for the State Party to deal with issues related to tourism and urban development pressures, and in particular, large development projects, to ensure that they do not have a negative impact on the OUV of the property.

**Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.57**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.63**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Notes the findings of the reactive monitoring mission in regard to the physical state of conservation of the structures, archaeological remains, and mural paintings at the property;



4. *Requests the State Party to develop an ongoing monitoring system to ensure the continued stability of these structures, archaeological remains, and mural paintings, and to refrain from planning or implementing restoration projects prior to obtaining more accurate information on deterioration mechanisms from the monitoring process;*
5. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to put the 2007 Management Plan in operation as soon as possible, by reinforcing the management structure and staff at the property, by providing this staff with an executive summary in Arabic and by developing a detailed, costed revised action plan with clear timelines and responsibilities for implementation;*
6. *Urges the State Party to ensure that site staff and other stakeholders receive necessary capacity building in order to effectively implement the management plan;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to provide, in the framework of the Retrospective Inventory, detailed topographical maps of the five component parts of the property by **1 December 2011**;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to finalize the limits of the buffer zones and their associated planning controls as soon as possible, to ensure that pressure from tourism, urban and infrastructure development do not have a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and to submit a minor boundary modification by **1 February 2012** for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012;*
9. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

## **60. Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) (C 385)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1986

Criteria  
(iv) (v) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**Report 22 EX T.BUR (Document WHC-98/CONF.202/4); Report 23BUR (Document WHC-99/CONF.204/5); 25 COM III.239**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property (up to 2000): USD 52,000.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
Total amount provided to the property: 1988: USD 374,800, UNDP/UNESCO project in support of local staff training and fund-raising. 2004-2006: USD 60,000 for the Inventory of the historic city (Italian Funds-in-Trust)

### Previous monitoring missions

1998, 1999, 2003: World Heritage Centre monitoring missions; 2003 to 2005, and 2010: World Heritage Centre and experts missions

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) uncontrolled vertical and horizontal additions;
- b) use of inappropriate building materials and techniques;
- c) densification of the historic fabric through occupation of green areas;
- d) functional decay of the residential neighborhoods.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/385>

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on March 2011 in response to the request made by the World Heritage Centre on 15 November 2010. The report was requested given the concerns for the rapid rate of deterioration of the historic fabric raised within the context of a UNESCO training course on urban conservation, carried out in Sana'a in summer 2010.

The State Party reports that since the decision made by the World Heritage Committee at its 25th session (Helsinki, 2001) the state of conservation of the property has not significantly improved. It notes that the historic suq continues spreading within the residential area along the South/North axis of the property. Uncontrolled development of new constructions and vertical additions has continued to occur impacting the skyline of the old city and generating structural instability due to the use of modern materials in the additions. Historic houses are in a general state of disrepair and require immediate interventions to stop the increase in ruinous buildings.

These issues are related to the lack of a functioning management system, with adequate resources for implementation of conservation and protection measures and the lack of a finalised conservation plan. In addition, legislative measures are also pending approval and are consequently not being enforced and capacity building is still needed for the adequate management and conservation of the property.

The State Party also reports on some elements related to the actions suggested in the World Heritage Centre letter of November 2010. In particular, the State Party reports that the Social Fund for Development has expressed interest in supporting the development of the Urban Conservation Plan for Sana'a and the setting up of a training institute to enhance existing capacities.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to highlight the poor state of conservation of the property and the potential impacts to its Outstanding Universal Value. Since the last monitoring mission in 2003, no progress has been made in the preservation of the historic fabric and the preparation of an efficient and adequate management system. They consider that substantial actions have to be taken urgently by the State Party and that a monitoring mission would be useful in order to discuss how progress might be achieved to reverse the situation.

**Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.60**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **25 COM III.239**, adopted at its 25th session (Helsinki, 2001),
3. Notes the information provided by the State Party, expresses its deep concern about the state of conservation of the property and urges the State Party to implement measures to control urban development and finalise the approval process for the legislative framework;
4. Also urges the State Party to prepare the Urban Conservation Plan and develop capacity building programmes with the support of the Social Fund for Development (SFD);
5. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to evaluate the state of conservation of the property and to discuss how progress might be achieved in ensuring the conservation and protection of the property;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

## ASIA-PACIFIC

### 61. The Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) (C 322)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1985

Criteria  
(i) (ii) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**31 COM 7B.76; 32 COM 7B.64; 33 COM 7B.64**

International Assistance  
Training Assistance: USD 20,000; installation of a drainage system

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 800,000 from UNDP, UNESCO, Japan Funds-in-Trust, France UNESCO Cooperation Agreement and NORAD

Previous monitoring missions  
October 2002: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; February 2003: UNESCO expert mission; February/March 2009: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
a) Lack of an effective management system;  
b) Lack of adequate human and financial resources;  
c) Property and buffer zone boundaries not clearly defined;  
d) Drainage and internal moisture contents problem.

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/322>

#### Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) urged the State Party of Bangladesh, as a matter of priority, to address the recommendations made by the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission carried out in February-March 2009.

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 24 March 2011 through the UNESCO Dhaka Office, which reported progress made to implement Decision **33 COM 7B.64**.

#### a) *Management plan*

The State Party indicated that a comprehensive management plan including conservation policies and provisions for a buffer zone will be drafted under the project "South Asia Tourism Development Project - Bangladesh portion 2009-2014" financed by the Asian Development Bank (ADB). The State Party, through the Department of Archaeology, will consult over development of the management plan with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

*b) Refraining from carrying out major conservation works*

The State Party in the report noted the decision of the World Heritage Committee to refrain from carrying out any major conservation works until the management plan has been developed.

With regards to the removal of the incompatible light fittings installed within the courtyard of the monastery, the State Party reported that the lights are not removed yet and noted that these light fittings will be removed after introducing a better alternative system for lighting the temple wall. The report mentioned that the Department of Archaeology has planned to request consultation under the ADB financed project for alternative light fittings.

*c) Personnel*

The State Party further indicated that in responding to the need to recruit necessary professional staff, the Department of Archaeology has been able to fill 24 vacant posts and to engage 6 additional guards at the property. The State Party is also planning to recruit one institutional expert, within the ADB financed project, to revise the organisational charts of the Department with a view of improving the management of the property.

The State Party provided also information regarding the capacity-building activities and listed two activities which have been organised by the Department of Archaeology together with UNESCO: Value-based management of Cultural Heritage (May 2009) and Ethics-based management for Cultural Heritage sites of Bangladesh (December 2009).

The Report also mentioned plans for future capacity-building workshops to be organised by UNESCO under a project funded by the Norwegian Funds-in-Trust and under the ADB financed project.

*d) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

As a part of the Periodic Reporting exercise, the State Party submitted a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value on 1 February 2011 which has been forwarded to ICOMOS for review.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that while the authorities took some steps to implement the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee, a large number of key conservation and management issues have not been resolved and urge the State Party to pursue its efforts to implement the measures proposed by the Committee.

They also note that the two projects financed by the Asian Development Bank and the Norwegian Government are important opportunities to elaborate a comprehensive management plan for the property and for capacity-building purposes. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that it would be important that these projects be implemented by the State Party in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

**Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.61**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.64**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),

3. Acknowledges the steps taken by the State Party to pursue the implementation of the Committee decision and urges the State Party to implement the rest of the measures proposed by the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission carried out in February-March 2009;
4. Encourages the State Party to draft the management plan of the property under the project "South Asia Tourism Infrastructure Development Project - Bangladesh Portion 2009-2014" in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
5. Welcomes the information that the Norwegian Funds-in-Trust, is supporting a capacity-building project for long term management, conservation and preservation of World Heritage properties in Bangladesh, which may contribute to improving the property's protection and management;
6. Requests the State Party to undertake its capacity-building activities on management and conservation of Cultural Heritage properties, in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the progress achieved in the implementation of the above.

## **62. Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia) (C 1224rev)**

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add.2

## **69. Prambanan Temples (Indonesia) (C 642)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1991

Criteria  
(i) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**30 COM 7B.60; 31 COM 7B.83; 33 COM 7B.73**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 5,000 On-site promotion at Borobudur and Prambanan; USD 70,000 Emergency Assistance, June 2006.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 250,000 Saudi Arabia Funds-in-Trust for emergency rehabilitation.

Previous monitoring missions

February 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

Earthquake

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/642>

Current conservation issues

Since the 2006 earthquake in Yogyakarta, the Indonesian government has carried out rehabilitation work for the structural stability of the Prambanan Temples. A team from Tsukuba University, Japan has also conducted research surveys for the restoration of Prambanan Temples. In addition, the World Heritage Centre sent an expert in historic building structures to carry out research and provide technical recommendations for the rehabilitation work on the damaged Temples. The Indonesian government, together with the UNESCO Office in Jakarta, jointly organized international expert meetings for the Safeguarding of Prambanan in 2007 and 2009.

The earthquake which hit Yogyakarta and Central Java caused severe damage to the Temple Compounds, and the Siva Temple suffered the most. Hence, at its 33rd committee session in 2009, the World Heritage Committee urged the Government of Indonesia to restore the Siva Temple for its long-term preservation (Decision **33COM 7B.73**).

On 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. This report outlines the progress made through rehabilitation activities according to the March 2007 Action Plan defined by the International Meeting of Experts and includes details of the capacity building, awareness raising and visitor management activities undertaken.

a) *Research and restoration work*

The State Party report also illustrated the research and monitoring activities that have been carried out at both Sewu and Prambanan Temples. The activities include mapping the contours in order to study the drainage system, analyzing the stability of the structure at Prambanan and the Planning evaluation of rehabilitation work that has not been implemented.

Restoration work has already been carried out and is continuing at both locations. However, despite the importance of the preservation of the site and the need for sustainable development mechanisms, several planned projects have been hampered due to a shortage of financial and human resources, which are vital for dealing with their long-term conservation at the local/national level. Since 2010 experts have been investigating the most appropriate way to save the Temple Compounds. There are some disagreements about how best to rehabilitate the Siva temple and strengthen its structure. The government has asked international and national experts for a proper methodology to ensure the long-term preservation of the Siva Temple.

b) *Capacity building and awareness – raising*

The State Party report also provided details of nine capacity building activities including, a one-month “Regional Training Course on Conservation and Restoration” as well as a workshop on “Technical Guidance on Conservation of Traditional Building”, both conducted at the site. Some of the actions were undertaken with the help of the international community and Tsukuba University in particular.

The State Party further indicated that a series of activities have been undertaken with a view to raising awareness among local, national and international communities. Most activities target students at elementary and high school and university level.

It is also reported that due to the current rehabilitation projects some Temples are currently closed to visitors. Some of the temples remain open for visitors and it has to be ensured that visitor activities do not hinder the ongoing rehabilitation work.

c) *Planning*

The Ministry of Culture and Tourism also organised meetings in December 2010 and March 2011. The March 2011 meeting concluded that the Siva Temple is in an alarming condition and agreed on an eight-year restoration programme (starting 2011) for the Siva Temple. However, it was decided that no decision could yet be made on the nature of the restoration and that more extensive research should be carried out. To this end, an international meeting was organized by the Government of Indonesia and the UNESCO Office in Jakarta from 30 March to 1 April 2011 in Yogyakarta, Indonesia with the purpose of identifying ways of structurally consolidating the Prambanan Temple Compounds for their long-term preservation. The participants at the workshop adopted a series of recommendations on restoration and structural strengthening, material analysis, concept of authenticity and education and information issues, but maintained that no remedial activities should commence until the exact condition of the Siwa temple is fully understood.

d) *Volcanic eruption of Mount Merapi*

On 26 October 2010, the volcanic eruption of Mount Merapi seriously threatened the thousands of people living on the volcano's fertile slopes. This major eruption has blanketed the surrounding areas in volcanic ash of the Borobudur Temple Compounds World Heritage property. . The Prambanan temples were slightly covered by the volcanic ash, which was rapidly cleaned by the staff of the site management. Although, the lava/debris flow in the river nearby following the volcanic eruption was reported by the local media as a possible threat to the property, the UNESCO Jakarta mission found that the compound is well protected by high walls at the river bank.

Requested by the Indonesian authorities, the Director-General of UNESCO, through the World Heritage Centre and UNESCO Office in Jakarta, launched an emergency safeguarding initiative for Borobudur and Prambanan. The overall goals include rehabilitation of the temple compounds and enhancing and promoting the livelihoods of affected local communities, via their involvement in the rehabilitation of the cultural tourism and creative industry sector in the region.

Conclusions:

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made by the State Party in implementing the activities outlined in the 2007 Action Plan as requested by the World Heritage Committee. They also note the numerous expert meetings, capacity-building and awareness-raising activities organized during a relatively short period. They further encourage the State Party of Indonesia to address the conservation issues caused by the October 2010 volcanic eruption, in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.



**Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.69**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.73**, adopted at its 33rd session (Sevilla, 2009),
3. Notes with satisfaction the continuing efforts made by the State Party towards the rehabilitation of the property in accordance with the Action Plan prepared in 2007 and the steady progress being made;
4. Thanks the Director-General of UNESCO for having launched immediately after the volcanic eruption of Mount Merapi of Central Java in Indonesia, the emergency safeguarding operation, with primary objective of rehabilitating the surrounding areas of the property and of enhancing and promoting the livelihoods of affected local communities, via their involvement in the rehabilitation of the cultural tourism and creative industry sector in the region;
5. Encourages the State Party to conduct further research on the structure of the Siva Temple, such as onsite monitoring, seismographic studies, periodic monitoring of data analysis, before any major restoration work is agreed or undertaken;
6. Strongly recommends that minimum intervention be considered to retain the authenticity of the property;
7. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property with information on the progress made in the implementation of the above-mentioned Action Plan and the recommendations adopted by the April 2011 Working Group Meeting for the Safeguarding of Prambanan Temple Compounds, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

**72. Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Cham pasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 481)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2001

Criteria  
(iii)(iv)(vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**25COM X.A, 27COM 7B.51, 28COM 15B.65**

#### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: \$15,000 (1999) for the preparation of the nomination dossier.

#### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: Japanese-funded project: USD379,040 (1996-97), Total Italian-funded projects through Lerici Foundation: USD 482,194 (1996-2004; 3 project phases): Phase I (1996-1997) = USD161,124 ; Phase II (1998-1999) = USD 164,000; Phase III (2003-2005) = USD 157,070

#### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

#### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) New infrastructure construction including new proposed road
- b) Lack of coordinated management mechanism
- c) Parking lot and visitor centre
- d) Lack of sufficient professional staff

#### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/121>

#### Current conservation issues

Following the UNESCO fact-finding mission of December 2010, the State Party was informed of the examination of the state of conservation of the property.

In 2002, the possibility of constructing a new road through Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape was brought to the attention of the World Heritage Committee. This concern was noted by the World Heritage Committee at its 27th session (Paris, 2003), by requesting the State Party to “submit a detailed survey plan for the new north-south road to mitigate any negative impact this road could have on Zones 1, 2, 3, or 4, detailing the protective measures being undertaken or planned” (Decision **27 COM 7B.51**).

In April 2010, after a long period of inactivity concerning the road construction, UNESCO received reports that the construction of Route 14A had commenced and would pass through Zone 1 and Zone 3 of the property. The State Party was duly notified by the World Heritage Centre that potential damage from the construction works was not in compliance with existing legislation and management provisions and could lead to threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, thus providing grounds for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

To assess the emergency situation at the property, a UNESCO fact-finding mission was undertaken from 14 to 17 December 2010 at the request of the Ministry of Information and Culture, Lao PDR. According to the mission report, road construction plans provided by the State Party show that out of a total length of approximately 60 km, a 18-km section of Route 14A will be situated in Zone 1 of the property (Champasak Cultural Heritage and Cultural Landscape Protection Zone), from km 25 at Phaphin to km 43 at Ban Dontalat village. The road is designed with two lanes, together with associated turning lanes, bridges, drainage structures. From km 25 to 29, the works entail a widening of an existing road. From km 29 to 34, it consists of constructing a new road alignment including three bridges passing through existing paddy fields and nearby areas designated as Zone 3 (Archaeological Research Zone), notably the ancient city. From km 34 to 35, a bypass is designed around Ban Tang Kob Village. From km 35 to 41, the existing road will be upgraded and from km 42 to 43, a bypass will be constructed around Ban Dontalat Village. In addition, the project also includes proposals to upgrade the road running through Champasak town proper which passes through the Ancient City (designated Zone 3) by constructing sidewalks and associated drainage alignment.

Work on the road started in early 2010. After rapid construction in 2010, the road works had substantially progressed, with various sections in the World Heritage property advanced to various degrees of construction by January 2011. With the exception of an *Initial Environmental Examination* conducted in 2002 and seven archaeological trenches excavated in October and November 2010 during which the road construction work was halted temporarily, no further in-depth heritage impact assessment had been conducted by the State Party.

At the request of the State Party, a quick impact assessment was undertaken by an expert mission fielded by UNESCO Bangkok in January-February 2011. The results of the assessment concluded that the construction and planned operation of the road based on its current design will have an irreversible impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value. The road will impact on the cultural landscape and the buried archaeology and standing earthworks. The road alignment cuts through the cultural landscape and creates adverse visual and cultural impacts. Significant archaeological remains located in close proximity to parts of the road alignment have already been affected. The mitigation measures that have been proposed by the State Party, such as planting trees along the road alignment, were found to be inadequate or inappropriate. The expert mission made two sets of recommendations: first, mitigation actions for immediate implementation, and second, submission of modified design and alignment proposals for the new road and detailed mitigation plans. The immediate mitigation actions are as follows:

1. Suspension of all construction works from km 29 to 34 to allow time for preparation of a new Alignment Options Study in order to provide a design and locations not having impact on the Outstanding Universal Value. The options must take into account that a minimum of 100 metres will be required between the wall of the Ancient City and the new alignment;
2. Cancellation of the Ban Tang Kob Village bypass and use of the existing road through the village based on local access only.

In addition to Route 14A, other issues affecting the conservation of the property include the construction of a new site management office next to the site museum, an increase in building activity over the past ten years which has started to change the character of the property and is expected to be accelerated with the new road, and the non-functioning of the National Inter-Ministerial Coordinating Committee which is identified as a key coordinating body in the management plan. The State Party has made progress with restoration of the Vat Phou temple complex, with bilateral technical support from France, India and Italy. The capacity of the site management authorities has been strengthened with the upgrade into a department level. A new action plan for 2011-2016 is currently being prepared with support from UNESCO Bangkok which, if implemented properly, will help to address these longer-term conservation and management issues.

On 25 April 2011, the World Heritage Centre received information regarding a water supply project, to include 25 meter high water tanks, to be funded by the Asian Development Bank (ADB). It is understood that these are outside the property boundary but could impact visually the property and that no cultural heritage impact assessment has been carried out.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note with great concern that in spite of a request by the Committee in 2003 for information on the planned road, and repeated requests by the World Heritage Centre, work has started without the submission of detailed survey and mitigation plans, and without a comprehensive Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to consider the impact of the proposals on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The work is thus in contravention of Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that seven archaeological trenches were investigated by the Ministry of Information and Culture in October and November 2010 when the road construction was temporarily stopped for two months. However, this assessment was limited only to sub-surface archaeology in the seven selected areas and does not constitute a comprehensive impact assessment of the overall property and its Outstanding Universal Value.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the recommendations for immediate mitigation action proposed by the Quick *Heritage Impact Assessment* mission dispatched by UNESCO in January-February 2011, and considers that work on the planned roads must stop immediately while a thorough review is undertaken of the whole project in the context of its impact on the Outstanding Universal Value.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note that water tanks are being planned near the property, without any cultural heritage impact assessment being carried out.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that in the absence of firm commitment for the road project and reverse some of the work so far undertaken, the property is faced with serious and specific threats as set out in Paragraph 177 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

**Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B 72**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **27 COM 7B. 51**, adopted at its 27th session (UNESCO, 2003),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party has not provided the detailed survey plan on the construction of a new north-south road and mitigation measures to the World Heritage Centre, as requested by the Committee and as requested twice by the World Heritage Centre in 2010;*
4. *Notes with great concern that construction of the new road has started and progressed rapidly in 2010 with substantial progress, including in Zone 1 and 3 of the property;*
5. *Notes furthermore the recommendations made by the UNESCO quick assessment mission undertaken in January-February 2011, in particular the need to consider options for realigning and downgrading the road within the property and its setting;*
6. *Requests the State Party to immediately suspend all construction works from km 25 to 34 to allow time for preparation of a new alignment options;*
7. *Also Requests the State Party to undertake a cultural heritage impact assessment for the proposed water tanks and submit it to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, before any commitment has been made;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to invite, as a matter of urgency, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to the property in 2011 in order to consider alternative options for the proposed road upgrade, in the context of its cultural and socio-economic impact, to undertake a comprehensive assessment on the state of conservation of the property and its management system;*

9. Furthermore requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 **February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, and in particular on the implementation of the above mitigation measures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012, **with a view, in the case of confirmation of the ascertained threat to Outstanding Universal Value by road constructions, to considering the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

### **73. Melaka and George Town, Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca (Malaysia) (C 1223)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2008

Criteria  
(ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**32 COM 8B.25; 33 COM 7B.78**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
April 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports  
Approvals for inappropriate buildings in and around the property.

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1223>

#### Current conservation problems

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 21 January 2011, which responded to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).

#### Conservation management plan and Special Area plans

The Committee had requested Special Area plans for the property and its buffer zones in response to building approvals for inappropriate buildings, in terms of form and scale, in parts of the property and the buffer zone. The Committee also requested a Conservation plan for both cities and a schedule for implementation of conservation work.

In its response, the State Party has submitted a Conservation management plan which, it appears, will lead to the development of Special Area plans for each of the two sites that make up the property. The preparation of Special Area plans is provided under the Town and Country Planning Act 1976 (Act 172). The Plans, which include guidance on implementation and management, are statutory with legal support. Further statutory consultation will be needed before Special Area Plans can be put in place. It is not clear whether these will cover the buffer zones, as recommended by the 2009 Mission.

The Conservation Management plan is a flexible 6-year plan that will provide guidance for local authorities and owners. It overarches the individual management plans for the two cities. A Steering Committee will be set up to assist in its review. The Plan includes an overall vision for the property, management strategies in response to identified challenges, and planning and development control guidance that includes zoning, land use control, heritage building control, view and vista protection, public realm proposals, access and circulation measures, and proposals for improving utility and infrastructure. It also includes details of financial incentives and grants for certain types of work, a matrix of not permissible activities such as swiftlet (small birds) breeding, and the need to protect vistas and certain specific aspects such as the terracotta roofscapes. The Plan also provides, in annexes, detailed Conservation Guidelines for various types and categories of buildings, based on analyses of what exists and their spatial disposition. This states that buildings that are not individually protected - unlisted buildings located within conservation areas – and which are not seen to have intrinsic architectural and heritage interest may be demolished and replaced simultaneously subject to the conservation guidelines. The value of the overall townscape consisting of both listed and unlisted buildings does not appear to be articulated as part of the value of the property.

The Plan acknowledges that its implementation will require stronger administrative arrangements than those that are currently in place. There are many weaknesses in the existing government, institutional and administrative set-up such as shortage of staff, lack of experience, expertise, competency, bureaucracy, and also a lack of adequate procedures for assessing the heritage impact of proposed development. In order to address these, the interim institutional and management mechanisms for both parts of the property will be strengthened further so as to carry out the necessary implementation programmes. A Special Purpose Vehicle in the form of a World Heritage Office is being set up for the property. This will be responsible for providing professional and technical inputs on planning. The roles of the State Heritage Committees and the Heritage / Conservation Units in the two local authorities will be enhanced, the roles of the Commissioner of Heritage at the State and Local Authority levels will be strengthened, and coordination and collaboration between the two cities improved. The main laws will be reviewed to strengthen them further and to make them more effective in the conservation and protection of the property.

No timescale is provided as to when the World Heritage office will be set up, when the plan will be approved as a legal instrument, or when the other proposed measures will be implemented. The Plan also includes proposals for thirteen amendments to the buffer zones and these proposals will be considered under the item corresponding to minor boundary modifications.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the development of the detailed Conservation Management plan that includes Conservation Guidelines for both cities. However, they do note that the Guidelines include a presumption that buildings not individually protected might be demolished (with their replacements subject to various controls). The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the coherent

townscape that characterizes both cities is based on a combination of protected and unprotected buildings that together manifest an outstanding architectural ensemble. This part of the Guidance needs re-consideration.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the Conservation Management plan remains an advisory document until the adoption of Special Area plans that are statutory instruments providing planning controls at a more detailed level than currently exists, in particular in relation to views and building heights. These Special Area plans need to encompass both the property and its buffer zones. It is not clear from the plan whether they will extend to the buffer zone.

At its 33rd session, the World Heritage Committee noted that the State Party had agreed that no approval will be given for developments higher than 18 metres in the buffer zone until the adoption of the Special Area plans. There is no confirmation of this ban in this year's State of Conservation report.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to highlight the commitment of the State Party to establish a World Heritage office and to strengthen governmental and other administrative arrangements. They do, however, consider that the timescale for achieving this reinforced management system needs to be set out clearly in order to build on the structure of the Conservation Management plan.

Due to information on the possible impact of swiftlet breeding on heritage buildings and the physical fabric of the buildings in George Town, one cluster component of the property, the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party, on 14 January 2011, to carry out an impact assessment of this farming operation on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, for review by the Advisory Bodies. No assessment report has been received so far.

**Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.73**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.78**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Welcomes the development of the detailed Conservation Management plan overarching the existing Management plans for the two cities and the commitment of the State Party to strengthen the management arrangements for the property through the setting up of a World Heritage office and through reinforcing governmental and other administrative arrangements;*
4. *Notes the proposals included in the Conservation Management plan for thirteen extensions to the buffer zones that will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document WHC-11/35.COM/8B);*
5. *Requests the State Party to re-consider the Conservation Guidelines relating to the presumption in favour of demolition of unprotected property which together with protected property makes up the outstanding urban ensembles of the two cities;*
6. *Urges the State Party to:*
  - a) *Progress with the development of Special Areas plan that provides detailed planning constraints for both cities and their buffer zones,*

- b) *Confirm as reported to the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee that no approval will be given for developments higher than 18 metres in the buffer zone until such time as the Special Area plans are adopted,*
  - c) *Ensure that all major projects have adequate impact assessments in line with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessment for Cultural World Heritage properties', and*
  - d) *Set out a specific timetable for achieving the reinforced management system;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2013, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, on the development of Special Areas plans and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

## **78. Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1988

Criteria  
(iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**32 COM 7B.77; 33 COM 7B.82; 34 COM 7B.72**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
2002: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; November 2007: UNESCO expert advisory mission; April/May 2008: UNESCO New Delhi Office advisory mission; 2010 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission February;

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Need for development and management plan;
- b) Intrusive and illegal constructions within the Galle cricket ground impacting on the integrity of the property;
- c) Potential impacts of a proposed port construction on the integrity of the property.

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/451>

### Current conservation issues

In Decision **34 COM 7B.72**, the World Heritage Committee, regretted that the State Party had not provided a conservation report with responses to requests of the Committee at its 33rd session to provide plans for the property boundary and buffer zone, including an extension to embrace the maritime archaeology of the bay, reduced proposal for the Port and details of other developments which may impact on the property, including any further building on the cricket ground.



The State Party did not submit a state of conservation report as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010).

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that for the second consecutive year the State Party has not submitted a state of conservation report. They recall that the reactive World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the Old Town of Galle, Sri Lanka (13-20 February 2010) had been unable to make a full assessment because the State Party failed to provide all of the plans and other documents that had been requested.

The mission reported there had been disappointingly little progress in tackling the outstanding issues: development at the International cricket ground and at the Port, as well as the inadequacy of the buffer zone surrounding the old town and fortifications.

In the absence of any response to the mission report, and in the light of threats identified by the 2010 mission relating to lack of conservation and management as well as development, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to highlight the potential vulnerability of the property.

### **Draft Decision:      35 COM 7B.78**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B 72**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Expresses its deep regret that the State Party has not submitted a state of conservation report, that it did not submit one to the 34th session, and that therefore no response has been provided to the recommendations of the 2010 reactive monitoring mission;*
4. *Also Expresses deep concern at the potential vulnerability of the property from proposed development, from the absence of effective conservation control in the Old Town and from the lack of a conservation management plan;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and responses to the requests of the Committee at its 34th session for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

## 79. Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan) (C 602 rev)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1993

### Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

### Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**34 COM 7B.74**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 34,000 in 1995, USD 16,000 in 1997, and USD 21,960 in 2002

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a proper conservation and management plan;
- b) Recent hotel constructions which would negatively affect the integrity of the property;
- c) Heavy traffic, pollution and poor sewage system;
- d) Use of new building material and methods.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/602>

### Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session.

At its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property, and to review the recommendations of a technical report prepared by UNESCO Office in Tashkent in co-operation with the Board of Monuments of Uzbekistan and submitted by the State Party, the scope and content of the ongoing "State Programme for the conservation, restoration and utilization of the cultural heritage of the city of Bukhara" and to advise the State Party on the appropriate form and contents of an effective conservation and management plan for the property.

The joint reactive monitoring mission was carried out from 22 to 31 October 2010. The mission report identified a number of threats to the property including the following:

- Lack of on-going routine maintenance and poor state of conservation of monuments;
- Lack of repair, degradation and even abandonment of many traditional houses as a result of de-population of the Old City;
- Diminishing use of traditional materials and traditional building techniques, and introduction of new building materials (cement and burnt brick), as well as new architectural details, which alter the character of the old town;
- Lack of guidelines for rehabilitation of housing;
- Reconstruction of portions of the city walls and gates without adequate documentary evidence;
- Poor and deteriorating condition of public open spaces;
- Inadequate documentation for the major monuments and the urban fabric;

- Urban development pressures resulting in inappropriate design of new structures, particularly new hotels (out of scale, inappropriate forms and materials, and building setting which does not respect urban context and patterns);
- Infrastructure (water and sewage) in poor and deteriorating condition, inadequate drainage systems, increasing negative impacts of rising ground water on foundations of earthen buildings;
- Lack of seismic upgrading for structures and infrastructure in a zone of high earthquake susceptibility;
- Shortcomings in the support available for conservation activity and planning, inadequate resources, limited availability of technical and craft skills, inadequate management system, including lack of a management plan, inadequate planning mechanisms.

The main recommendations of the mission are the following:

a) *Conservation project*

The State Party should develop a major conservation project to bring together key conservation activities for the improved protection of the Historic Centre of Bukhara.

b) *Management plan*

The State Party should develop a management plan for the World Heritage property based on the existing draft and activities supported by the UNESCO Office in Tashkent since 2008 and built around both the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) currently under review by ICOMOS and adequate documentation of the property's heritage structures and elements.

The management plan should include the following governing components: Bukhara World Heritage Steering Committee with the authority to oversee implementation of the Management Plan under the patronage of the Board of Monuments of the Ministry of Culture and Sports, provision of all the necessary financial means, forms of co-operation established with international organizations and partners, stakeholder consultations during development of the management plan (including the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies), and integration within the Master Plan of the City of Bukhara (including re-zoning, traffic management, and efforts to avoid speculative reconstructions).

The management plan should include the following planning components: a functional computerized data-base, a Master Conservation and Development Plan for the historic centre, a scientific monitoring system, a plan and programme for upgrading all infrastructure, design guidelines for new construction and guidelines and regulations for all tourist services.

The mission concluded that the property is vulnerable and its historic fabric has been undermined to some extent. The report also stressed that timely implementation of the mission's recommendations would be critical in addressing potential negative impacts on authenticity and integrity of the property.

This State Party report notes that a management plan is being elaborated for city monuments and archaeological sites but also stresses the importance of the traditional urban fabric in developing potential for educational and cultural tourism and improved involvement of the local population. The report also notes the importance of efforts to promote sustainable development through conservation of traditional urban fabric for the benefit of local populations. Finally, the report notes the importance of using accumulated knowledge and documentation as a basis for continuous monitoring, as well as the importance of establishing a steering committee for the World Heritage property and of preparing an action plan for implementation of the measures and activities suggested within the management plan.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies believe that the threats identified during the mission make the OUV of the property vulnerable. However the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that if the State Party implements the recommendations of the mission in the timeliest fashion possible, the threats to the OUV could be mitigated. They further believe that the state of conservation of the property should be closely monitored in the near future; the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are in a position to assist the State Party to address these threats in the most effective way possible.

### **Draft Decision:      35 COM 7B.79**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.74**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Notes the results of the October 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and the identified threats to the property;*
4. *Urges the State Party to undertake, in a timely fashion, the measures recommended by the October 2010 mission report, particularly the need to complete and implement the Management Plan and the establishment of the Bukhara World Heritage Steering Committee for the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to address potential negative impacts on authenticity and integrity of the property to ensure the protection of its Outstanding Universal Value;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the October 2010 reactive monitoring mission, and the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

## **81. Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam) (C 678)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1993

Criteria  
(iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**30 COM 7B.71; 31 COM 7B 75; 33 COM 7B.85**

#### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 307,111 (Technical co-operation and Emergency assistance)

#### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 18,279 International Safeguarding Campaign for Hue

#### Previous monitoring missions

November 2003: Monitoring mission by international expert; October 2006: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; September 2008: Expert mission within the framework of France/UNESCO Cooperation Agreement

#### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Development of the road infrastructure and modern constructions in and around the Citadel;
- b) Urban infrastructure of Hué and its surroundings.

#### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/678>

#### Current conservation issues

By Decision **33 COM 7B.85**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to ensure that the management plan is integrated in the larger regulatory framework being developed for the city of Hue (master plan).

It urged the State Party to complete the works needed to minimize the negative impact of noise and visual pollution on the Minh Mang and Khai Dinh tombs. Furthermore, it reiterated its request to the State Party to refrain from carrying out major infrastructure projects within the areas being considered for the extension of the property, as recommended by the 2006 mission, until an appropriate regulatory framework is approved, including the management plan for the property.

As requested by the World Heritage Committee, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre a draft Statement of Universal Outstanding Value (OUV) on 1 February 2011.

The State Party submitted its state of conservation report on 18 April 2011, outlining progress as follows in meeting the Committee's requests:

##### *a) Illegal buildings and inventory of properties of heritage significance*

The State Party reports that a survey of illegal households in Zone 1 was carried out in 2010, in order to plan the relocation of these households step by step. The survey showed that the number of illegal households located in the protection Zone 1 has been reduced from 3687 in 2003 to 3147 in 2010.

However, the report does not specify how many illegal households were removed during the period of 2009-2010 covered by the present report.

In addition, within the programme for Resettlement of Boat People of Hue City, the report notes that 892 households of boat people have been resettled in new residential district.

The report also notes that work continued with Waseda University in studying the historical water system in the citadel and related recommendations including the preparation of plans to protect the historical landscape environment and drafting guidelines on Conservation and Regeneration of the Traditional environmental management System in the area of the royal tombs peripheries.

However, the report does not mention the requested work on the inventory of properties of heritage significance within the citadel, one of the recommendations made by the 2006 mission.

*b) Suspension of major infrastructure projects*

The State Party report notes that the provincial government has taken into careful consideration the request to restrict major infrastructure projects, excepting those considered most important, such as the replacement of old Bach Ho Bridge (railroad, pedestrian and motor-bike), with a new motor vehicular road bridge for solving the traffic jam problems on Phy Xuan bridge and Truong and Tien bridge. The project was approved in 2005 and will be built during 2009-2012. The replaced bridge is located outside the buffer zone of the property, over the Huong River.

Regarding the repairing and upgrading a section of the provincial route (2.5 km long) to Khai Dinh to prevent degradation and erosion, the work on this section will respect the original route. In particular the construction of the road running in front of the tomb (450M long), will be mostly retained and consolidated with a thin layer of asphalt. The repair work is to be implemented from February to December 2011.

On the other hand, the State Party carried out major preservation and restoration on Hue traditional garden houses. During 2009-2010 the local government has restored four heritage houses inside the citadel with funding from the European Union; three traditional garden houses in Thuy Zuan Ward, as well as eight garden houses.

*c) Development of a management plan*

The State Party and local authorities have realised that the development of a comprehensive management plan requires in-depth studies, high professional competencies, the participation of many government agencies and priority investment on the part of the national government. The State Party report notes that the Hue Monument Conservation Centre continued to co-operate with Urban Solutions from Netherlands to implement phases 2-3 of the management plan framework of Hue heritage. However, it does not stipulate whether the current elaboration of the management plan is integrated in the larger regulatory framework being developed for the city of Hue (master plan).

*d) Action plan to mitigate impacts of noise pollution on Minh Mang and Khai Dinh Tombs*

The State Party reports that trees have been planted in order to mitigate the negative effects of noise and vision at the Tomb in particular for the South west route (the bypass route around Hue City passing along Minh Mang tomb). In 2010, a project for the rehabilitation of the green belt land surrounding the Minh Mang tombs was established for implementation in 2011-2012.

Reducing negative visual impacts from Khai Dinh tomb was carried out by cultivating grass and climbing plants on the talus well. The State Party reports that this has considerably reduced the negative visual impact on the tombs.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made by the State Party in addressing the requests made by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **33 COM 7B.85** (Seville, 2009), notably in dealing with illegal buildings, development of a management plan and carrying out mitigating measures at the Minh Mang and Khai Dinh Tombs to reduce the impact of the new highway, as well as restriction of major infrastructure projects within the protected area as well as the buffer zone. They would welcome information on how the management plan under preparation will be integrated in the context of the new Master Plan for the larger city of Hue.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note, however, that no information has been provided regarding redefinition of boundaries in order to reflect the significant geomantic elements associated with the inscribed monuments.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note that a series of other development and conservation activities have been carried out in Hue for which the World Heritage Centre has not received detailed information concerning approaches planned in advance of decision-making for assessment of potential impacts on OUV, authenticity and integrity in line with the requirements of Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines. These include the replacement of old Bach Ho Bridge and the repair and upgrading of a section of the provincial route (2.5 km long) to Khai Dinh, the restoration of the Buu Thanh Mon gate and the royal screen, Truong Sanh Cung Residence, Long Duc Dien Temple, as well as improvements to landmark setting and panels erecting for introducing the protection zone.

**Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.81**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.85**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes the progress made by the State Party in dealing with illegal buildings, the on-going process for the development of a management plan, the carrying out of mitigating measures at the Minh Mang and Khai Dinh Tombs to reduce the impact of the new highway, as well as restricting some major infrastructure projects within the protected area and the buffer zone;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to to consider an extension of the property to include its surrounding cultural landscape that is related spatially to the major monuments;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, any new development or conservation projects which might have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to complete the Management Plan without further delay and to ensure in the process its integration into the larger regulatory framework being developed for the city of Hue (Master Plan);*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a detailed report on the progress achieved in the implementation of the above.*

## EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

### 87. Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria) (C 217)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1983

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**32 COM 8B.82; 32 COM 8D; 34 COM 7B.81**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 19,000 for restoration works (1991)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2010: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) urban development pressure
- b) lack of a management plan, of an urban master plan and of a conservation master plan of monuments and archaeological sites

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/217>

Current conservation issues

During its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), the World Heritage Committee expressed its deep concern regarding the overall state of conservation of the property, urged the State Party to immediately adopt all necessary measures and to immediately halt “any development projects which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property.

A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited the property from 29 November to 1 December 2010, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session. A report of the mission is available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>

Following consultations with all stakeholders and in the light of on-site visit to the World Heritage property, the mission considered that despite the various problems and challenges identified by the mission the value for which this property was inscribed on the World Heritage List is substantially maintained. However, the mission underlines that the property is vulnerable and the current problems if not dealt with in the short term could represent a threat to the property.

The mission considers that a set of measures developed by the mission in close coordination with the national authorities should be implemented by the authorities, as a matter of urgency in order to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property.



The mission observed at the time of the visit that the negative urban developments within the property have stopped and that the existing developments/constructions could be considered as reversible in principle. The mission notes the initiation of a process by the national authorities for the removal of illegal constructions or inadequate adjustments to existing structures, in order to prevent serious deterioration of architectural and urban planning coherence.

Despite some recent improvement in protective legislation, the mission noted that implementation is lagging due to the lack of updated decrees, regulations and directives without which the existing normative acts while adequate, are still inapplicable for solving problems of management, conservation and urban planning.

The mission considered that the following measures should be taken by the national and local authorities as a matter of urgency:

- Immediately establish regulations for tourism activities, movable facilities and components of urban infrastructure, advertising activity and open-air commercial activity;
- Immediately halt the allowance of new construction permits within the World Heritage property and surrounding sea coast area, which could visually affect the property, prior to the preparation of a visual impact study for development projects, the approval of adequate and effective protective juridical regulations, and the establishment of effective control mechanisms and institutional frameworks among all stakeholders involved in the management and protection of the Ancient City of Nessebar.

The report includes the following recommendations concerning management and protection of the property and its buffer zone:

- Establish an overall management strategy and co-ordination mechanism for the property;
- Organise property inventory to serve management, conservation and planning purposes, including topographic and archaeological recording of surface conditions, archaeological vestiges, historic monuments and important landscapes, and a complete inventory of frescoes;
- Adapt planning mechanisms to the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, develop and adopt an urban master plan for the Ancient City establishing land use goals (including rehabilitation of infrastructure provisions, zoning controls (including no build zones), institutional reform, and strengthening capacity building, community relations and tourism development), clear operational plans strictly limiting development in the property and its buffer zone, a conservation master plan, an integrated management plan for the property and its buffer zone, clearly defined development rights for private property, improving availability of accessible and use friendly planning information for the public, and create an integrated multi-institutional tourism strategy with regulations governing movable facilities and infrastructure development, and prepare a Technical Manual for conservation, rehabilitation and restoration;
- Strengthen the protection status of the sea coastline in relation to the capacity of the municipality, including cultural heritage impact studies of the any proposed developments on the sea coastline on the property's OUV;
- Undertake restoration and maintenance works including long term consolidation of the historic monuments of ancient Nessebar, put in place a monitoring mechanism for physical conservation of buildings and archaeological sites, develop guidelines for new construction, urban design and advertising and information panels in the property and its buffer zone, create a training programme for conservation and

management for the property's responsible personnel, a programme for restoration of the property's religious frescoes, a special programme for the protection of the property's archaeological resources, and identify financial support to assist home owners in rehabilitation work;

- Develop capacity building activities including a World Heritage training seminar for all professional staff involved with World Heritage properties, conservation and management training for maintenance staff;
- Create awareness raising initiatives including cultural tourism activities to renew the City-Museum area as a spiritual and unique cultural centre, and promoting international "twinning" exchanges.

The mission recommends that the State Party submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2013 a detailed state of conservation progress report including documents and information on the implementation of all necessary measures recommended, and as well, that a reactive monitoring mission be carried out prior to the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee to review the state of conservation of the World Heritage property, the implementation of recommended measures, - and the existence of an integrated and comprehensive management plan for the World Heritage property, and the State Party response to all recommendations.

On 31 January 2011, the State Party submitted a detailed and comprehensive state of conservation report as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session. This report addresses the requests of the World Heritage Committee one by one.

- Concerning actions taken for improving management of the property, the report notes employment of a qualified conservation architect to act as Chief Architect for the ancient Nessebar Reserve, and improved co-ordination between activities of the State and the municipality.
- Concerning development of a conservation and management plan, the State Party reported progress in developing a draft regulation to guide legislation for establishing World Heritage Conservation and Management Plans, enabling municipal funding, terms of reference for the project, a programme for its execution and the systematisation of available documentation.
- Concerning actions for the removal of illegal constructions and improved control to prevent future such problems, the report noted periodic inspections on site under the authority of the new Cultural Heritage Act by inspectors of the south-eastern region, and in co-operation with the municipality also undertook compliance actions in relation to already enforced orders for the removal of certain illegal constructions. Seven successful such actions are illustrated in the report of the 23 processes initiated by the municipality, and the report documents interim progress on these as well.
- Concerning improved efforts for monitoring, the report notes that all major structures and sites in the property were monitored during the period December 2010 to January 2011. The report noted that most structures were in good condition, some needing maintenance. The associated risk analysis allowed identification of prevalent key threats for single structures or complexes, including non-harmonious interventions, unprofessional reconstructions, poor quality conservation on archaeological sites, physical deterioration, problems in adapting to new uses, and lack of identification plaques, and also for the urban environment: the coastal setting, and increased development including tourism.
- Concerning the review of the spatial planning policy in the reserve, the report noted plans to carry out an analysis of problems of the dated provisions of the current plan

and to develop a new detailed Spatial Plan linked to provisions of the Conservation and Management Plan.

- Concerning efforts to improve exploration, conservation, restoration and presentation of archaeological sites, the report notes strengthened reconnaissance provisions, strengthened inspection efforts and proposed regulations for land exploration (including professional qualifications), and conservation and restoration of immovable property.
- Concerning efforts to improve conservation and presentation of medieval churches, the report noted plans recently adopted to use the sites of St. John the Baptist Church, Saint Paraskeva, of the Holy Archangels Michael and Gabriel for educational and functional purposes, dependent on European funding.
- Concerning efforts to control development of mobile retail units, the report notes plans to develop a “total concept” for management, design, location, and conditions etc. of such units.
- Concerning activities to strengthen awareness of the OUV of Nessebar, the report notes the emphasis given to the importance of bringing conservation messages to young people through initiatives of the Ancient Nessebar Museum, the municipality, schools and youth centres as well as ongoing initiatives to engage adults through continuing exhibitions, web site development, photo competitions and scientific symposia.
- Concerning activities to develop a long term cultural tourism strategy, the report notes that a section of the conservation and management plan will be devoted to this effort. The report further notes efforts to develop a cultural itinerary (the Spiritual Road of the Ancient City of Nessebar)

The State Party’s report notes that the municipality suspended the issuing of building permits in the protected area (reserve) until a plan could be drawn up for the conservation and management of the Ancient City of Nessebar. The national authorities have also requested the municipality to impose a temporary construction ban within the buffer zone of the property; in relation to this, a proposal to construct a complex within the area of the ancient Necropolis was suspended. As a consequence, the report notes that no development projects need be reported under Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that while the State Party has made strong and significant efforts to launch policy and legislative initiatives intended to enhance protection of the World Heritage property, most of these are in the planning stages and have not been implemented yet. The joint reactive mission noted that a shared vision of how the property should be safeguarded and managed had been recently developed by the national and municipal authorities and that a process in order to prevent serious deterioration of architectural and urban planning coherence had been recently initiated by the national authorities.

However, the mission emphasized the need to urgently define appropriate control mechanisms accompanied by strong awareness raising programmes in order to ensure compliance with the 1972 *Convention* and enhance long-term effective management and protection of the property including its buffer zone.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies underline that the mission considered that if the necessary measures are not implemented by the authorities as a matter of urgency, the continued absence of an appropriate master plan for the City of Nessebar which specifies particular regulations and norms adopted to the status of the World Heritage

property and aims to maintain the present balance between the natural and built environment, along with a conservation master plan with a specific programme of protection, including the archaeological remains in the city and underwater, the absence of a Management Plan for the property, including tourism management policy with regulations for movable facilities and components of urban infrastructure, as well as the absence of advertising activity and open-air commercial activity to be developed in harmony with local traditions and knowledge, could propose threats to the property's OUV, as defined in paragraph 179 (b) of the *Operational Guidelines*.

**Draft Decision:      35 COM 7B.87**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.81**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Acknowledges the State Party detailed report and the efforts made to launch policy and legislative initiatives intended to enhance protection of the World Heritage property, as well as the State Party's strong commitment to improve measures in place for conservation of the World Heritage property;
4. Notes with appreciation that the municipality suspended the issuing of building permits in the protected area and requests the State Party to declare a temporary construction moratorium within the buffer zone of the property and its sea coast line prior to the approval of adequate and effective protective juridical regulations, and the establishment of effective control mechanisms and institutional frameworks among all stakeholders involved in the management and protection of the Ancient City of Nessebar;
5. Also notes that the continued absence of an appropriate planning, monitoring, management and conservation mechanisms could pose a threat to the property's Outstanding Universal Value, as defined in Paragraph 179 (b) of the Operational Guidelines;
6. Also requests the State Party to implement all the recommendations of the 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property, including:
  - a) Immediately establish regulations for tourism activities, movable facilities and components of urban infrastructure, advertising activity and open-air commercial activity,
  - b) Fully develop and implement all planning, policy and legislative initiatives recently launched or planned by the State Party including preparation, adoption and implementation of a management plan (including integrated multi-institutional tourism strategy and guidelines for the use of historic buildings and monuments), urban master plan and a conservation master plan of monuments and archaeological sites,
  - c) Ensure a permanent monitoring of the property with a view of halting and preventing any threats to its Outstanding Universal Value,
  - d) Establish a protection regime for the buffer zone of the property, as well as of the sea coastline and strengthen the system of development control within it,

- e) *Ensure that all tourism development plans be subservient to the overall Master Plan for the inscribed property, and that control mechanisms be established for the buffer zone and be developed in ways which will not negatively impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value,*
  - f) *Remove or demolish all illegal and inappropriate structures within the property and its buffer zone;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, prior to its 37th session in 2013, to review the state of conservation of the property, the implementation of measures which adequately ensure the authenticity and integrity of the property and its World Heritage values, - and the existence of an integrated and comprehensive management plan for the World Heritage property, and specifically State Party response to all 2010 mission recommendations;*
8. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2013**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

**96. Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata (Italy) (C 829)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1997

Criteria  
(iii) (iv) (v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**33 COM 8D**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission in December 2010 and January 2011

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
N/A

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/829>

### Current conservation issues

After the collapse of the Schola Armaturarum on 6 November 2010 and further collapses of walls at Pompei at the end of November 2010, the State Party invited a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission, which was carried out from 2 – 4 December 2010 and from 10–13 January 2011. The mission report is available online at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>.

The mission assessed the impact of the collapses on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property as well as the overall state of conservation, reviewed the management arrangements and provided recommendations for its conservation and management.

The mission considered that the collapses that occurred in November were regrettable. However, they did not consider that these collapses threatened the OUV of the property. Nevertheless they considered that the conditions that caused these collapses are widespread within the site and the consequences of cumulative on-going deterioration could potentially threaten the OUV. A considerable number of houses and other structures at Pompei and Herculaneum are at risk and therefore require major conservation work. The identified factors include:

#### *a) Management*

There is a general backlog in the property's maintenance and monitoring due to institutional instability and the resulting lack of adequate management and coordination. In addition, on several occasions the scarce resources have been diverted from conservation and maintenance to non-urgent projects. Although Pompei has a management plan, it is not used as an effective means to protect the property or to guide decision-making. Furthermore, basic documentation for the management and monitoring of the property and its surroundings is missing or outdated for Pompei, leading to uncontrolled development in the vicinity of this portion of the property.

#### *b) Restoration, maintenance and lack of skills base*

Inappropriate restoration methods and a general lack of qualified staff for the restoration and maintenance of the property have impacted the property. Restoration projects are outsourced and the quality of the work of the contractors is not being assessed. An efficient drainage system is lacking leading to water infiltration and excessive moisture which gradually degrades both the structural condition of the buildings as well as their décor. The mission was also concerned by the amount of plant growth, particularly ivy, in some places at Pompei.

#### *c) Visitor pressure*

In 2010, Pompei received 2.3 million visitors with a peak of 300 000 visitors per month in spring and early summer. This situation contrasts with the fact that large areas of Pompei are not accessible for visitors due to the lack of custodians, so accessible parts are over-visited and suffer considerably from visitor erosion.

Altogether, the mission considers that it is essential that the Ministry of Culture maintains institutional stability within the Superintendency in order to allow it to focus on managing and conserving the property as its main priority. Required technical and financial resources need to be identified to carry out an effective programme and steps should be taken to secure them for sustained implementation. The management plan needs to be reviewed to include a comprehensive public use plan and a risk management plan. Priority in work programmes should be given to dealing with the backlog in conservation and maintenance. An effective drainage system needs to be installed urgently to prevent further deterioration of unstable areas.

The mission also recommended that the Superintendency develop and implement a set of simple monitoring measures for the condition recording and use of the site, which would entail the updating of the Geographic Information System (GIS) for Pompei and the

development of common standards for GIS for all the components of the property. Concerning Herculaneum, the Superintendency should plan with the Herculaneum Conservation Project for the integration in due course of the Herculaneum GIS.

d) *Other conservation issues*

On 12 April 2011, the World Heritage Centre was informed about the current construction of a large concrete building immediately North of the Pompei portion of the property, in the vicinity of the Porta di Nola. According to a press article of 1 April 2011, the building will serve as a deposit for the archaeological findings and will additionally house office space. The State Party has not informed the mission members about this project, nor submitted any information to the World Heritage Centre so far.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that a considerable number of structures at Pompei and Herculaneum are in a poor state of conservation and maintenance. They consider that substantial efforts are necessary to urgently address the property's management, conservation and continuous monitoring, in order to forestall a repeat of the collapse that occurred in November 2010. They also note that the current construction of a large concrete building immediately north of the Pompei portion of the property could impact on the visual setting of the property and that actions are needed to protect it.

They consider that a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission should be invited in 2012 in order to review the implementation of the proposed recommendations.

**Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.96**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 8D**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes with deep concern the collapses that occurred at the property in November 2010 and urges the State Party to address the underlying conditions that have contributed to the collapses, as a matter of urgency;*
4. *Also notes the conclusions of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission to the property that while the collapses in November 2010 did not compromise the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, nevertheless the underlying conditions could threaten the Outstanding Universal Value if they remain unaddressed in the short term;*
5. *Deeply regrets that neither the World Heritage Centre nor the mission were informed about the construction of a large concrete building north of the Porta di Nola at the Pompei portion of the property and also urges the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with detailed information on this project for review;*
6. *Requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre regularly and in due time about any building project planned in the vicinity of the property in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*

7. Also requests the State Party to give priority to work programmes dealing with the backlog in conservation and management of the property and to:
  - a) Review the management plan to include a public use plan and risk management plan as well as provisions to regulate and control development at the vicinity of the property,
  - b) Ensure that there are adequate qualified staff and contractors for the restoration and maintenance of the property,
  - c) Develop and implement measures to monitor conditions and use of the property, including the updating of the Geographic Information System (GIS) for Pompei,
  - d) Design and install effective drainage systems,
  - e) Identify and secure the required technical and financial resources in order to carry out an effective programme of conservation and maintenance of the property;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value by **1 February 2012**;
9. Requests furthermore the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission during 2012 in order to assess the progress achieved in implementing the measures outlined above;
10. Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

## 99. Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2000

Criteria  
(v)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**31 COM 7B.114, 32 COM 7B.98, 34 COM 7B.91**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 60,000

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A



#### Previous monitoring missions

2001: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN mission; November 2003: World Heritage Centre mission; July 2009: ICOMOS / IUCN Technical Advisory mission (invited by Lithuania), December 2010: WHC / ICOMOS / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

#### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Potential pollution from the oil exploitation of the D-6 oil field in the Baltic Sea by the Russian Federation;
- b) Lack of bilateral cooperation between Lithuania and the Russian Federation including joint assessment of environmental impact of the D-6 project;
- c) Impacts of sewage spill accident which took place at Klaipeda Water Treatment Station (Lithuania);
- d) New and possibly illegal constructions;
- e) Sand dunes erosion;
- f) Possible tourism economic zone in Kaliningrad.

#### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/994>

#### Current conservation issues

The State Party of Lithuania submitted a state of conservation report on 10 February 2011. The State Party of the Russian Federation submitted a state of conservation report on 4 March 2011.

From 4 to 9 December 2010, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM/>.

##### a) *Kaliningrad Economic Development Zone*

The mission report states that the "The Tourist and Recreational Zone of the Curonian Spit" at Kaliningrad region was established by a Russian Federal Government Decision of 2007. This is one of 15 Federal Special Economic Zones that have been created under a federal law issued in 2005. The zones are managed by a joint stock company to attract investment.

Within the Kaliningrad Economic Zone there are proposals for a series of leisure complexes in the municipality of Zelenogradsk. This development is in line with a new "Federal Target Program of Economic and Social Development of the Kaliningrad Region for the Period till 2010". The planned leisure complexes would be located on four sites, two of them on the Baltic coast and two on the lagoon shore, covering a total area of 282 ha. The proposals include parking for 1,000 vehicles, 1,200 rooms/apartments, restaurants and coffee shops (with 550 seats) as well as a business and conference centre (6500 m<sup>2</sup>).

The details of these projects shown to the mission raised concerns about the appropriateness of the developments. The proposed artificial environment has no affinity with the Outstanding Universal Value of the Curonian Spit. The proposed development would dwarf the traditional settlements and severely impact on the landscape of the man-made dunes.

The mission considered that the potential tourism projects highlight the weak protection arrangements for the World Heritage property in the Russian Federation. The creation of an economic development zone conflicts with the purpose of the National Park and the obligations to protect the cultural landscapes for which the property was inscribed. The mission recommended that the State Party review legal protection for the property. It also recommended that the leisure complexes should not be built and that the economic zone should be reviewed. The Mission further recommended that, as a matter of urgency, an overall tourism plan be developed for the property to identify the type of tourism that the Spit might host without damaging the fragile environment.

The State Party of the Russian Federation reports that the Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation informed that the development plans for the

Zelenogradsk district shall not be executed in their present form. New development plans will be drawn up taking into account the opinion of the Federal Executive authorities, the Government of Kaliningrad Region, the Administration of the Curonian Spit National Park, scientists carrying out research on the Curonian Spit, and the general public. It further states that these plans will be in strict conformity with the existing ecological requirements and will ensure the maximum preservation of the existing ecological environment, and the minimization of loss of green plantations. The predominant location of the proposed development will be, it is stated, on 'territories with violated landscapes'. No more details are provided.

b) *Erosion of the dunes and water quality*

The mission reported that due to a variety of factors, since the inscription of the property the dunes have begun to diminish visibly in several areas. While the reasons for this are not exactly known, the main factors seem to be the violent storms, changes in the direction of the winds, and problems with the stability of the shores of the Baltic Sea and the Lagoon.

The State Party of Lithuania reports that there have been no strong storms and winds in the Curonian Spit in 2010 and the dune condition is stable. The part of the foredune that was eroded in 2009 was not reconstructed because of judicial issues related to public procurement. After the court decision this part will be reconstructed using traditional materials.

The State Party of Lithuania further reports that it has successfully maintained the protected dunes for years and could provide methodical recommendations to the State Party of the Russian Federation, if such assistance is needed, as a part of the existing cooperation agreement (2009-2010) between the Lithuanian and Russian Federation National Parks administrations.

The mission reported that the work of cleaning the Curonian Lagoon undertaken in Lithuania during recent years has now begun to show positive results, as the water meets European Union (EU) standards.

The State Party of the Russian Federation reports that 5 ha of dunes were strengthened in 2010, bundled brush checks have been erected on an area of 0.15 ha and trenches have been filled in an area of 0.3 ha. Moreover, beach peas were planted in an area of 1.2 ha and brushwood was paved in an area of 3.375 ha. To prepare effective methods for preservation of sand bund and big white dunes, the Directorate of the National Park "Curonian Spit" cooperates with the St. Petersburg State Engineering Academy named after S.M Kirov and the St. Petersburg Scientific and Research Institute for forest farming, exchanging experience with the National Park "Kurshu Neria" (Lithuania).

c) *Collaboration between States Parties*

Both States Parties report on the collaboration of experts of responsible institutions on the issue of possible oil spills. The last meeting concerning this issue was organized on the 27 September 2010 in Klaipėda, Lithuania. Local authorities (national park administrations of both States Parties) and municipalities (Neringa and Kaliningrad) have close contacts.

d) *Lithuania: Implementing the 2009 advisory mission recommendations*

The State Party of Lithuania reports good progress in implementing the recommendations of the advisory mission including in the following areas:

- i) Approval of the boundaries of Curonian Spit national park in December 2010;
- ii) Work on the revision of the new municipal general plans for the Neringa and Klaipėda city municipalities and the National Park management plan – with a proposal to approve the management plan in October 2011, after which the revised Neringa municipality general plan should be approved. After

successful approval, all territorial planning documents will enter into force at the end of 2011;

- iii) Improvement works at nine cultural heritage sites and the restoration of two fishermen's houses;
- iv) Modernization of sewage treatment system completed in 2010, with all settlements equipped with modern treatment facilities in conformity with EU standards;
- v) Considerable progress in challenging claims that sought to overrule spatial planning and construction regulations.

The State Party also reported on two project applications submitted to the UNESCO Participation program for 2010-2011. The project proposal for "Developing Preconditions for Sustainable Curonian Spit Managing" was approved. The second proposal for the "Preservation of the Curonian Spit Cultural (Architectural) Heritage: Research, Recommendation and Awareness-Raising" was not approved. However, alternative financial possibilities are being considered.

The State Party further reports that a fire protection system was installed in the Park.

e) *Joint Management plan*

The mission reported that the joint management plan agreed at the time of the inscription and requested again by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), is still lacking.

f) *Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

A draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) has been prepared, but only for the Lithuanian part of the property. The State Party of the Russian Federation states that the draft is in preparation and will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre shortly. The mission noted that one joint statement is urgently needed as a basis for the management of the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the designation of an economic development zone within the Kaliningrad region and the proposals for a series of large leisure complexes in the municipality of Zelenogradsk. The entire concept of the economic zone appears to have the potential to threaten the OUV of the property. More specifically, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further note that the size and scale of the proposed leisure complexes would overwhelm the landscape of the property and threaten its integrity. Although the State Party of the Russian Federation states that the current plans shall not be executed in their present form, and that the proposed development would only occur on "territories with violated landscapes", there is no information on where these territories are located within the World Heritage property, all of which is a National Park:

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that these leisure complexes should not be built, and that the economic zone as well as the legal protection of the property should be reviewed keeping in mind the OUV of the property. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that an overall tourism plan should be developed for the property to identify sustainable tourism options, in harmony with the environment as a matter of urgency. This could build upon the UNESCO supported project in the Lithuanian part for 'Developing Preconditions for Sustainable Curonian Spit Management'.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note that progress has been made on the Lithuanian part of the Spit on implementing the recommendations of the 2009

advisory mission. They also note the offer to share experience on dune management and restoration.

Although cooperation continues between the States Parties on certain issues, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further note that there has been no progress in developing a joint Statement of Outstanding Universal Value or a joint Management Plan which could allow exchange of information and ideas across the property and should over-arch economic development and ensure the long-term protection and management of the property as a whole.

**Draft Decision:        35 COM 7B.99**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **31 COM 7B.114**, **32 COM 7B.98** and **34 COM 7B.91** adopted at its 31st (Christchurch, 2007), 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions respectively,*
3. *Acknowledges the recommendations of the December 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission;*
4. *Notes with great concern the designation of an economic development zone within the Kaliningrad region which appears to conflict with the needs of the property, and proposals for large leisure complexes which would overwhelm the fragile landscape of the Spit and threaten its integrity;*
5. *Requests the State Party of the Russian Federation to halt immediately the current proposals, not to pursue the development of large leisure complexes and to review the designation of the economic zone;*
6. *Also requests the State Party of the Russian Federation to review the overall legal protection arrangements for the property in order to ensure that development respects the Outstanding Universal Value;*
7. *Urges the States Parties of Lithuania and the Russian Federation to prepare a joint Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property as a basis for future management, conservation and economic development; to strengthen collaboration on management and protection, in line with the assurances made at the time of inscription, and to put in place a coordinated management mechanism in line with the requirements of the Operational Guidelines;*
8. *Also urges the States Parties of Lithuania and the Russian Federation to develop, as a matter of urgency, an overall Tourism Strategy for the property, based on the UNESCO supported project on the Lithuanian part, in order to define sustainable approaches to tourism that respect the landscape and support local communities;*
9. *Further requests the States Parties of Lithuania and the Russian Federation to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a joint progress report on the state of conservation of the property, and the implementation of the above and of the recommendations of the December 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN*

*reactive monitoring mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

### **103. Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslav (Russian Federation) (C 1170)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2005

Criteria  
(ii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**29COM 8B.43; 32COM 7B.107; 33COM 7B.120**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property: 18,695USD for preparatory assistance (2002)

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
May 2009: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Gradual changes to the urban fabric: construction and restoration projects
- b) Inappropriate urban development
- c) Major changes to the property's skyline through the construction of the new Cathedral of the Assumption
- d) High rise projects

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1170>

#### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a 2009/2010 state of conservation report which provides information on thirteen construction and development projects and an additional eight restoration projects being undertaken in 2009 and early 2010. The report did not include a detailed progress report on the implementation of the recommendations of the May 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, as requested by the Committee at its 33rd session.

#### a) *New Constructions and Developments with the property*

The construction projects mentioned in the report include the following, some of which such as the Cathedral and the bridge, have already been completed:

1. Museum and Exhibition Complex with engineering infrastructure at Volga Embankment near house #32v (project listed as suspended)
2. Cultural and Entertainment Centre with engineering infrastructure at 3 Pervomayskaya Street (project listed as suspended)
3. Hotel with engineering infrastructure at 4 Pervomaysky Lane

4. Administrative Building and Residential House with engineering infrastructure at 12 Tereshkova Street
5. Construction (reconstitution) of Cathedral of Assumption with engineering infrastructure at Peace Boulevard
6. Residential house with offices, underground car parking and engineering infrastructure at Tereshkova Street in the vicinity of house #29a
7. Construction of 3-4-storey residential house with car parking and engineering infrastructure at Respublikanskaya Street in vicinity of house #47
8. Multi-storey car parking with engineering infrastructure with café, maintenance shop, car wash in the block at Bolshaya Oktaybrskaya Street, Mukomolny Lane, Kotorosl Embankment, Respublikanskaya Street
9. Hotel with engineering infrastructure at 9 Kooperativnaya Street
10. Multi-storey residential house with engineering infrastructure at October Avenue in the vicinity of house #5
11. Reconstruction of residential house with superstructure above carport for gym with amenity rooms and offices at 22 Sobinov Street (construction is not carried out)
12. Construction of Junction and Reinforced Concrete Bridge across Kotorosl River with Engineering Infrastructure
13. Yaroslavl Millennium Monument

Information provided includes photographs of the sites in question; elevations and or architectural renderings of the proposed construction (but not within its larger urban context), the name of the developer, and the approval status of the project in regard to the various Russian planning authorities and the “Russian World Heritage Committee”.

The report also notes that one of the main reconstruction areas is the Volga embankment area. Work to be undertaken includes the construction of a recreation area, the addition of a “fountain zone”, the redevelopment and landscaping of the entire area, and the construction of the already-mentioned Yaroslavl Millennium Monument. The report also describes a project for the enhancement of transport including the above-mentioned bridge across the Kotorosl River and the construction of a “new modern transport junction”.

The documentation provided, however, does not include any detailed project documents, any analysis of the projects within their larger context, nor any cultural heritage impact assessments for the major new constructions/urban developments mentioned in the report,, in terms of their impact on Outstanding Universal Value. In its report, the State Party notes that historic, town-planning and landscape analyses were implemented prior to the “area reconstruction,” without providing any details of those analyses.

In regard to the Cathedral of the Assumption, the State Party underlined that its reconstruction has a particular importance for reconstruction of historic appearance of the central part of Yaroslavl, and that the Cathedral’s skyline is one of the organizing verticals in the historic city panorama. The report states that areas near the cathedral will also be subject to reconstruction and redevelopment.

In March 2011, the World Heritage Centre received further information from civil society groups that the two level bridge across the Kotorosl River had been completed and that a further development project along the Kotorosl river bank is in the process of implementation. This information also stated that a hotel had been constructed instead of the historical park, and that more than ten other new constructions were underway within the boundary of the Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl and its buffer zone.

In April 2011, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre project documents for a five-star Hotel planned in the vicinity of the Cathedral of Assumption and a number of other historic buildings in the central part of the World Heritage property, which is under review by the Advisory Bodies.

b) *Management*

In regard to the management of the property, the State Party report does not contain any information in regard to the overall management system and legal protection for the property. Neither is there information on how planning permissions are granted or how coordination is carried out between stakeholders and authorities at different levels, as requested during the 2009 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission. The State Party has reported that the Russian World Heritage Committee has been empowered by the State Party as the official national coordination centre for conservation and management of World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body remained concerned however, that while the Russian World Heritage Committee reviews and makes recommendations on major development projects, that these projects are not being submitted to the World Heritage Centre in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

On 21 April 2011, the World Heritage Centre formally requested the State Party by letter and during a meeting with national authorities that any consideration, review and recommendations for implementation of projects, if issued by the Russian National World Heritage Committee or its Departments, should include a clear notice indicating that they do not imply or replace, in any way, the review by the World Heritage Committee, as required by the *Operational Guidelines*.

Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies express concern that the State Party report did not provide any updated information on the first stage of the implementation of a general development strategy for city planning until 2030 within the framework of the Urban Master Plan for Yaroslavl established in 2006, nor the regulatory act regarding the conservation area of the property initiated in 2008.

On 3 May 2011, the World Heritage Centre reiterated its concern to the State Party about the lack of information in response to the Committee's decision adopted at its 33rd session, and in particular information related to the management system and regulatory frameworks. The State Party was requested to provide this information as a matter of urgency.

*Conclusions*

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the property was inscribed under criteria (ii) and (iv), with its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) based on both the town planning scheme from the 18th century and the presence of architectural monuments from the 16th and the 17th centuries. Sustaining OUV, therefore, relies to a great extent on maintaining the original planning and spatial relationships, as well as ensuring that any new construction -respect the designs and materials of the existing buildings and does not overwhelm the architectural monuments or confuse the spatial planning.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies further note that since its inscription in 2005, the Committee has expressed concern about the new developments in the property and its buffer zone in order to protect its OUV. In the findings of the 2009 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission and the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) concern was expressed that the ongoing new construction projects at the property could have a negative impact on the OUV. Particular concern was expressed for the horizontality of the skyline with regard to the construction of a new Cathedral of the Assumption.

The Committee further requested the State Party to provide information to the World Heritage Centre on all major projects with the boundaries of the property in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. Despite this request by the Committee as well as ongoing contacts with the State Party by the World Heritage Centre, the State Party has not provided adequate information in regard to the ongoing, fast pace of urban development in within the World Heritage property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are extremely concerned at the number of hotel, apartment building, and parking garage developments presented in the report, as well as the bridge construction project at the Kotorosl river, and the “Yaroslavl Millennium Monument”.

As the report provides no detailed information on the materials to be used or the physical context, it is not possible to understand in detail how they fit into the surrounding urban environment. Further, the report does not make clear what the state of construction is for many of these projects. Some seem to already be in a state of construction or completion. Nevertheless what is indicated is the extremely extensive nature of the proposed development within the property.

From the information available, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the large number and scale of the new projects within the World Heritage property may have already caused a significant negative and possibly irreversible impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in relation to the town planning scheme from the 18th century, and the architectural monuments from the 16th and the 17th centuries.

In addition these major projects have not been referred to the World Heritage Centre in compliance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and there is a lack of information in regard to the management system in place to be able to control such developments.

In recognition of all these factors, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the property is faced with serious deterioration of its architectural and town-planning coherence, and that it is therefore facing an ascertained danger to its OUV as defined by Paragraph 179 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Committee may therefore wish to consider the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List in Danger and request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to develop, with the State Party, a Desired state of conservation and necessary corrective measures for the removal of the property from the World Heritage List in Danger. This mission should also review the existing management system and decision-making mechanisms for the property, including legislative and regulatory framework, institutional arrangements and existing planning tools.

**Draft Decision:        35 COM 7B.103**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.120**, adopted at its 33rd session (Sevilla, 2009),
3. Takes notes of the information provided by the State Party in its state of conservation report and expresses its deep concern about interventions carried out by the State Party, as well as a large number of completed and proposed development and



construction projects that have not been submitted to the World Heritage Centre in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;

4. Reiterates its utmost concern about the lack of follow-up in response to the 2009 reactive monitoring mission recommendations, and in particular the:
  - a) Establishment and approval, in conformity with the official juridical documents, of the process of review and delivery of the building permissions within the boundary of the property and its buffer zone,
  - b) Official submission of all projects which could impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property to the World Heritage Centre, for review, prior to any approval and delivery of the building permissions,
  - c) Transparency of the planning and decision making processes,
  - d) Designation by the Federal authorities of the administration in charge of the process of monitoring of the state of conservation of the property,
  - e) Adequate human resources for the management and monitoring of the property,
  - f) Establishment of a limitation for excessive use and opening of underground spaces within the boundaries of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone,
  - g) Avoidance of the use of new and inappropriate materials (such as metal and glass) as main materials on the facades,
  - h) Implementation of restrictions of outdoor advertisements;
5. Strongly reiterates its requests to submit to the World Heritage Centre information on any construction or development projects that may have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in conformance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and requests the State Party to halt any such ongoing projects which may have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, until these projects can be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the World Heritage Committee;
6. Strongly urges the State Party to establish an appropriate management system for the property to handle planning permissions in a clear and transparent manner, and to ensure that there is an effective coordination between the authorities concerned and stakeholders;
7. Expresses serious concern that the ongoing changes to the horizontal urban skyline, and the quantity and scale of new construction and development projects within the property have had a negative impact on the urban planning scheme of the 18th century and the architectural monuments of the 16th and 17th centuries, and therefore constituting an ascertained threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
8. **Decides in conformity with Paragraphs 177 and 179 of the Operational Guidelines to inscribe the Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl on the List of World Heritage in Danger;**
9. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to develop with the State Party, in accordance to paragraphs 178 – 186 of the Operational Guidelines, a Desired state of conservation and necessary corrective measures for the removal of the property from the World Heritage List in Danger. This mission should also review the existing management system and decision-making mechanisms for the property, including legislative and regulatory framework, institutional arrangements and existing planning tools;

10. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including all of the issues mentioned above in this decision, and in particular the Desired State of Conservation and corrective measures for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

#### **104. Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1990

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

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**32 COM 7B.105; 33 COM 7B.118; 34 COM 7B.95**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 17,620 for the St Petersburg International Conference, January 2007

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 18,000 from the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust

Previous monitoring missions:  
February 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission; January/February 2007: International Conference for Eastern and Central Europe Countries on the Application of Scientific and Technological Achievements in the Management and Preservation of Historic Cities inscribed on the World Heritage List, St Petersburg; 2009 and March 2010: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
a) Quality of new design projects in the inscribed zone;  
b) High-rise development ;  
c) Confusion over definition and extent of inscribed property and its buffer zones.

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/540>

#### Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a state of conservation report which was requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010).

##### a) *Boundary issues*

By a letter of the Commission of the Russian Federation for UNESCO dated 13 April 2011, the State Party submitted the inventory of several components of the property and informed the World Heritage Centre that an international expert forum to discuss boundary issues will be organised from 29 May to 1 June 2011. No details of the agenda have been provided at the time of drafting the report. In view of the short notice before the 35th session of World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the results

of the international expert forum may not be properly communicated to the World Heritage Committee.

b) *“Okhta Centre” Tower*

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note that they did not receive any official written communication from the federal authorities regarding the status of the “Okhta Centre” Tower project. However, in a letter received on 1 February 2011, the Governor of Saint Petersburg informed the World Heritage Centre that the Municipality, taking into account the recommendations and decisions of the World Heritage Committee, has cancelled the City Government’s Decree which authorized a height of 403 meters for the site of the “Okhta Centre” Tower. It appears that this will lead to the revision of the project including its possible change of location.

c) *Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

The local authorities of Saint Petersburg have requested the national authorities by letter of 8 July 2010 to revise the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the property and also integrate the recommendations of the 2010 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission. However, no revised Draft of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been received by the World Heritage Centre, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, at the time of drafting this report.

d) *Management of the property*

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the need to provide an overarching management framework for the property has not been addressed as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session and reiterated at its 34th session.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note that the State Party did not provide a state of conservation report and did not address the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee at its previous sessions, in particular the lack of an appropriately defined buffer zone for all components of the property, including the Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg, the surrounding landscape and the panorama along the Neva River, as well as the lack of an appropriate management framework necessary to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They note as well that the revision of the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has not been undertaken by the national authorities.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies further note that the City Municipality cancelled the City Government’s Decree which authorized a height of 403 meters for the site of the “Okhta Centre” Tower, but the official position of the State Party is still unclear. The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note that there is a possibility that the project could be moved to a new location.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies are still expecting the official position of the State Party on this project and remind the relevant national authorities that the new project proposal, as well as any new project within the property or a project having a potential visual impact on the World Heritage property, should be accompanied by a detailed heritage impact assessment, in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties.

**Draft Decision:      35 COM 7B.104**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decisions **32 COM 7B.105**, **33 COM 7B.118** and **34 COM 7B.95**, adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008), 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions respectively,
3. Deeply regrets that the State Party did not submit a state of conservation report, as well as any boundary modification/clarification as requested by the World Heritage Committee and did not address the World Heritage Committee request to extend the buffer zone of the property;
4. Expresses its grave concern that the need to provide an overarching management framework for the property has not been addressed as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session;
5. Notes the recent information received from the State Party that it plans to organize an international expert forum in Saint Petersburg in order to discuss boundary issues, as requested by the World Heritage Committee; and requests it to submit to the World Heritage Centre all relevant information on the conclusions and outcomes of the forum;
6. Acknowledges the information regarding “Okhta Centre” Tower project including the possible revision and change of location, provided by the municipal authorities, and also regrets that the State Party has not provided an official confirmation to the World Heritage Committee;
7. Also requests that the new project proposal, as well as any new project within the property or a project having a potential visual impact on the property, should be accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment, in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties;
8. Further regrets that the State Party did not submit a revised draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value as requested by the World Heritage Committee, and reiterates its request to the State Party to submit a revised draft, taking into account the recommendations of the 2010 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, by **1 October 2011**;
9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

## 107. Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1992

### Criteria

(iv)

### Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**16 COM XA**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/632>

### Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre had requested the State Party in three letters dated 18 January, 23 April and 23 November 2010, to provide the World Heritage Centre with a detailed report on the state of conservation of several World Heritage properties with religious meaning in the Russian Federation, including information on development projects and on the intention to change the management system and use of these World Heritage properties. Concerned by the lack of information on the state of conservation of the property, by the challenges faced due to the change in the management system, and taking into account that a new Federal Law on the transfer of State or Municipal properties of religious origin to religious organizations has been recently approved by the President of the Russian Federation (2010), the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies considered necessary to present a state of conservation report of this property for review by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session and requested the State Party to submit a state of conservation report by 1 March 2011.

The State Party did not submit a state of conservation report as requested. It explained in a letter of 13 April 2011, that in accordance with this new Federal Law on the transfer of State or Municipal properties of religious origin to religious organizations, the procedures for the transfer of the property are currently being developed by representatives of the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation, the Commission of the Russian Federation for UNESCO and the Patriarchate of Moscow and All-Russia. The State Party provides no further information and states that after the transition period the World Heritage Centre will be informed.

It is to be noted however, that during the international seminar on "The role of religious communities in the management of World Heritage properties" organized in November 2010 by the World Heritage Centre in Kiev, Ukraine, the representatives of the Department for External Church Relations of the Moscow Patriarchate (DCER) actively participated and

informed in a presentation about the elaboration of a special state programme dedicated to the development of this property including the reconstruction of the monastery buildings, the creation of a research centre, the regeneration of the environment, the construction of a tourist centre and modern infrastructure on the island. They also informed that the property, both the monastery complex and the museum-reserve, are presided over by the monastic superior, a representative of the Russian Orthodox Church.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note the apparent lack of monitoring as the State Party did not provide information on the state of conservation of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note with concern the information transmitted by the religious representative during the Kyiv Seminar regarding planned reconstruction of the monastery buildings. Furthermore, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the State Party should inform the World Heritage Centre of any project that may affect the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of a World Heritage property before irreversible decisions are taken, including those which are part of the special state programme. The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies consider that all project proposals should be accompanied by detailed heritage impact assessments, in conformity with the ICOMOS *Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties* and that submitted to the World Heritage Centre in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further stress the importance of setting up an adequate management system for the property. As for all World Heritage properties of religious meaning in the Russian Federation, the State Party has been invited by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) to establish a special board, including all stakeholders concerned, including representatives of the Patriarchate of Moscow and All-Russia, in order to develop and implement appropriate legal measures and rules for conservation, restoration and use, a joint management system for the religious World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation, and specific measures appropriate for each religious property.

Due to the huge challenges faced by religious heritage and sacred places world-wide, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to actively participate in the development of a Thematic Programme on Religious and Sacred Heritage. This Programme seeks to create an action plan for the protection of religious and sacred heritage world-wide aiming to enhancing the role of communities and preventing any misunderstandings, tensions or stereotypes.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies suggest that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to the property to review the existing management system and decision-making mechanisms, and to assess the overall state of conservation of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also suggest that a special training workshop for the religious representatives involved in the management and use of the World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation be organised by the State Party and the Moscow Patriarchate to take place during this reactive monitoring mission.

**Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.107**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Regrets that the State Party did not submit a state of conservation report;
3. Expresses its concern about the apparent lack of monitoring mechanisms and adequate management structures and urges the State Party to develop and implement appropriate legal measures and rules for conservation, restoration and management and use of religious World Heritage properties, as well as to develop a joint management system by establishing a special board including all stakeholders, as well as representatives of the Patriarchate of Moscow and All-Russia;
4. Also expresses its concern about the possible reconstruction of the monastery buildings and other major interventions in the sensitive landscape of the property, in terms of impact on its Outstanding Universal Value;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre all project proposals, including those which are part of the special state programme, that may threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and also requests that all new project proposals should be accompanied by heritage impact assessments, in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties;
6. Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to the property to :
  - a) Review the existing management system and decision-making mechanisms,
  - b) Assess the overall state of conservation of the property;
7. Invites the State Party and the Moscow Patriarchate to organise a special training workshop, in close coordination with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, for the religious representatives involved in the management and use of the World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation, to take place during the joint reactive monitoring mission;
8. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

**110. Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev)**

See Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add.2

## 111. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

### Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

### Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**32 COM 7B.110; 33 COM 7B.124; 34 COM 7B.102**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property (from 1987 to 2004): USD 371,357

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 211,900 (Conservation of Hagia Sophia); USD 36,686.30 (Convention France-UNESCO); USD 155,000 (in the framework of the International Safeguarding Campaign for Istanbul and Göreme).

### Previous monitoring missions

2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004: World Heritage Centre missions, April 2006, May 2008, March 2009: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Continued degradation of the vernacular architecture within the protected zones (particularly Ottoman-period timber houses in the Zeyrek and Süleymaniye core areas);
- b) Quality of repairs and reconstruction of the Roman and Byzantine Walls and associated palace structures, including Tekfur Saray and the "Anemas Dungeon" (Blachernae Palace);
- c) Uncontrolled development and absence of a World Heritage management plan;
- d) Lack of coordination between national and municipal authorities and of decision-making bodies for safeguarding World Heritage at the site;
- e) Potential impacts of new buildings and new development projects on the World Heritage site mainly within the framework of Law 5366, and the lack of impact studies before large-scale developments are implemented;
- f) Potential impact of the proposed new metro bridge across the Golden Horn.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/356>

### Current conservation issues

On 7 February 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report.

#### *a) Management plan development*

The State Party submitted an outline of the draft Istanbul Management Plan prepared by three universities and a private consultant (an architect's firm). At this stage it appears that this draft does not yet reflect the complexity of the urban property, or set out a management system that might bring together all the key stakeholders to agree upon appropriate constraints and mechanisms to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) is sustained. Furthermore, the draft plan does not relate the management of the property to the fact that some 40% of the overall historic peninsula had been declared as urban renewal zones, including nearly all the shores of the historic peninsula that reflect the essential links between the inscribed property and its maritime development. There appears to be limited guidance in the draft on how to deal with the impact of major transport and infrastructure works on the historic fabric, the historic peninsula and its setting. The urban conservation of the neighbourhoods of Süleymaniye, Zeyrek and others in Fatih does not seem to have been



fully considered in relation to major proposed 'regeneration' schemes: clear policies for the neighbourhoods – the last surviving examples of urban quarters from the Ottoman period – have not been included. There is also an absence of tourism policies for the historic peninsula, of policies related to maintaining the integrity of the property, and of policies for protecting key views and silhouettes.

However, on 17 March 2011 the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that further progress had been made on the finalisation of the management plan. The State Party submitted a more detailed copy of the first draft in Turkish on 15 April 2011. They also clarified that the management plan will be applicable to the whole Historic Peninsula, in compliance with Turkish legislation which stipulates its status as a conservation site. On 22 April 2011, the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that the text of the management plan had been modified according to the comments of the “Consultative Board”. And on 5 May 2011, the State Party reported that this ‘final’ draft had been further discussed by the Istanbul Site Management Authority. On 16 May 2011, shortly before the finalization of this document, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre the new version of the draft management plan, dated April 2011, in Turkish. The Coordination and Monitoring Board will further study the revised draft and it is anticipated that approval will follow shortly.

The Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) report for the Golden Horn Metro Bridge commissioned by the Turkish authorities (see (h) below) commented on numerous communication deficiencies in the management structure, both with the World Heritage Centre and between the authorities themselves. It also points out that existing protection areas beyond the inscribed property related to its visual integrity are not integrated into the management plan, while other parts of the setting such as Kasimpasa and Uskadar are neither integrated into the plan, nor protected. It stresses the need for the historic peninsula to be protected as part of its wider landscape, as the urban areas of Eyup, Beyoglu/Galata and Uskudur (Asian peninsula) and the Princess islands in the Sea of Marmara, contribute to its overall value and “should be incorporated into the property management system as quickly as possible”. This is to ensure that future development measures are compatible with the OUV.

*b) Ottoman Houses Rehabilitation Strategy / Programme*

The State Party reports on a number of ongoing restoration projects in Suleymaniye and Zeyrek districts. The implementation of a “Repair of Timber Houses Program”, which aims to sponsor and provide technical assistance to buildings owners, is mentioned in the State Party report, but no further information is provided.

*c) Urban Renewal Projects and Impact Assessments*

A letter of the Director-General of Cultural Heritage and Museums requesting to avoid any major projects that might impact on the OUV of the World Heritage properties and would need to be notified to the World Heritage Centre in line with Paragraph 172 of *Operational Guidelines*, has been sent to all authorities involved with World Heritage or Tentative List sites. On Urban Renewal projects, the State Party confirms that cultural values and spatial characteristics of the concerned areas are taken into account.

*d) Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

The State Party also submitted a draft retrospective Statement of OUV. This will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document *WHC-11/35.COM/8E*).

*e) Traffic Plan*

No specific information has been provided. However the Visual Impact study for the Golden Horn metro bridge (see (h) below) comments on the existing transport strategy and on the

fact that traffic studies show that the current network planning will not suffice to meet future requirements.

f) *Marmaray Rail tube Tunnel Project*

The State Party did not submit new information on this project, e.g. on the impact of stations on the historic landscape.

g) *Bosphorus Transition Tunnel Project for Motor Vehicles*

The State Party states that the project was approved in principle in October 2010, and enclosed an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment for the Eurasia Tunnel Project.

The impact assessment study does not include a specific assessment of the impact on the attributes of the OUV of the property. It does however conclude that “the project is close to the UNESCO listed historic peninsula of Istanbul. The potential exists for the project to have both direct and indirect impacts on this internationally important cultural site during construction and operation of the project”. It points out that design changes have been made so that “no structure exceeds approximately 6 m above existing ground-level and all are below the line of the old sea walls and the city beyond them so that no structure intrudes into the view of the old city. Key design revisions include reducing the height of the Operations Building to a single storey structure and the removal of signage on the toll plaza”. It further states that contact with the World Heritage Centre should be maintained during the construction period. According to the State Party, this project will reduce the volume of traffic within the historic peninsula, although a few roads will have a small increase in traffic.

h) *Golden Horn Metro Bridge Heritage Impact Assessment*

The State Party has submitted a VIA report of the Golden Horn Metro Bridge, commissioned from a group of independent experts from Aachen University in consultation with an international steering committee. The State Party has also submitted a separate report by another international expert team, entitled Historical and Visual Impact Assessment (HVIA). This study is part of a research doctorate at Nuova Gorica University and the IUAV University in Venice. Both studies were commissioned by the Metropolitan Municipality of Istanbul.

The authors of the VIA report acknowledge that the study was unusual in being carried out after tenders had been agreed for the bridge, construction work had started on the pylons and the metro lines were already in place at either end.

The VIA report considered the potential impact on the OUV of the property of a cable stay Metro Bridge supported by two 65 m pylons and with a metro station near the centre. The impact analysis is said to have been undertaken in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidelines on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties and based on the OUV. The 2010 draft retrospective Statement of OUV was apparently not used. The VIA confirms the very large scale of the proposed bridge and the sensitivity of its proposed location across the Golden Horn. Various images included in the VIA show the potential impact of the bridge on the OUV of the property. It is concluded that from some views the pylons compete with the Suleimaniye Mosque minaret on the skyline, and that the deck of the bridge adds a new element to the city’s silhouette that ‘has to be classified as a grave impact on the city skyline’. Furthermore, the deck of the bridge is above the height of other bridges and its presence ‘changes the historic urban landscape significantly’, and has a ‘severe impact on the sensitive shoreline’. It was also pointed out in a preliminary text that the proposed bridge would gravely alter visual relationships from high points in the historic peninsula and Beyoglu/Galata and alter significantly the overall impression of the historic landscape. Overall, it stated that the bridge structure would impair the cityscape across the entire heartland of the Golden Horn and would have severe negative effects on the OUV of the property.

In order to mitigate this impact, the VIA experts, in collaboration with the Steering Committee, convened a workshop to consider modifications to the bridge with advice from structural

engineers. A discussion of revisions was undertaken within extreme constraints - the already existing foundations for the pylons, the need to minimise the number of supports to reduce costs, the need to optimise the flow of water and use the completed metro lines at either end. The possible modifications were therefore limited to adjustments of the height of the pylons, down to 48 m, to slight reduction of the width of the pylons, to changes to the glass structure of the metro station to make it lighter, and to modifications of the viaduct arrangements at either end.

A further VIA was then undertaken on the revised designs. It suggested a reduced impairment of the view from some high and low level points, although at lower level there will still be significant adverse change and the proposed viaducts will lead to considerable disturbance of the urban fabric. Furthermore noise pollution could be severe. However, this issue could not be addressed due to lack of time.

Further, the VIA recommended that the link between the Historic Peninsula and the water, which has had a decisive role in the development of Istanbul, should be reflected in the Statement of OUV, and that the waterfront zones proposed as "urban renewal zones" in the draft management plan should be considered extremely carefully.

Overall the experts carrying out the VIA considered that the recommendations for the modifications of the bridge were no more than initial steps, and that further development of this project should be guided by some kind of Expert Panel tasked to also consider the wider development and management of the Historic Peninsula and particularly further infrastructural projects.

The proposed bridge had been approved in 2005, but was first considered by the Committee in 2006, when it requested an impact study in conformity with international standards. In spite of many repeated requests for impact studies to consider also alternatives to a cable-stay bridge, the independent impact study was not carried out until 2010, by which time all necessary permissions were in place and construction had started. The work has been put on hold in August 2010, in line with the recommendations of the 34th session of the Committee.

The second report entitled *Historical and Visual Impact Assessment* suggests a series of indicators for understanding projects and their context, such as visual, functional, significances, etc. On the basis of these it suggests ways of achieving a preliminary impact assessment for the Golden Horn Bridge, based on ICOMOS Guidance.

It suggests that any analysis must start with an assessment of the current state of buildings, monuments, infrastructures, etc., aimed at defining the visual, historical, functional, symbolic, perceptive elements, but that currently the information needs to be gathered from maps and other sources, as much of this data is not available in the absence of the management plan. The analysis then needs to identify views with meaning and the various options interrogated for their impact.

On 15 April 2011, the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that the Turkish authorities have made modifications to the design of the bridge in accordance with the conclusions of the two impact assessment studies. They stated that the cable stay structure will be lowered to 47 m, two thirds of the metro station structure has been cancelled, the diameter of the bridge pylons have been reduced to 8,5 m, the curved suspension cables reduced to 17 cm and that transparent sound prevention panels and landscape projects have been added (although no details of these have been provided).

*i) Awareness raising*

The State Party further informed the World Heritage Centre on 26 April 2011 about the Turkish translation of the ICOMOS Guidance on heritage impact assessments for Cultural World Heritage properties, for dissemination in a circular letter among the relevant authorities to guide the process of future project evaluation. In addition, the World Heritage Centre has been informed of a non-profit campaign entitled "We should not ignore it!" by a major private

media group aimed at raising awareness and engaging citizens and local communities in the protection of cultural heritage in Turkey.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the detailed VIA carried out for the Golden Horn Metro Bridge based on the ICOMOS Guidance and particularly its conclusion that the proposed bridge would have a significant adverse impact on what the VIA report describes as “the almost pristine urban landscape of Istanbul that represents a priceless treasure that is closely interlinked with the values and attributes of the World Heritage property”.

The VIA was conducted in difficult circumstances, some five years after the location of the bridge was agreed and after work on its construction had already started. In recognising its adverse impact, there was little room for manoeuvre within which mitigation measures could be identified. Within their extremely narrow confines, the experts have recommended that the height of the bridge pylons be reduced and that the roof of the metro station be made lighter, to which the State Party has now agreed. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the report acknowledges that the proposed changes will not remove the overall negative impact but could mitigate it to an extent, from some views, and slightly improve the impact of the viaducts at either end of the bridge.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that, notwithstanding the fact that the World Heritage Committee had discussed the conservation of the property at its 27th, 28th, 29th, 30th, 31st, 32nd, 33rd and 34th sessions (from 2003 to 2010), this major project was not brought to the attention of the World Heritage Committee at the earliest possible stage, and that work was only halted after recommendations made at the 34th session.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the World Heritage Committee highlight this regrettable situation reflecting the serious communication discontinuities within the management and planning authorities in Istanbul, the lack of adequate communication with the World Heritage Centre, the lack of overall traffic management strategy and the lack of an agreed and robust management plan for the property. They recall that the World Heritage Committee has repeatedly expressed concerns during the past seven sessions over legislative arrangements and the absence of a protective buffer zone.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the fact that a management plan is being prepared and its final version has still to be submitted by the authorities. They consider that the draft outline as submitted in February 2011 does not sufficiently address the complex, multi-disciplinary needs of the city. The plan needs further development in order to define a structured and coordinated management approach, with clear roles and responsibilities, to ensure an effective management system for the property’s historic urban landscape, taking into account the complexity and the size of the property, its manifold challenges, as well as the need for inputs from a wide range of stakeholders, both public and private. To achieve this, there is a need to form active partnerships between all relevant authorities, citizens and stakeholder groups. The management plan should reflect the development of a protection and planning framework that is based on a thorough analysis of the heritage assets that sustain the OUV. Also, the Plan needs to be supported by Traffic and Tourism Plans to ensure a synergy between the ways the various needs of, and demands on, the property are addressed in the context of sustaining the OUV.

They also note that even the currently planned proposals for transport improvements, including the planned Bosphorus Transition Tunnel Project for Motor Vehicles and the Marmaray Bosphorus Rail tube Tunnel Project are not considered adequate for providing an overall sustainable transport system for the city, as acknowledged in the VIA report. The Management Plan should also address the wider setting of the property and particularly the

strategic link between the land and the water. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee indicate the need for a protective buffer zone to be put in place to acknowledge the symbiotic relationships between the property and its setting and the property and its skyline. This issue, and that of integrated management and planning, has not been addressed despite the requests of the World Heritage Committee at previous sessions.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the proposed Golden Horn Bridge, even if modified as suggested, would have a negative impact on the OUV. Despite the fact that the bridge is joining existing metro lines and work has started on the piles (although now halted) and that there appears to be extremely limited room to make changes to the overall structure, they nevertheless stress that every effort should be made to consider what further mitigations might be possible, taking up the suggestion of an independent expert Advisory Panel, as put forward by the experts who conducted the VIA.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further stress that the bridge project is symptomatic of the wide range of threats to the property, identified in World Heritage Committee reports over the past seven years, that have not been systematically addressed through the development of a coordinated management system, coordinated conservation strategies, specific development strategies, including for traffic and tourism, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, and thus the whole property is vulnerable to constant, persistent and wide-ranging threats.

**Draft Decision:      35 COM 7B.111**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **32 COM 7B.11**, **33 COM 7B.124** and **34 COM 7B.102** adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008), 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions respectively,*
3. *Recognises the efforts of the State Party in the preparation of the detailed Impact Assessments for the Golden Horn Bridge carried out by international experts on the basis of the ICOMOS Guidance and acknowledges with concern the conclusions that the bridge design it had considered at its last session would have a grave and detrimental impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
4. *Notes the proposed minor changes to the design of the bridge proposed by the experts, in particular reducing the height of the pylons and amending the cover of the metro station which could have some beneficial improvements on the impact from certain views; but expresses its great concern that the bridge, even if amended as proposed, would nevertheless still have an overall negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
5. *Deeply regrets that the bridge was approved in principle in 2005 without any referral to the World Heritage Centre, not in compliance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and that its alignment has been fixed by work on metro tunnels on either end, and that further substantial amendments to its alignment and design appear to be almost impossible;*
6. *Also regrets the lack of adequate communication and the lack of adequate responses to its recommendations on the bridge and on the need for conservation plans, an*

effective management system, development strategies for traffic and tourism, and a buffer zone;

7. Also acknowledges the efforts of the State Party in the preparation of a draft management plan but considers that the submitted outline of a draft plan falls short of the wide ranging, multi-disciplinary and effective document that is needed, and should be further developed to set out an effective protection and conservation framework and a robust management system that will involve relevant stakeholders, encourage dialogue between authorities and involve citizens and their interest groups and adequately responds to the major challenges that face the historic urban landscape of the city;
8. Further acknowledges the information of the State Party on the progress of approval of the management plan and requests the State Party to submit the final version of the fully developed management plan as approved by the authorities in English or French by **1 October 2011**, to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;
9. Recommends that the State Party appoint an independent expert Advisory Committee for the property, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre, to advise on the development of a strategic framework for infrastructural development and conservation, to guide the management of the property, and to also consider all ways possible to mitigate the impacts of the Golden Horn Bridge;
10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

## **118. Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 7B.21; 32 COM 7B.115; 33 COM 7B.130**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

October 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Urban development projects:

- a) Lack of overall management of new developments;
- b) Lack of analysis and description of the townscape characteristics relevant to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and important views related to the property and its buffer zone;
- c) Lack of clearly established maximum heights for new development, for the backdrops of the World Heritage areas as well as along the waterfront;
- d) Lack of awareness of developers, building professionals and the wider public about the World Heritage property, its Outstanding Universal Value and requirements under the World Heritage Convention.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1150>

### Current conservation issues

On 25 February 2011, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report followed by supplementary information on 5 April 2011, in response to a request from the World Heritage Centre for details on the proposed Liverpool Waters Development. Preliminary information on the proposed Liverpool Waters Development was submitted in 2010, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The proposed development covers 60 ha in the property and its buffer zone to the north of Pier Head. It extends some 2km along the waterfront and covers five docks with open water: Bramley Moore Dock, Nelson Dock, Salisbury Dock, Collingwood Dock, (all protected Grade II), Princes Dock, Princes Half-Tide Dock and East Waterloo Dock, and other former dock areas of West Waterloo Dock and Trafalgar Dock have been subject to earlier in-filling.

The dock site is reclaimed land – a feature of the development of the Liverpool Docks – bounded by the River Mersey in the west and by the Dock Wall and Tobacco Warehouses in the East. The docks are characterized by their monumental construction and materials of granite and sandstone, as is the river wall and the major part of the Dock Wall which is built of cyclopean granite. Some of the original entrances have associated entrance lodges, built of brick and granite, and monumental entrances. The docks originally housed single storey linear transit sheds on the quaysides, with ancillary facilities such as entrance lodges, cranes and an elevated railway. The site historically had the character of a low-rise, utilitarian and industrial area.

An outline planning application for the Master Plan was submitted in October 2010. This includes proposals for 9,152 residential units, 305,499 sqm of commercial business space, 69,735 sqm of hotel and conference space as well as retail, leisure and community facilities and a cruise ship terminal. The scheme proposes a high density of development and incorporates two clusters of tall buildings, with towers up to approximately 195 metres in height, and a series of medium rise blocks, approaching 45 metres high, along the river frontage. Many of the buildings have underground parking. The scheme is planned to be developed over at least a 30 year period.

As the Environmental Impact Assessment submitted by the developer has failed to consider adequately the impact of the proposals on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, and because of the scale of the proposals, the State Party report included a separate, independent Impact Assessment commissioned by English Heritage, the Government's adviser on the historic environment. This detailed report was based on the approved Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and considered impact on the attributes of the OUV. The overall conclusion of this assessment is that the proposals will result in an array of negative impacts on the OUV (a number of which will be of major magnitude), and that overall there will be a significantly damaging impact on the OUV.

In detail, the assessment considered that the vital relationship of the property with the river will be severely compromised through mid-rise buildings on the sea wall; the legibility of the Central Docks and the central commercial core of the City will be damaged by the secondary cluster of tall buildings; the cumulative effect of the development will be to overwhelm the defining traditional characteristics of the area with opposing modern ones (in other words, low, horizontal and transverse historic emphases will be replaced by height, verticality and the longitudinal); the underground archaeology will be compromised by the insertion of underground parking across historic dock walls, into the bottoms of dock basins, and into the fill of historic quaysides; and the failure of the development to respect fundamental notions of form and function will damage authenticity. The scheme is also said to be non-compliant with national and local policies, including Liverpool City Council's Urban Development Plan.

The Management Plan for the property, parts of which were adopted as supplementary planning guidance following the recommendations of the 2006 mission, has also not been respected. An objective of the plan states that Liverpool City Council will *'ensure that new development respects the significance of the Site and is appropriate to the historic urban grain and the architectural and townscape context'*.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies observe that the Master Plan has progressed so far although it is not in compliance with the Management Plan for the property nor with the Urban Development Plan. At the time of inscription, the protection for the property was accepted on the basis of adequate planning and development control mechanisms. The 2006 mission highlighted the impressive planning system that had been put in place and stated that it was agreed, that the 'inscription should call for the introduction of a stricter regime of planning control based on a thorough analysis and description of townscape characteristics and sense of place. These then should be taken as a point of departure to establish consensus upstream over the extent and range of development in and around the World Heritage property, and ways and means to achieve this. Benefits would include more consistency in decision-making and more clarity for the public at large, including developers and local heritage conservation groups, as well as the World Heritage Committee. It also said that "for the moment, no additional statutory controls follow from the inclusion of a site in the World Heritage List although, in accordance with the guidance, the outstanding international importance of a World Heritage site as a key material consideration must be taken into account by local planning authorities in determining planning and listed building consent applications".

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies highlight the fact that that the proposed development has been shown by the independent Impact Assessment to represent a major threat to the property, which will have irreversible consequences. If constructed, the whole area would completely engulf the historic docks and all that would be visible is the water between the buildings. The tobacco warehouses behind would be dwarfed and there would appear to be absolutely no way that the historic docks could be "read" from the river or their association with the warehouses, dock wall, and commercial quarter with its Three Graces (Royal Liver Building, Cunard Building, Port of Liverpool Building) be understood. Both the authenticity and integrity of the property would be severely compromised and the OUV threatened.



**Draft Decision:      35 COM 7B.118**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Expresses its extreme concern at the proposed development of Liverpool Waters in terms of the potential impact of its dense, high and mid-rise buildings on the form and design of the historic docks and thus on Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
3. Notes that the independent Impact Assessment commissioned by English Heritage clearly sets out the significantly damaging negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
4. Also notes that the proposed development is not in compliance with the property Management Plan nor with the Liverpool Urban Development Plan;
5. Urges the State Party to ensure that these proposals are not approved, as failure to do so could lead to consideration of loss of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
6. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, as soon as possible, to assess planning procedures and the overall development strategies for the property;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

### 119. Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia) (C 567 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2000

Criteria  
(iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**32 COM 7B.119; 34 COM 7B. 105**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 8 000 for the elaboration of a Tentative List and the preparation of the nomination files of Tiwanaku and Samaipata.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 870 000 (2008-2011, Japanese Funds-in-Trust-JFIT project)

Previous monitoring missions

August 2002: UNESCO and International Expert Mission; in the framework of the JFIT project - November 2007: World Heritage Centre Preparatory Mission; February – March 2009: World Heritage Centre Technical Assessment Mission for the implementation of a JFIT project; November 2009: World Heritage Centre/UNESCO Quito Office follow-up Mission; November 2010: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a management plan for the site;
- b) Lack of coordinated conservation policies and interventions between the national government and the Municipality of Tiwanaku;
- c) Need for the designation of a national counterpart for the JFIT project and a site manager at the local level;
- d) Lack of governance.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/567>  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/597>

#### Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a state of conservation report as was requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). However, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out in November 2010 to evaluate the current state of conservation of the property, as well as the management arrangements and the progress made in the implementation of prior Decisions of the World Heritage Committee.

a) *Management system*

The mission reports that legislative and regulatory frameworks are currently being reviewed with a new Ministerial Decree foreseen for the property to regulate the roles and responsibilities of the various entities at the local and national levels. The proposed management system will entail participation from the local communities; however the mission noted that the proposed Board will include political representatives who will be making technical decisions. Modifications to the composition of the Board have been suggested to ensure the technical management of the site. As for institutional arrangements, the

appointment of new directors at different levels and the hiring of professionally trained staff are expected to improve failed co-ordination and also facilitate dialogue between the local and national governments, for better conservation and management of the property. However, there are still issues to be resolved regarding skilled technical workers to carry out interventions.

The management plan for the property has not been finalized, which has hindered the sustained implementation of actions for the property. The mission noted that a participatory approach is needed to ensure its adoption by the diverse stakeholders involved with the property. It is important that the management plan for the property be integrated with on-going initiatives focused on the development of land use and development programmes currently being financed by the World Bank for the Lake *Titicaca* Project.

*b) Protection of the property*

The mission reports that no policy has been developed for the integrated management of the property and its surrounding areas, and that land use plans have yet to be developed. Only the monumental centre has been physically de-limited, however no surveys have been carried out to determine the extent of the area that needs to be protected. The zoning of the property, including the definition of a buffer zone, remains a critical need. In addition, the lack of enforcement of regulations and the limited awareness regarding the significance of the archaeological heritage has impacted the remains as no archaeological evaluation or supervision is conducted when works are being implemented. Municipal ordinances are needed to provide regulations for the use of the various zones, as well as procedures for all public works.

*c) Current state of conservation*

The mission reports that information on interventions carried out is very limited and there is no central repository of data that would facilitate decision-making for the property. As for the archaeological structures, the mission carried out a detailed inspection and identified decay factors and processes arising both from natural and man-made phenomena. Main issues identified are related to the uncontrolled flow of rainwater and lack of proper drainage, soil erosion, biological and stone decay. The mission also noted that interventions at buildings have not been based on archaeological and topographic information, and there is no integrated approach to interventions which has greatly impacted the structures, in particular the *Akapana* building. Additionally, there are no visitor management strategies in place which has also affected the fabric of the property. Adequate interpretation and presentation is also lacking, in particular the relationship between the ceremonial and the urban centres. The management plan will need to include a comprehensive conservation plan, with precise interventions for each of the monuments including guidelines and principles that take into account practice and standards at the international level, as well as a public use plan. The existing museums are in poor condition and affecting the existing collections, and no interventions are currently being carried out pending the judicial resolution of cases involving both museums.

*d) UNESCO Project for the Conservation and Preservation of Tiwanaku and the Akapana Pyramid*

The mission reports that the implementation of the Japanese Funds-in-Trust (JFIT) project has been hindered by the lack of co-ordination between the various entities at the national and local levels, however new arrangements are expected to overcome this impasse. New timeframes and a plan of activities need to be determined in accordance with new conditions in the country, and pending the approval of the Ministerial Decree to ensure the official endorsement and sustained implementation of the project.

## Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the World Heritage Committee express its concern regarding the delay in the finalization of the property's management plan. They consider that current approaches to the interventions being carried out at the property, with particular focus on the Akapana Pyramid, should be re-evaluated, with a focus on scientific archaeological interventions and conservation actions. They also recommend that the World Heritage Committee invite the State Party to pursue with urgency the organization of an international meeting to define regulations and guidelines for the development of a conservation plan for the property.

## **Draft Decision:      35 COM 7B.119**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.105**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit the required state of conservation report as requested at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010);*
4. *Notes the results of the November 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; endorses its recommendations and requests the State Party to:*
  - a) *Finalize the process for the adoption and enforcement of the new Ministerial Decree for the property,*
  - b) *Secure the required human and financial resources for the conservation and management of the property,*
  - c) *Carry out an archaeological survey of the area adjacent to the property, in order to define a buffer zone and establish appropriate regulatory measures to ensure its protection;*
5. *Requests the State Party, within the framework of the Japanese Funds-in-Trust project, to work in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to:*
  - a) *Organize an international meeting to define regulations and guidelines for the development of a conservation plan for the property,*
  - b) *Design and install an integrated water drainage system, based on the multidisciplinary study of each monument,*
  - c) *Develop the Management Plan for the property, including archaeological, conservation and public use components; and articulate it with other existing planning tools, such as land use plans;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, technical specifications on planned projects relating to interventions at the property, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, for consideration and review before any commitment is made toward implementation;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2013, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the*

implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

## 120. City of Potosi (Bolivia) (C 420)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

### Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

### Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**17 COM X - SOC; 19 COM VIIC.2.33/34; 20 COM VIID.60/61**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 7 500 for the elaboration of a technical co-operation request (preparatory assistance); USD 20 000 for conservation; and USD 26 285 (ongoing conservation of the Cerro Rico Mountain)

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

USD 10 000, World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS technical mission in 2005 financed by the Spanish Funds-in-Trust for World Heritage

### Previous monitoring missions

November 2005: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS Technical mission; November 2009: WHC meeting.

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Potential degradation of the historic site by continued and uncontrolled mining operations in the Cerro Rico Mountain;
- b) Instability and risk of collapse of the Cerro Rico;
- c) Deficiencies in conservation: special attention required for the restoration and upgrading of structures with residential use and the archaeological industrial heritage;
- d) Inefficient enforcement of protective legislation;
- e) Environmental impacts on the river which in turn affects the historic fabric and the local population.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/420>

### Current conservation issues

The *Cerro Rico* is an integral part of the World Heritage site - City of Potosi. In 1996, the World Heritage Committee noted with satisfaction that the Bolivian Mining Corporation (*Corporación Minera de Bolivia – COMIBOL*) had included the preservation of geological features and the topography and natural environment of the *Cerro Rico* as important objectives to be considered regarding future mining activities, given that uncontrolled mining operations over the last 500 years had continuously threatened not only the preservation of the Mountain, but also the lives of over 14 000 miners who work there on a daily basis.

In 2005 a technical mission conducted an analysis of the mountain's geology and morphology, mining activities, security, pollution, existing environmental conditions and threats to heritage, and provided recommendations for each of the three sectors the mountain is divided into, namely the: summit, middle area and low area; as well as for its

surroundings. These included: the termination of mining activities over 4000 metres above sea level and those not related to maintaining the stability of the mountain; the monitoring of all natural phenomena; the elaboration of a Geologic Monitoring Plan focused on geo-mechanics and geo-structural stabilization; the development of a Geo-Environmental Risk Plan; controlled mining activities; the elaboration of a mining work plan; the evaluation of pollution levels; and the implementation of measures to safeguard the human and labour rights of miners and their families.

During a meeting held in November 2009 in Bolivia the Ministry of Cultures agreed to undertake urgent measures to facilitate coordinated actions for the preservation of the mountain. The State Party also expressed the need for the development of a Management Plan for the City of Potosí and the *Cerro Rico* Mountain. In March 2010, the International Assistance request for the preservation of the *Cerro Rico* mountain was approved, with the objective of having qualified international experts work on the site to: (a) assess and analyze the specialized geotechnical, structural, geophysical and geodesic studies undertaken at *Cerro Rico*; (b) participate in the definition of a drilling programme; (c) assess and diagnose the structural stability status of the *Cerro Rico*; and (d) propose a suitable Action Plan in co-ordination with the Bolivian Government, national experts and stakeholders. It was agreed with the State Party that once the specialized studies were finalized, the Mission and the implementation of the International Assistance request would be undertaken.

As a result of the most recent and critical collapse of the summit (mid February 2011), the State Party requested the urgent implementation of the International assistance request to send a technical mission to the site in May 2011 and to organize an International Expert Meeting to urgently establish recommendations and guidance for the conservation and management of the property and its components. In particular, it is expected that an Action Plan will be developed to assist the State Party in identifying required measures for the preservation of the Mountain, including the definition of regulations for the control of mining activities. The State Party is presently finalizing the Tomography Study of the *Cerro Rico* and a preliminary report has been sent to ICOMOS for its analysis.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the serious collapse of a portion of the *Cerro Rico* Mountain, an important component of the property, and particularly the impacts that uncontrolled mining activities are having on the preservation of the mountain, its heritage components, and the potential threat to workers and the City of Potosí. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee point out that the formulation of an Action Plan as well as the identification of management and conservation recommendations is a necessary step in ensuring the conservation of the property. Current efforts could also serve to address pending issues, such as the definition of a larger buffer zone to include all reservoirs to the east and south-east of the City.

### **Draft Decision:        35 COM 7B.120**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **20 COM VIID.60/61**, adopted at its 20th session (Merida, 1996),
3. Expresses its deep concern regarding the collapse of a portion of the summit of the *Cerro Rico* Mountain;

4. *Requests the State Party to undertake emergency measures to prevent future impacts and further destruction; and to work in co-ordination with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to implement the priority measures identified during the 2005 technical mission undertaken to the property;*
5. *Urges the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, as well as other relevant bodies and funding partners, to co-operate with the State Party to implement with urgency, the identified conservation measures for the preservation of the Cerro Rico Mountain;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to begin the process for the development of a participatory Management Plan for the property, and the delimitation of a new buffer zone;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

## **125. National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1982

Criteria  
(iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**06 COM XII.41; 07 COM X.36; 34 COM 7B.110**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 200,668 for conservation and emergency programmes; USD 49 300 for emergency technical mission after the 12 January 2010 earthquake.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

USD 14 780 for the July 2010 Technical Mission partially funded by the Spanish Funds in Trust for World Heritage

Previous Monitoring Missions

September 2006: UNESCO Havana Office Technical Visit; July 2010: Joint Expert Technical Mission; March 2011: Preparatory Mission for Haiti Donor's Conference, CLT

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a Management Plan;
- b) Lack of a Conservation Plan;
- c) Water damage;
- d) Vandalism;
- e) Seismic activities;
- f) Infrastructure projects;
- g) Lack of a Risk Preparedness Plan;

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/180>

### Current conservation issues

In the framework of the preparations for the Haiti Donors Conference for Culture, the World Heritage Centre had the opportunity to discuss in three working sessions with members of the Haitian Institute for the Preservation of the National Heritage (ISPAN). The national authorities submitted official information on the state of conservation of the World Heritage property: current projects, programmes seeking funding, the list of proposals for action in terms of bilateral and multilateral cooperation, as well as a detailed analysis on progress made since the last mission of July 2010. Mission report: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>. Brochure for the Donors' Conference: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/725>

For the Donors' Conference, ISPAN requested assistance for the creation of a technical office at the Citadel, implemented by two technicians, one sited at Milot and the other at Dondon, the two populations located at the northern and southern extremities of the National Park.

In September 2010 the World Heritage Centre organized a technical working meeting with the experts who accompanied the mission in July 2010, in order to prepare a working document in accordance with the Decision of the World Heritage Committee in 2010. Special emphasis was placed on actions for the implementation of the conservation and risk management plan. The final technical document that will provide the basis for the action plan is being finalized. The Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is being developed and the historic documentation of the construction of the property have been completed with documentation from UNESCO, ICOMOS, and the cartographic archives of the Chateau of Vincennes.

Regarding the Retrospective Inventory of the property, the Ministry of Culture and Communication established official boundaries for the National Park through a Presidential Order in July 2010. The boundaries of the Park will be defined, and work to identify types of land tenure within the site and in the surrounding areas are underway.

Discussions have been initiated with representatives of the European Union, the Ministry of Public Works, representatives of the Ministry of Planning, and the Ministry for Tourism, in order to obtain all information relating to the construction of the 003 national road, the original route of which had caused the World Heritage Committee to request a halt to its construction in 2010. Alternative routes circumventing the Park were also requested. During the working meeting with the Ministry of Public Works and its team, it was confirmed that technical and financial assessment studies for an alternative route were underway. Haitian officials have confirmed that the technical project to improve the national road, which currently runs through the Park, linking Milot with Dondon, will be submitted for examination to the World Heritage Centre.

With regard to plans for tourism projects to be developed at the Citadel, discussions were initiated with the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) in Port-au-Prince. It was informed in detail of the decisions officially adopted by the World Heritage Committee requesting the interruption of the mass tourism project at the Citadel until the Conservation and Management Plan of the site is finalized. The IDB is one of the investors, along with the Royal Caribbean Company and the Ministry for Tourism, in the action programme to organize visits for tourists disembarking from cruise ships at Labadee. ISPAN has not accepted supervising of planned actions, or to sign the proposal for their implementation. The Ministry of Culture and Communication, responsible for the conservation of the property,



did not participate in negotiations, as it is not included among the signatories of the programme of interventions in the agreement of the IDB with the Haitian Government.

The Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID) has confirmed a State subvention of 200,000 Euros for the development of conservation, management and risk preparedness plans to make progress on what was foreseen in Decision **34 COM 7B.110** of the World Heritage Committee.

### Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies propose to the World Heritage Committee to thank ISPAN for its collaboration, particularly for having maintained constant communication, despite the difficult circumstances in the country, and take note of the determination of ISPAN in the implementation of actions called for by the World Heritage Committee.

### **Draft Decision:      35 COM 7B.125**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.110**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party regarding the arrangements for implementing the decisions of the World Heritage Committee, recognizes the efforts made by the State Party to ensure the safeguarding of the property and thanks the Haitian Institute for the Preservation of the National Heritage (ISPAN) for the work undertaken and the respect of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee;*
4. *Welcomes the initiative of the Culture Sector of UNESCO in organizing the Haiti Donors Conference for Culture on 19 April 2011, and requests that the projects foreseen for the property be one of the priorities of the action plan that will be developed.*
5. *Also thanks the Government of Spain and the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation for their generous contribution to the implementation of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee;*
6. *Also takes note of the mission report prepared by the World Heritage Centre;*
7. *Further takes note of the progress of the Haitian Ministry for Public Works' proposal for an alternative to the 003 national road, and reiterates its request that the final draft, as well as the environmental impact studies and the assessment of impact on the heritage be submitted to the World Heritage Centre and to the Advisory Bodies for review before any intervention;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit the technical project for the improvement of the existing road within the Park, including its route, the engineering work for the canalization of the river, the type of asphalt and the width of the route, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*

9. Further requests the State Party to take all necessary measures at the inter-ministerial level to ensure that no undertaking, work or facilities destined for tourism are developed before they are taken into consideration in the conservation plan;
10. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre the draft *Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value* of the property and to take all necessary steps to officially finalize the cadastral survey, as well as the delineation of the Park boundaries and its buffer zone and the legal framework for their protection;
11. Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

### **133. City of Cuzco (Peru) (C 273)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1983

Criteria  
(iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**28 COM 15B.119; 29 COM 7B.96; 34 COM 7B.115**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 25,000 Emergency Assistance; USD 47,000 for conservation and elaboration of a Management Plan.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
July 2009: Technical visit DIR/WHC; December 2010: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Need for a Master Plan officially approved and implemented;
- b) Need for specific regulations for a risk-preparedness programme, traffic restriction studies and regulations for built heritage conservation;
- c) Planned infrastructure projects (i.e. the Monastery Hotel, Commercial Centre Ima Sumaq and the Marriot Hotel)

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/273>

#### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 2 February 2010. As requested by the World Heritage Committee, a joint World Heritage

Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out from 12 to 19 December 2010. The mission report is available online at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>.

a) *Projects at the property: Monastery Hotel, Commercial Centre Ima Sumaq and Marriot Hotel*

The State Party submitted technical information on the projects at the property which were also evaluated by the reactive monitoring mission. Regarding the Monastery Hotel project, it consists of the restoration and rehabilitation of the *Beaterio de las Nazarenas* and new construction at an adjacent lot. The State Party reports that several modifications were made to the original proposal presented in 2003 in order to meet current heritage conservation regulations; subsequently it was approved both by the Municipality of Cuzco and by the Ministry of Culture and is currently being implemented. The mission reports that interventions have been carefully supervised with attention given to the materials, techniques, and original space; and concludes that the monument conserves its characteristics and conditions of integrity and authenticity. It also notes that efforts have been made to preserve architectural remains of historic value and that new construction does not visually affect or compete with the historic ensemble.

With regard to the Marriot Hotel project, it consists of the re-adaptation of the former convent of Saint Augustine for a hotel. The project has also had several adaptations based on the need to carry out archaeological research. The mission noted that the project is on-going and is currently focusing on the archaeological excavation. It reported that the building had been abandoned without any maintenance and has suffered from transformations throughout history, therefore very little of the original colonial building remains. It reports that works have been closely monitored and that artefacts and architecture have been preserved for future presentation and that the project proposal will not impact the original volumes or the urban fabric of the Historic Centre.

As for the *Ima Sumaq* Commercial Centre, the State Party reports that the property is considered of contextual value in accordance with the Master Plan for Cuzco. It notes that the construction failed to meet standards for rehabilitation and disregarded recommendations made by the Ministry of Culture. The project has currently been halted. The Mission reported that inadequate interventions have physically affected the archaeological remains and that new additions have also visually impacted the building. It does note however that corrective actions can be implemented to reverse the negative results.

b) *Management system*

The State Party provided information on the status of management arrangements. The Ministry of Culture, through the Cuzco Regional Cultural Directorate and the Cuzco Provincial Municipality are mandated to protect, conserve and present the property. Currently the Committee for implementing Cuzco's Historical Centre Master Plan (COPLAN) is the participatory entity involved in diverse actions at the property defined in accordance to the Plan. Based on collaboration agreements, a Coordination Board and a Technical Secretariat have been set up and have been charged with updating the Master Plan. No precise information is provided on how these arrangements are currently operating or on the expected process and timeframe for the requested review of the management plan.

The mission reports that the Master Plan is well developed and that regulations are comprehensive to control and regulate activities at the different sectors through zoning and land use. However, it notes that implementation has only been partial and through pilot projects that have not triggered holistic interventions nor have they addressed pressing concerns such as housing, improvement of living conditions or enhancement of public areas. It also reports that in spite of the definition of roles in the Master Plan, in practice there is an institutional dualism and no continuity has been given to the created entities (Coordination

Board and Technical Secretariat) so the management unit is not effectively operating as such.

*c) Other issues*

The State Party provided an analysis of existing conditions at the property and the processes currently affecting it, including the loss of the local population due to increased tourism activities, reduced quality of living, and changes in land use. This has led to the deterioration and abandonment of historic buildings and to the transformation of the city with new construction and changes to the urban fabric. Additional problems exist with waste management, sewage grids, basic services such as water and electricity, traffic and pollution. Tourism activities continue to be largely unregulated and have increased speculation and changes in land use. The report also provides additional information on the actions currently being implemented, including dissemination and awareness raising actions, education, heritage inventory and assessment projects and intervention projects at diverse historic buildings.

The mission noted that although the general state of conservation of significant buildings is overall good, urban degradation and gentrification are a matter of concern for the property. These phenomena are largely related to the legalization of property titles and by the lack of implementation of comprehensive urban policies. It also reports that immediate measures are needed to effectively define a buffer zone and enforce regulations to ensure the protection of the surrounding landscape.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that although emblematic historic buildings are generally in a good state of conservation, other significant component parts of the property have continued to decay. They also emphasize the important urban degradation that continues to exist and the limited effort implemented to provide affordable housing and improve living conditions, which continues to exacerbate the gentrification of the property. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee indicate that if the situation remains unaddressed, further impacts to heritage areas could threaten the attributes of the property and its setting that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

**Draft Decision:      35 COM 7B.133**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.115**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the implementation of prior decisions by the World Heritage Committee and requests it to fully set up the Coordinating Board and Technical Secretariat for the management of the property and to secure the necessary resources for its effective operation;*
4. *Notes the results of the December 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and endorses its recommendations and also requests the State Party to:*

- a) *Update the Management Plan to include a comprehensive public use plan and provisions to address urban degradation and gentrification,*
  - b) *Implement a process for the regularization of property titles,*
  - c) *Enforce regulations to control changes to land use and new development, particularly at the property's buffer zone,*
  - d) *Develop and implement a policy for social housing including financial mechanisms to improve living conditions and the recovery of historic buildings at popular sectors,*
  - e) *Continue to monitor existing restoration and rehabilitation projects at the Monastery Hotel and the Marriot Hotel and implement actions to reverse the negative impacts generated by the Ima Sumaq Commercial Centre;*
5. ***Further requests*** the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

### **135. Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (C 747)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1995

Criteria  
(iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
N/A

Previous Committee Decisions  
**29 COM 7B.99; 32 COM 7B.128; 33 COM 7B.146**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 35,000 for Preparatory Assistance and Conservation.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
Total amount provided to the property: 2008 ICOMOS Technical mission financed by the Spanish Funds-in-Trust for World Heritage.

Previous monitoring missions  
April 2002 and May 2004: ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions; June 2008: ICOMOS technical mission; September 2009 World Heritage Centre mission (update of the Tentative List).

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Inappropriate architectural and urban design for a marina and hotel-casino in a building block at the old harbour;
- b) Need to strengthen management planning for the Historic Quarter.

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/747>

### Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a state of conservation report as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), therefore there is no updated information to assess the progress made in the implementation of previous World Heritage Committee decisions. Previous examination of the state of conservation of the property has noted concern on unresolved issues such as increase in visitation without adequate management strategies in place, the gentrification of the historic quarter, the lack of a comprehensive management plan and conservation guidelines as well as zoning and land use regulations integrated with existing planning tools.

The State Party submitted an International assistance request in 2009 for the development of a participatory methodological approach for the formulation of the management plan, the establishment of mechanisms and structures to ensure the follow-up process, and the implementation and elaboration of proposals for the improvement of the management structure. The World Heritage Centre has received information from the State Party that this project has been implemented and that the final report is currently under elaboration and will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that no updated information exists for the property to gauge the rate of implementation of past decisions made by the World Heritage Committee and whether the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property has been sustained.

### **Draft Decision:      35 COM 7B.135**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.146**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit the required state of conservation report;*
4. *Urges the State Party to finalize the process for the development of a comprehensive participatory management plan for the property, including zoning and land use regulations and to submit by **1 February 2012**, three (3) printed and electronic copies to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review;*
5. *Reiterates its invitation to the State Party to propose the extension of the property to include the "Bay and Islands of the City of Colonia del Sacramento";*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*