SECTION II

State of Conservation of specific World Heritage properties

State Party: Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka
Property Name: Ancient City of Sigiriya
PERIODIC REPORTING
FOR WELL PLANNED HERITAGE PRESERVATION

Background

The twenty-ninth General Conference of UNESCO, held in 1997, decided to activate Article 29 of the World Heritage Convention concerning the submission of periodic reports on the state of implementation of the World Heritage Convention (Section I) and the State of Conservation of World Heritage properties (Section II). The national authorities are invited to report on Section I, while Section II shall be prepared for each property inscribed on the World Heritage list by the person(s) directly in charge of the property’s management.

The periodic reports prepared by the States Parties will serve a three-fold purpose:

- to assess the current state of all World Heritage related issues in a State Party,
- to help focus the Committee’s as well as the State Party’s future activities and funds,
- to strengthen sub-regional and regional co-operation between States Parties.

The Periodic Reporting Questionnaire

In 1998, at its twenty-second session, the World Heritage Committee approved Explanatory Notes, designed to be read in conjunction with the Periodic Reporting Format, in order to outline the information expected to flow from the periodic reporting exercise. To facilitate the preparation of the report, a Questionnaire was developed that the States Parties are encouraged to use. It closely follows the subjects referred to in the Explanatory Notes, but in contrast to the latter splits the subjects up into short questions to be answered in a few sentences or paragraphs. A second type of question requires the indication of YES or NO by circling or underlining the appropriate answer. All questions are clearly identified with a little number in the right hand column of the Questionnaire. To make the reporting results meaningful every one of these questions has to be answered. If no answer is possible, the reasons should be given. If the available space is not sufficient for the answer, the response should be continued on a separate sheet of paper, clearly indicating the number of the question the text refers to (e.g. 006).

Benefits for the States Parties

The Questionnaire was developed in such a way as to allow to extract and compile or compare relevant information from different States Parties or properties, facilitating the process of preparing the regional synthesis report to be presented to the World Heritage Committee. The YES / NO questions make it possible to evaluate the reports quantitatively, but only the details that should be supplied in the related ‘open question’ make the answers meaningful and can be the basis for concerted actions to preserve a State Party’s most valuable heritage for its transmission to future generations.

The information collected in this way will help the States Parties to assess their own strengths and weaknesses concerning the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, putting them in a position to (re)define policies and to request assistance in order to finance projects and / or training. On the other hand it allows the World Heritage Committee to collect information needed to devise Regional Action Plans, give well-informed advice to States Parties and to focus funds as well as attention on the region(s), States Parties and / or properties that need the collective support of the international community.
The preparation process of the regional periodic report will furthermore enhance regional cooperation through information meetings as well as through the better availability of regularly up-dated information on activities as well as contact addresses etc. The identification of the State Party’s strengths makes it possible to exchange experiences and look for solutions to problems (e.g. of site conservation) within the region.

Conclusion

Periodic Reporting is a participatory exercise, aiming to collect information on World Heritage related issues on a national as well as on the property level. The individual State Party reports will be collated into a regional synthesis report to be presented to the World Heritage Committee. This information will enhance cooperation between the Committee and the States Parties and allow to focus funds and activities more efficiently, allowing the States Parties to protect their most valuable heritage more effectively for transmission to future generations.
PERIODIC REPORTING ON THE APPLICATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

(FORMAT)

SECTION II: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF SPECIFIC WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

II.1. Introduction

a. State Party
b. Name of World Heritage property
c. Geographical coordinates to the nearest second
d. Date of inscription on the World Heritage List
e. Organization(s) or entity(ies) responsible for the preparation of the report
f. Date of report
g. Signature on behalf of State Party

II.2. Statement of significance

II.3. Statement of authenticity/integrity

II.4. Management

II.5. Factors affecting the property

II.6. Monitoring

II.7. Conclusions and recommended action

a. Main conclusions regarding the state of the World Heritage values of the property (see items II.2. and II.3. above)
b. Main conclusions regarding the management and factors affecting the property (see Items II.4 and II.5. above)
c. Proposed future action/actions
d. Responsible implementing agency/agencies
e. Timeframe for implementation
f. Needs for international assistance.

II.8. Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise for Section II

II.9. Documentation attached
## II.1. Introduction

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Country (and State Party if different): <strong>Democratic Socialistic Republic of Sri Lanka</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Name of World Heritage property: <strong>Ancient City of Sigiriya</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>In order to locate the property precisely, please attach a topographic map showing scale, orientation, projection, datum, site name, date and graticule. The map should be an original print and not be trimmed. The site boundaries should be shown on the map. In addition they can be submitted in a detailed description, indicating topographic and other legally defined national, regional, or international boundaries followed by the site boundaries. The State Parties are encouraged to submit the geographic information in digital form so that it can be integrated into a Geographic Information System (GIS). On this questionnaire indicate the geographical co-ordinates to the nearest second (in the case of large sites, towns, areas etc., give at least 3 sets of geographical co-ordinates):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Centre point:</strong> Centre of the stone throne, in the 5th century palace at the summit (lat 7.95594, long 80.75847)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>North-west corner:</strong> N-W point corner of the Buffer Zone, 12,600 acres of UDA gazetted Sigiriya Reserve (lat 7.96482, long 80.75035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>South-east corner:</strong> S-W point corner of the Buffer Zone, 12,600 acres area of UDA gazetted Sigirya Reserve (lat 7.94626, long 80.77010) (see maps and detailed site plans given in annexure S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Give the date of inscription on the World Heritage List and subsequent extension (if applicable): <strong>Inscription of the World Heritage List on 17 December 1982 and subsequent inclusion of 12,600 acres as a buffer zone (see attached map of the new boundary of the Government Gazzette Notice).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Organisation(s) or entity(ies) responsible for the preparation of this report. Organisation(s) / entity(ies): <strong>Archaeological Survey Department (ASD) Central Cultural Fund (CCF)</strong> Person(s) responsible: i. Director General (ASD), ii. Director General (CCF) Address: i. Department of Archaeology, Sri Marcus Fernando Mawatha ii. Central Cultural Fund, 212/1, Bauddhaloka Mawatha City and postcode: i. Colombo7, Sri Lanka, ii. Colombo 7, Sri Lanka, Telephone: i. ++ 94 1 695255, ii. ++ 94 1 508960, Fax: ++ 94 1 696250, ii. ++ 94 1 500731, E-mail: i. <a href="mailto:arch@diamond.lanka.net">arch@diamond.lanka.net</a>, ii. <a href="mailto:gen_ccf@sri.lanka.net">gen_ccf@sri.lanka.net</a>,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Date of preparation of the report: <strong>20th December 2002</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Signature on behalf of the State Party Signature: ………………………………………………… Name: <strong>Mr. V.K. Nanayakkara</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page, clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006).
Function: Secretary, Ministry of Human Resource Development Education and Cultural Affairs.
### II.2. Statement of significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| At the time of inscribing a property on the World Heritage List, the World Heritage Committee indicates its outstanding universal value(s), or World Heritage value(s), by deciding on the criteria for which the property deserved to be included on the World Heritage List. Circle the criteria retained for the inscription: | Cultural criteria: **ii, iii and iv**  
Natural criteria: **Not applicable** |
| Were new criteria added by re-nominating and/or extending the property after the original inscription? | **No.** |
| If YES, please explain: | **Not applicable** |
| Please quote observations concerning the property made by the Advisory Body(ies) during the evaluation of the nomination: | **“Criterion III, This cultural property is a unique witness to the civilization of Ceylon during the years of Kasyapa I”.**  
**“Criterion IV, May be involved as well to the extent that an exceptional and significant event was the determining factor in the creation of the empirical capital”.**  
**“Criterion II, offers the best justification for the request for inscription introduced by Sri Lanka. On the one hand, the frescoes of Sigiriya inaugurated a pictorial style which endured over many centuries. On the other, the site of “Lion mountain” was visited from the 6th century A.D. by passionate admirers. The poems inscribed on the rock by certain of these admirers and known by the name “Sigiri Graffiti” are among the most ancient texts in the Sinhalese language, and thus show the considerable influence exerted by the abundant City of Kasyapa I on both literature and thought”.**** |
| Quote the decisions and observations / recommendations, if appropriate, made by the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription and extension (if applicable): | **No statement was made** |
| Identify the actions taken as follow-up to these observations and/or decisions: | **Not applicable.** |

**II.2. continued**
Please propose a statement of significance by providing a description of the World Heritage value(s) for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List. This description should reflect the criterion (criteria) on the basis of which the Committee inscribed the property on the World Heritage List and it should also detail what the property represents, what makes it outstanding, what the specific values are that distinguish the property as well as what its relationship with its setting is, etc.:

One of Asia’s major archaeological sites, Sigiriya presents a unique concentration of 5th century urban planning, architecture, gardening, engineering, hydraulic technology, art and poetry. Centred on a massive, Pre-Cambrian inselberg rising 200m above the surrounding plain, Sigiriya’s setting is one of considerable natural beauty and a distinctive cultural landscape of great archaeological, historical and ethnographical value. Lying between the historic capitals of Anuradhapura and Polonnaruva, the Sigiriya plain still retains much of its forest cover and many of its present rural settlements and hydraulic systems date back to the first millennium BC.

The history of Sigiriya extends from prehistoric times to the 18th and 19th centuries. The earliest evidence of human habitation is from several prehistoric rock shelters of the Mesolithic period, occupational sequences from about 7500 yrs ago. Sigiriya is also surrounded by proto-historic settlements and cemeteries from the early and mid 1st millennium BC. The historic period at Sigiriya begins about the 3rd century BC with the establishment of a Buddhist monastic settlement on hill slopes around the rock. As in other similar sites of this period these remains consist of rock-shelters, with donatory inscriptions above their drip ledges.

The most significant remains today are from the construction of a new royal capital at Sigiriya by Kassapa I in the 5th century AC. This took the form of a walled and moated city, with a palace on top of the rock, elaborate pleasure gardens, gateways, extensive moats and ramparts, and the well-known paintings on the western face of the rock. Sigiriya is one of the best-preserved urban forms in the region from the 1st millennium of the present era, while it has one of the earliest preserved large-scale garden complexes in Asia. Immediately to the south of the city is the Mapagala fortified complex and a great artificial lake, the Sigiri-mahawava and its feeder canals. While closely adjoining the city to north and south are the two ancient Buddhist monastery complexes of Pidurangala and Ramakale.

After the brief royal period in the 5th century, Sigiriya was preserved as a monastic and urban complex for several centuries, until the 13th or 14th century, and again served as a military outpost of the Kandyan kingdom in the 17th and 18th centuries. From the 6th century onwards, the palace on the summit and the paintings attracted visitors from various parts of the country, who wrote graffiti poems on a 'Mirror Wall' recording their feelings and emotions. Antiquarians and later archaeologists began work at Sigiriya in the early 19th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the extension of a property or the inclusion of additional criteria a re-submission of the property may be considered. This might be regarded as necessary in order to recognize cultural values of a natural World Heritage property, or vice-versa, become desirable following the substantive revision of the criteria by the World Heritage Committee or due to better identification or knowledge of specific outstanding universal values of the property. Should a re-nomination of the property be considered? <strong>No</strong></td>
<td>YES / NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, please explain: <strong>Not applicable.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the borders of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone (still) adequate to ensure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page, clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006).
the protection and conservation of the property’s World Heritage values: No \(\text{YES / NO}\)

If NO, please explain why not, and indicate what changes should be made to the boundaries of the property and / or its buffer zone (please indicate these changes also on a map to be attached to this report):

**After the inscription of the site in 1982, numerous (and ongoing) multidisciplinary multi-agency research undertakings conducted at Sigiriya and its surrounding areas has resulted in a clearer understanding of the total archaeological landscape of the site and its vicinity. Radiating from the monument, within an extent of of 2600 acres are:**

(i) Prehistoric and protohistoric sites.

(ii) Five ancient village settlements dating back to the Anuradhapura

(iii) An ancient irrigation system centred on the “Sigiriya Mahawewa” a man made reservoir with a tank bund extending 7 miles and a catchment of 1000 acres. This cultural landscape still exists in unique bio diversity value.

Recent settlement growth due to socio-economic developments within the Sigiriya region has resulted in a demand for land, causing encroachments into the archaeological landscape and therefore, currently presents a serious threat to the values of conservation. Hence, there is a need to extend the borders of the World Heritage Property to include its archaeological landscape of the sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II.3. Statement of authenticity / integrity**

| Have the World Heritage values identified above been maintained since the property’s inscription? Yes \(\text{YES / NO}\) | 021 |
| --- |
| If NO, please describe the changes and name the causes: Not applicable | 022 |
| What was the evaluation of the authenticity / integrity of the property at the time of inscription? (Please quote from the ICOMOS / IUCN evaluation): NO statement has been made | 023 |

If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page, clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006).
Have there been changes in the authenticity / integrity since inscription?  No  YES / NO 024

If YES, please describe the changes to the authenticity / integrity and name the main causes?  Not Applicable 025

Are there (further) changes foreseeable to the authenticity / integrity of the property in the near future?  No  YES / NO 026

If YES, please explain and indicate how these changes might affect the World Heritage values of the property: 027

II.4. Management

How could the arrangements for the protection and the management of the property best be defined (more than one indication possible)?

Legal  (x)  
Contractual (x)  
Traditional (x) 028

II.4. continued

Please describe and assess the implementation and effectiveness of these arrangements for the preservation of the values described under item II.2 at the national, provincial and/or municipal level:

AT national level, the Government Archaeological Survey Department mandates the Central Cultural Fund (CCF) to undertake the total responsibility for the preservation of all values of the site described under section (1-2).

The CCF enters into contract agreement with the leading National Universities to provide consultancy services in archaeological excavations and other related academic research work. Similarly, leading private sector Architectural/ Engineering firms are commissioned to provide consultancy services in conservation work.

The consultants advice on Archaeology and Conservation are implemented and co-ordinated by the CCF agency. Government Departments that entrusted with statutory regulatory powers are co-opted by the CCF as required for management and implementation.

The CCF generates its own funding locally and also enters into negotiations for international grant funding. The CCF manages its own funds by its own internal audit processes and finance accounting arrangements.

In general terms, can this legislative, contractual and/or traditional protection be considered sufficient?  Yes  YES / NO 029

Please explain:  The existing laws may be considered adequate. Effective enforcement should be ensured by early intervention. 030

If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page, clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006).
Provide a list and summaries of laws and regulations concerning cultural and natural properties protection and management (including extracts of relevant articles from the Constitution, Criminal Law, Law/Regulations on Land-use, Environment Law and Forestry Law, amongst others). Please also attach any documentation available concerning these points:

- Central Cultural Fund Act, No: 57, 1980
- Antiquities Ordinance No: 9, 1940 revised Act 1956
- Town and Country Planning Ordinance, No: 13, 1946, revised Ordinance No: 49, 2002
- Urban Development Act No: 41, 1978
- Fauna and Flora Protection Ordinance, No:2, 1937 revised Ordinance of No: 49, 1993
- Sigiriya Heritage Foundation Act No: 62, 1998
- Buddhist Temporalities Ordinance Act, No: 19,1931
- Tourist Board Act, No: 14, 1968
- National Environment Act, No: 47, 1980

Describe the administrative and management arrangements that are in place for the property concerned, making special mention of the institutions and organisations that have management authority over the property as well as of the arrangements that are in place for the coordination of their actions:

The CCF provides an overall administrative umbrella for site management. The policies of the CCF is determined by the Board of Governors. The site management is directed by the Director General CCF in consultation with the Director Archaeology and Director Conservation of the project. Day to day site management is done by a Project Manager assisted by a Senior Conservation Supervisor and a Excavation Supervisor. Site coordination meetings are held on a regular schedule of two meetings per month. Relevant Government officers of the institutions given below participate in the meetings in order to implement regulatory and statutory functions.

(i) Archaeology Department through its regional office in Kandy
(ii) Central Cultural Fund through its site office
(iii) Chief Incumbent and the Bhikku Council of the Golden Rock Temple
(iv) State department offices and other local bodies
(v) Deputy Commissioner of Buddhist Affairs in Kandy
(vi) Director General – NPPD
(vii) Chairman, Dambulla Pradeshiya Sabha

Please indicate under which level of authority the property is managed:

Property (x)
Regional (x)

If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page, clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006).
Periodic Reporting Exercise on the Application of the World Heritage Convention  
Section II: State of conservation of specific World Heritage properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **National (x)**  
Other (please describe): | |
| Please provide the full name, address and phone/fax/e-mail of the entity(ies) directly responsible for the management (conservation, preservation, visitor management) of the property: | |
| **i. Project Manager, Sigiriya CCF Project, Sigiriya Tel 066-31815 Fax 066-31815**  
**ii Director-General, Central Cultural Fund,**  
212/1, Bauddhaloka Mawatha, Colombo 07, Sri Lanka  
**iii Director-General, Archaeological Survey Department,**  
Sir Marcus Fernando Mawatha, Colombo 07, Sri Lanka | |
| **Is it necessary to revise the administrative and management arrangements for the property?**  
**YES / NO** | 035 |
| **If YES, explain why this is the case:**  
It is proposed that the “Sigiriya Heritage Foundation Act No. 62 of 1998” be established and implemented. | |
| **Is there a management plan for the property?**  
**Yes**  
**YES / NO** | 038 |
| **If YES, please summarise, indicating if the plan is being implemented and since when:**  
Sigiriya Heritage Development Master recognizes the existence of a rich and diverse cultural landscape within the hinterland surrounding the Sigiriya Complex.  
Conservation strategies for this zone have been outlined in the plan accepting the reality that although the Sigiriya region is still relatively under developed, the politics of socio economic improvements in the area will eventually conflict with Heritage Management.  
The plan therefore attempts to forestall this inevitable conflict by suggesting policies that will harness economic development to achieve the final objectives of conserving and protecting the heritage values of the site.  
For its implementation, the plan envisaged a multidisciplinary approach of several specialised organizations, coordinated with the statutory powers vested with the UDA.  
The plan is pending implementation subjective to funding. | 039 |
| **Please report on legal and administrative actions that are foreseen for the future, to preserve the values described under item II.2 (e.g. passing of legislation, adjusting administrative and management arrangements, implementing or drawing up of a (new) management plan, etc.):**  
Establishment of the Sigiriya Heritage Foundation under the Sigiriya Heritage Foundation Act no:62 of 1998 (see section 037 for objectives of the Foundations). | 040 |
| **Please provide detailed information, particularly in cases where changes have occurred since the inscription of the property, on the following matters:** | |

If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page, clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006).
### Conservation

Make reference to all major interventions at the property and describe its present state of conservation:

1. **Consolidation of existing monuments excavated prior to inscription**
2. **Expose and clarify the layout of the Sigiriya Complex to reveal elements of its ancient architectural character and spatial organisations.**
   - (a) Rehabilitation of the Water Garden on the Western Precinct
   - (b) Rehabilitation of the axial pathway through the Water Garden and leading to the Mirror Wall Gallery.
   - (c) Rehabilitation of the Western approach to the site.
   - (d) Rehabilitation of the ancient N/S link between the Sigiriya Complex and Mapagala Complex across the bund of the Sigiriya reservoir.
   - (e) Rehabilitation of the South Axial approach to the site and the layout of a peripheral road system around the Western Precinct of the site
   - (f) Desilting of several ponds in the water garden and surrounding western fortification moats.
   - (g) Removal of silted Earth from high visibility area of the western precinct
3. **Site Infrastructure development work**
   - (a) Development of water supply system
   - (b) Development of sanitation works
   - (c) Development of visitor facilities by creating parking areas, picnic areas etc.
   - (d) Development of site Pedestrian circulation by widening pathways, ladders, bridges etc

### Ownership

Make reference to all major changes in ownership of the property and describe the present state of ownership:

- The ownership of the property remain with ASD administered and managed by the CCF

Please, give a detailed description of the staffing of the site:

- The Central Cultural Fund maintains a site office under the direction the Project Manager to coordinate the total project administration. The scientific work on the project is coordinated by an Archaeological Director for excavation work and Conservation Director for conservation work. A graduate staff of archaeologists and conservators supervise the field staff. In addition Photographic documentation and photographic records are maintained by a site photographer. Technically qualified artefact conservator team operates a site conservation laboratory. Documentation, excavation and conservation work is performed by a team of trained draftsmen working through a site drafting office.
### Periodic Reporting Exercise on the Application of the World Heritage Convention

**Section II: State of conservation of specific World Heritage properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the staffing level sufficient for adequate management of the property?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If NO, what should be done to improve the situation?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the staff need additional training?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, what are the training needs for your staff?</td>
<td>Sigiriya needs to develop and maintain high levels of qualified, professional staff in order to maintain the quality and momentum of research and conservation that the project has developed over the years, since the start of the UNESCO/Cultural Triangle Project. Towards that end a fresh approach to staffing and facilities should be devised. Closer involvement of Archaeological Researchers, conservators and Heritage Managers will facilitate the training of a younger generation of staff in the processes of monitoring and conserving the heritage values.</td>
<td>047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the funding and financial situation of the property, indication sources, level and regularity of financing:</td>
<td>Apart from a small annual grant from the government the project is self financed. The primary source of funding is by the sale of local and foreign visitor tickets to the site. Therefore, any fluctuations in the tourist industry has a direct bearing on the financial situation of the property. The level and regularity of this funding source has been illustrated in the attached graph of visitor statistics to the site (see annexure 048).</td>
<td>048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the available funding sufficient for adequate management of the property?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II.4. continued**

If NOT, describe the financial resources that would be required for the management of the property:

Although Sigiriya generates the most amount of funds by the sale of tickets in comparison to the other cultural sites, the total collection of the project is shared with the other projects of the Cultural Triangle. When the ticket collections are less due to low tourist traffic, the available funds are proportionately reduced, causing a series of financial problems. In these circumstances Government funding is requested to sustain the project and its on going conservation programs.

Indicate International Assistance from which the property has benefited:

- World Heritage Fund:  
  Provision of equipment to the Mural Painting Laboratory
### Section II: State of conservation of specific World Heritage properties

- **UNESCO International Campaign:**
  
  Seed money and technical assistance to review the excavation, conservation and layout work of the Cultural Triangle Project

- **National and/or regional projects of UNDP, the World Bank or other agencies:**
  
  WFP helped to meet half of the wage of workers by providing dry rations.

- **Bilateral co-operation:**
  
  KAVA Project funded by the Federal Republic of Germany (KAVA: Kommissariat für Allegemine und vergleichende Archaeology) – PGIAR (Postgraduate Institute of Archaeology) and CCF collaboration project, for archaeological research in the area.

  SURREC Project funded by Sweden (SARCP: Settlement Archaeology Research Collaboration Project), for studying the settlement and ancient technological-related fields.

- **Other assistance:**
  
  None

---

**Describe the IT (computer) equipment of the site and/or management office and assess its effectiveness:**

**Basic computer facilities with basic user programs for office administrative functions.**

Are you using (multiple indications are possible):

- PC (x )
- Apple ( )
- Mainframe ( )

Please, give the number of available computers:

**One**

Does an operational access to the Internet exist? **No**

---

### II.4. continued

- Is e-mail used for daily correspondence? **No**

---

- Is there a Geographical Information System (GIS) for the site? **No**

If YES, what software do you have and how is the GIS used?

---

If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page, clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List scientific studies and research programmes that have been conducted concerning the site:</td>
<td>Please refer to Annexure No. 063.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe financial and human resource inputs for the research programmes and or facilities:</td>
<td>Please refer to Annexure 064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe how the information / results are disseminated?</td>
<td>Research information is disseminated through publication in research journals books and magazines. Public awareness is generated through multi-media, lecture presentations at workshops and school seminars. The general public are informed by T.V. programs, Radio programs, exhibitions and news paper articles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any visitor statistics for the site? Yes.</td>
<td>YES / NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If YES, please summarise the statistics and attach to this report:</td>
<td>Please refer to section 048.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| What visitor facilities do you have at the property?                    | (1) Visitors infrastructure facilities within the site such as car parks visitor toilets direction and information sign boards. 
(2) Visitor facilities outside the site such as 
(a) “3-star” Hotels 
(b) Low cost guest house accommodation 
(c) Domestic Airport with Helicopter Service 
(d) Train access to Habarana Town (10 miles from the site) |
| What visitor facilities are you in need of?                             | Special attention should be focussed on the visitor facilities and heritage management of this unique site. This includes the establishment of a modern Visitor Information Centre and site Museum. |
| Is a public use plan (tourism / visitor management plan) in existence for the property? YES | YES/NO                                                                 |
| If YES, please summarise, if NO explain if one is needed:               | Sustainable Tourism Master Plan is under preparation with the consultancy services provided by USAID assisted and coordinated by the Tourist Board |
| Indicate how the property’s World Heritage values are communicated to residents, visitors | If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page, clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006). |
and the public (please attach examples of leaflets, videos, posters etc. and print-outs and/or the address of a web-page):

**Attempt has been made by the CCF Sigiriya Project to educate the public, tourist and the residents using films, videos and posters etc.**

| Are there educational programmes concerning the property aimed at schools? | Yes | 073 |
| If yes, please describe: | 074 |
| **Research officers and information officers of the sites visit the schools in the area and hold exhibitions and seminars to educate school children on the values of the World Heritage Site. They also organise guided tours and training programs within the sites for the students. Undergraduates of the universities are provided with educational programs for upgrading their practical applications of archaeological and conservation theory during the vacations. Furthermore, there are on site lectures and guided tours.** | |

| What role does World Heritage inscription play for the site concerning the visitor number, the research programmes and/or the awareness building activities? | 075 |
| **The World Heritage Inscription has had a positive impact with regard to the visitor arrivals. The entry charges to the site enable the allocation of a considerable amount of funding for the management of the site. This also helped in the reduction and relocation of residents within the boundary of the World Heritage Site.** | |
| **World Heritage Inscription also helped to mobilise an international lobby to uphold conservation values. A recent example in point was the successful campaign to prevent the expansion and development of a major military airport in close proximity to the World Heritage Site.** | |

### 1.5. Factors affecting the property

Please comment on the degree to which the property is threatened by particular problems and risks, such as development pressure, environmental pressure, natural disasters and preparedness, visitor / tourism pressure, number of inhabitants. Also mention all other issues that you see as problematic.

1. **Urbanisation of the buffer zone**
2. **Disorganisation and lack of enforcement on sector activities (vendors, guides etc)**
3. **Pressures to increase the carrying capacity of site, as visitor demands continue to rise rapidly**
4. **Rainfall erosion and other environmental damage**
5. **Natural decay of the Sigiriya rock surface threatening the “Mirror Wall” and the visitors**
6. **Sustained inputs needed to maintain functioning of ancient hydrology**
7. **Inadequate refuse management**

If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page, clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006).
Section II: State of conservation of specific World Heritage properties

| (viii) | Graffiti on the “Mirror Wall” and elsewhere |
| (ix)   | Visitors’ lack of adequate and accurate information of the site, leading to failure of the site to educate visitors as planned and hoped for |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Is there an emergency plan and / or risk preparedness plan for the property in existence?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If YES, please summarise the plan and provide a copy:

*Although, there is no documentation, several steps have been taken to address these issues such as:*

1. Effort has been taken to minimise possible risk to the visitors
   (a) Stairways have been secured with hand rails
   (b) Security guard rails have been provided in dangerous locations
   © Protective enclosures have been provided to secure against possible attack from stinging bees.
   (d) Security guards have been dispersed throughout the sites for visitor protection against harassment
   (e) ASD and CCF security guards constantly monitor the “Frescoes” and the “Mirror Wall” from vandalism

If NO, describe what is being done – and by whom – to counteract the dangers that threaten or may threaten the property:

*Not applicable*

*II.5. continued*

If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page, clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicate areas where improvement would be desirable and/or towards which the State Party is working:</td>
<td>The State Party presently considering the expansion of the boundaries and monitoring the development activities of the Sigiriya Heritage Zone. Sigiriya Heritage Foundation should be permitted to implement the formulated plan of development at Sigiriya without disturbing the World Heritage Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give an indication if the impact of the factors affecting the property is increasing or decreasing:</td>
<td>Unauthorized and haphazard development activities in the buffer zone are on the increase. The State Party should pay more attention in the enhanced implementation of regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What actions have been effectively taken, or are planned for the future, to address the factors affecting the property?</td>
<td>Unauthorised settlements have been relocated with mutual consent by providing improved alternative accommodation in appropriate areas. Phase 1 of this programme has been completed. Phase 2 &amp; 3 are pending implementation. Training and re-training of staff and monitoring program for enhanced management to be implemented. Further, inter-coordination between relevant agencies has to be streamlined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.6. Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| If applicable, give details (e.g. dates, results, indicators chosen) of any previous periodic or reactive monitoring exercises of the property: | 1. A monitoring program was conducted at the end of 1994 by a team of experts nominated by ICOMOS
2. Activities on the Sigiriya site of the CCF has been monitored by UNESCO working group every 2 years from 1981 to 1988. |
| Is there a formal monitoring system established for the site? | YES / NO |
| If YES, please give details of its organisation: | A site meeting is held each month and includes the participation of the Director-General and other Directors and officials of the CCF project. Representatives of the various State departments including the ASD, Department of Wildlife Conservation, Forest Department, Urban Development Authority and Pradesha Sabas are among the participants. Decisions concerning the site are taken at this meeting, which also serves as a monitoring system.

The “Mirror Wall” and “Frescoes” are monitored on a regular basis with the coordination of the relevant officials of the ASD and CCF. |

If not already in place, is the establishment of a formal monitoring system planned? | YES/NO |

If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page, clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006).
However, the monitoring system which is in place needs to be renewed periodically. It is also suggested to have “Annual Technical Audits” by an independent committee comprising members of ICOMOS, PGIAR, ACOMAS, Universities etc followed by “Periodic Peer-Review Meetings’ with international experts.

If YES, please outline the functioning of that system, taking into consideration the key indicators you will be asked to define below (see 089 / 090):

| Not applicable |

Are there any indicators established for monitoring the state of conservation of the property?

| No |

If YES, please provide up-to-date information with respect to each of the key indicators established and/or used. Care should be taken to ensure that this information is as accurate and reliable as possible, for example by carrying out observations in the same way, using similar equipment and methods at the same time of the year and day. Name and describe the key indicators for measuring the state of conservation of this property:

| Not applicable |

**II.6. continued**

| If NO indicators have been identified and / or used so far, please define key indicators for future use in monitoring: |

1. Human flows measured by
   (a) Number of visitor to the site local and foreign
   (b) Number of vehicles entering the site
2. Environmental degradation by solid waste disposal
3. Number of unauthorized encroachments
4. Sanity of the site measured by the amount of graffiti
5. Availability of information and education of the site using a questionnaire |

| Indicate which partners, if any, are involved or will be involved in the regular monitoring exercise: |

UDA (Urban Development Authority)
Archaeological Survey Department
Central Cultural Fund
ICOMOS (Sri Lanka)
Geological Survey and Mines Bureau |

Identify the administrative provisions for organizing the regular monitoring of the property:

The existing site staff of the Archaeological Department and the Cultural Triangle will be adequate.
Describe what improvement the State Party foresees or would consider desirable in
improving the monitoring system:

**On site staff equipped with mobile facilities to monitor encroachments and violations
within the buffer zone. Re-commissioning of the Peripheral fencing. Seek UNESCO
assistance to obtain an international expert for the proposed “Technical Audit” at
least once in two years.**

In specific cases, the World Heritage Committee and/or its Bureau may have already
examined the state of conservation of the property and made recommendations to the State
Party, either at the time of inscription or afterwards. In such cases the State Party is
requested to report on the actions that have been taken in response to the observations or
decisions made by the Bureau or Committee. Give details, if applicable:

**A sustainable conservation plan with economic development should be finalized and
adopted for implementation**

### II.7. Conclusions and recommended actions

Please summarise the main conclusions regarding the state of the World Heritage values of
the property (see items II.2. and II.3. above): **The World Heritage values of the property
have been maintained and enhanced since its inscription.**

Please summarise the main conclusions regarding the management and factors affecting the
property (see items II.4. and II.5. above): **The objectives of the Sigiriya Heritage
Foundation Act describes the management conclusion for the site.**

### II.7. continued

Give an overview over proposed future action / actions:

**A strong management body is a crucial requirement at the site. The “Sigiriya
Heritage Foundation Act” will fulfil this necessity.**

Name the agency responsible for implementation of these actions (if different from 005):

**The State is duly required to implement “Sigiriya Heritage Foundation Act”.**

Give a timeframe for the implementation of the actions described above:

**The period 2003 – 2005 subject to financial funding.**

Indicate for which of the planned activities International Assistance from the World
Heritage Fund may be needed (if any):

(i) **To establish visitor information centre and a museum.**
(ii) **Digital Archives**
(iii) **Funding for community development, poverty alleviation and relocation of
residents**

If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page,
clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006).
Are there any contacts with management units of other properties within or outside your country? **YES**

If YES, please explain:
- Cultural heritage site management experiences of other sites

Please indicate which experience made during the periodic reporting exercise and/or during the on-going conservation/protection efforts of the property could be shared with other States Parties dealing with similar problems or issues:
- Sigiriya and its heritage management system and its results have been regularly featured in international meetings and published in proceedings. These findings show a significant contribution to the study of garden histories, integration of archaeological and botanical dimensions of the sites and thereby research and management of cultural landscapes

Provide the name(s) and address(es) of organizations or specialist(s) who could be contacted for this purpose:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City and Post Code</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Archaeological Survey Department</td>
<td>I. Department of Archaeology, Sir Marcus Fernando Mawatha</td>
<td>I. Colombo 7, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>++ 941 695255</td>
<td>++ 941 696250</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arch@diamond.lanka.net">arch@diamond.lanka.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Central Cultural Fund</td>
<td>II. Central Cultural Fund, 212/1, Bauddhaloka Mawatha</td>
<td>II. Colombo 7, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>++ 941 508960</td>
<td>++ 941 500731</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gen_ccf@sri.lanka.net">gen_ccf@sri.lanka.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Project Manager</td>
<td>III. Sigiriya Project, Central Cultural Fund, Anuradhapura</td>
<td>III. Sigiriya, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>++ 940 66 31815</td>
<td>++ 940 66 31815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.8. Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise for Section II

Was sufficient and adequate information made available to the responsible authorities and individuals during the preparation phase of the Periodic Reporting exercise (information given, meetings etc.)? **Yes**

If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page, clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006).
Was the questionnaire clear and did it help to comply with the reporting requirements of the State Party? Yes 106

What are the perceived benefits and lessons learnt of the exercise?
The need to establish well-controlled buffer zones for the protection of the immediate surrounding of the Heritage site was highlighted. The need to prepare comprehensive management plan, monitoring system for the sites together with "technical audits" was identified 107

Please describe the expected outcome of the Periodic Reporting exercise and the desired follow-up by the World Heritage Committee:
World Heritage Committee should take action to identify the needs to upkeep the values of the site and to provide the necessary technical assistance to conduct peer-review sessions that will help the locally responsible organisation to improve the standards of the management of the site. On the other hand the World Heritage Committee should see the positive possibilities of providing technical inputs that have been requested in this document. 108

II.9. Documentation attached

The State Party is invited to supply the materials listed below. Please check those items that were attached.

1. (X) Maps and plans showing the general location of the property, its boundary and buffer zone as well as the necessary detail of the property itself (see question 003 for specifications)
2. (X) Photo of general view (aerial view) of the property
3. (X) Illustrations of the state of conservation of the site (photographs, slides and, if available, film/videos)
4. (X) Details of the important aspects of the property (landscapes, animal and vegetable species, monuments etc.)
5. (X) Photos illustrating the main threats to the site and its surroundings
6. (X) Extracts of relevant laws and regulations concerning the protection of cultural and natural heritage at national, provincial and municipal levels
7. ( ) Copies of the management plan of the site as well as extracts and/or copies of other plans relating to the site (e.g. emergency plan, use plan, etc.)
8. (X) Indicative bibliography

If the space on the Questionnaire is not sufficient, please continue on a separate page, clearly labelling the answer with the corresponding number of the question (e.g. 006).
Annexure No.063:

- The PGIAR-CCF-KAVA collaboration project (1990-1992) carried out archaeological research studies in the Sigiriya-Dambulla region.
- PGIAR-CCF-SARCP collaboration project (1988-1993) studied the archaeological landscape and carried out multi-disciplinary studies including palynology to understand the palaeo-environment of the area. (Please find attached the Contents Pages of the SARCP publications 1990 and 1994).
- Several research studies carried out with Maitland University in the United Kingdom, to survey the Water Garden.
- Intensive archaeological explorations were carried out by the Sigiriya Cultural Triangle Project to document and study the disappearing archaeological evidence.
- Please find attached a list of the sites excavated and conserved by the project in the World Heritage Site of Sigiriya.