



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

World Heritage

32 COM

Distribution Limited

WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add

Paris, 18 June 2008

Original: English / French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

World Heritage Committee
Thirty -Second Session
Quebec City, Canada
2 - 10 July 2008

Item 7B of the Provisional Agenda: State of conservation of World Heritage properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

SUMMARY

As per Decision **7 EXT.COM 4B.1, paragraph 9**, this document contains information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, and is separated in three categories:

1. State of conservation reports for adoption requiring discussion by the World Heritage Committee, and especially concerning properties considered for in-Danger listing;
2. State of conservation reports for adoption requiring no discussion by the World Heritage Committee;

Decision required: The World Heritage Committee is requested to review the reports on the state of conservation of properties contained in this document. In certain cases, the World Heritage Committee may wish to decide to discuss in detail the state of conservation reports which are submitted for adoption without discussion. The World Heritage Committee may wish to adopt the draft Decision presented at the end of each state of conservation report.

The full reports of Reactive Monitoring missions requested by the World Heritage Committee are available at the following Web address in their original language:
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008/>

Table of content

I.	LIST OF PROPERTIES FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING	3
II.	REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	4
	NATURAL PROPERTIES	4
	AFRICA	4
	2. Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N 1162)	4
	3. Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199)	7
	ARAB STATES	12
	6. Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)	12
	7. Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia) (N 8)	14
	ASIA-PACIFIC	18
	13. Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)	18
	15. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)	21
	EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	26
	21. Danube Delta (Romania) (N 588)	26
	24. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)	30
	25. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)	34
	LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	38
	31. Iguazu National Park (Argentina) (N 303)	38
	32. Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N 355)	41
	35. Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205 bis)	45
	37. Sangay National Park (Ecuador) (N 250)	49
	38. Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)	51
	39. Manú National Park (Peru) (N 402)	54
	40. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161)	56
	MIXED PROPERTIES	60
	ASIA-PACIFIC	60
	41. Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181 bis)	60
	LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	67
	44. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)	67
	CULTURAL PROPERTIES	73
	AFRICA	73
	46. Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15)	73
	47. Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia) (C 18)	75
	49. Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev)	78

52. Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape (South Africa) (C 1265)	78
54. Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173 rev)	81
ARAB STATES	86
57. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)	86
59. Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093).....	86
63. Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20)	89
ASIA-PACIFIC	94
77. Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451)	94
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	98
80. Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley (Andorra) (C 1160 bis).....	98
82. Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033)	99
83. Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786)	101
86. Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616).....	103
88. Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (France) (C 85)	106
89. Bordeaux, Port of the Moon (France) (C 1256)	107
90. Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708)	109
91. Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710)	113
93. Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066).....	117
97. Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia) (C 852).....	119
106. Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545).....	119
108. Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320 bis)	122
110. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)	124
112. Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488).....	124
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	129
121. City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 120)	129
122. Maya site of Copan (Honduras) (C 120).....	130
125. Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135).....	133
127. Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016).....	135

I. LIST OF PROPERTIES FOR CONSIDERATION FOR IN-DANGER LISTING

MIXED PROPERTIES	60
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	67
44. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)	67

II. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

2. Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N 1162)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

Criteria

(viii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 8B.4

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

The following threats were identified at the time of inscription of the property on the World Heritage List:

- a) Theft and vandalism;
- b) Pollution of the Vaal River;
- c) Lack of tourism management, particularly access.

Current conservation issues

The joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission to Vredefort Dome was carried out from 28 April to 3 May 2008 in accordance with the World Heritage Committee decision **29 COM 8B.4**, and included a review of progress towards the special management and collaboration with the landowners to ensure the integrity of the property; clear definition of the legal boundaries for the three satellite component sites of this serial property and implementation

of the management plan for the property with the support of the key stakeholders. The following issues were identified by the mission:

a) *Proclamation under National Legislation*

To date the Vredefort Dome Site has not been proclaimed under the World Heritage Convention Act of South Africa, although a "Notice of Intent" was published in December, 2007. A number of land owners have raised written objections to the Proclamation claiming lack of sufficient awareness and consultations, and have threatened legal action which may delay the Proclamation.

Under the same legislation, the boundaries of the property, including the buffer and core zones must be physically demarcated on the ground. It is also noted that there may be scope to harmonize the buffer zone boundary better with the boundaries of the private landowners, as this would simplify the management of the property. This process should be carried out in consultation with the relevant landowners.

b) *Land owners*

Resolution of the concerns of landowners is critical to the successful management of the property. A number of landowners have recorded their appreciation of the World Heritage designation and have made progress with promotional activities and compatible land use practices such as establishment of nature based conservancies and Game Farms. However, there are a number of landowners who formally registered objections to their land being proclaimed under national legislation and some have noted that they do not have sufficient information on the property, and their roles and responsibilities. The Department of Environment and Tourism (DEAT) and the local Municipalities lack accurate and up to date data on landownership within the Dome.

c) *Inadequate Site Management*

The National World Heritage Site Management Authority has replaced the Vredefort Dome Inter-Provincial Task Team under the Vredefort Dome Steering Committee as the recognized institution under the World Heritage Convention Act of South Africa, even while the proclamation is pending. However, currently there is no operational management unit with sufficient capacity to implement and enforce regulations to ensure protection of the property.

The site management authority for the Vredefort Dome (WHSMA) has not been established nor staffed yet. The lack of a functional unit on site has resulted in a number of uncontrolled activities taking place within the property. Lack of monitoring and enforcement of adverse aspects such as pollution, vandalism is a result of this weakness.

Lack of a physical presence of a Management Unit is a major cause of poor communication and awareness, which is the case of many landowners.

d) *Degradation of the property*

Inspection of the Vaal River and the sewage treatment works in the town of Parys showed high levels of untreated and semi treated sewage being released into the river. While the impact of this current level of pollution on the geological integrity of the property is not known and may be negligible, the effect on its potential for tourism and education, and therefore the integrity of the property will be compromised. The Municipality officials have admitted to this fact and presented a case on the need for substantial overhaul of the system and equipment. It does not appear that this improvement will take place soon given their limited financial and personnel capacity. Industrial and urban pollutants released upstream also affect the integrity of the property.

Ground water, which is the sole source of water for both domestic and agricultural use, has been over utilized as indicated by abandoned homes and some dry boreholes. The mission team was also informed that several boreholes have been polluted by leaks from sanitation systems. In view of the critical issue of water and sanitation at the property, there is a need to

undertake: (a) proper pollution source inventory and quality monitoring system; (b) geological survey of the property as a priority for water management plan in view of current poor quality water entering the Vaal River drainage system; (c) an inventory of water quality and groundwater table levels in boreholes in the property in order to improve knowledge of the aquifer system and management in terms of any future expansion of the tourism infrastructure and (d) effluent from Parys and Vredefort sewerage treatment plants needs to be monitored and corrective measures taken.

The mission team received information about a project planned by the South African Government to address all sources of pollution in the Vaal River. However, details and the time frame for this project were unclear.

A number of abandoned or unsuccessful maize farms are turning to alternative agricultural practices. Pecan nut cultivation has been introduced on some of the farms visited and seen from the air within the property. This is a long term and irrigation intensive form of agriculture but with high value. The impact of large scale conversion of the farms within the Dome core area is unknown and given the substantial water and fertilizer requirements of the practice, the effects are likely to be negative.

Veld fires are a major threat to the property. The only fire department located in Parys Town is not equipped to provide the necessary rapid response in the event of fire.

Wildlife poaching is a threat in the property considering the high value of wild meat in the area. Regarding theft and vandalism reported at the time of inscription, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN mission was informed that a study has been commissioned to identify the sensitive areas for protection. It is neither clear who commissioned the study nor who will implement its findings.

In the absence of the formal proclamation of the property as well as agreements for responsible conduct by the landowners within the property, there is evidence of unplanned tourism and recreational development which has not been approved nor advised by the management authority. Unregulated construction of lodges and camps along the river and other areas of the Dome core have the potential to damage the integrity of the property from increased human traffic and associated impacts. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN therefore recommend that the State Party ensures the application of relevant environmental laws for all new development projects. In addition, development within the property should not impact the outstanding universal value or integrity of the property. Furthermore, all new constructions, since the inscription of the property, should be reviewed and modified to comply with relevant legislation.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.2

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 8B.4**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Requests the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 2008 reactive monitoring mission as soon as possible, including:*
 - a) *Through its relevant Ministry and the Department of Environment and Tourism undertake urgently all the necessary steps to have the property proclaimed under national Law and adopt the 2007 integrated management plan;*
 - b) *In consultation with the landowners, clearly demarcate appropriate boundaries of the buffer zone of the property and obtain endorsement for the legal proclamation*

and for the 2007 Integrated management plan to ensure adequate legal protection of the property and its effective management;

- c) Provide as a matter of priority the urgently required resources for management and for staff and services within the property;*
 - d) Urgently reduce the level of pollution in the Vaal River and conduct regular monitoring, including the monitoring of ground water quality and levels;*
 - e) Establish clear policies for appropriate land use, particularly in relation to agriculture and tourism;*
 - f) Ensure development is effectively regulated in relation to environmental legislation and that any development does not threaten the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property;*
 - g) Ensure that the issue of fire hazard is addressed as a matter of urgency through the provision of an on-site fire fighting facility equipped and manned for rapid response;*
4. *Calls upon the international community to assist the State Party by mobilizing financial resources to enable the management of the Vredefort Dome;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress in implementing the recommendations of the 2008 monitoring mission, and in providing adequate legal protection to the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

3. Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.3 ; 31 COM 7B.3

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2007: World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Proposed cattle driving route;
- b) Poaching;
- c) Insufficient funding;
- d) Mineral and hydrocarbon prospecting and mining;
- e) Tourism management and development;
- f) Potential and proposed dam development.

Current conservation issues

From 2 to 9 June 2007, a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission visited the property. The findings and recommendations of this mission were presented orally at the 31st session (Christchurch, 2007). This report and its recommendations are available online <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2007>.

The mission considered that the property is at a critical stage in its development and noted the lack of financial and human resources while at the same time management challenges are increasing. The significant financial resources that were available during the period 1994 to 2004 as a result of the previous Revenue Retention Scheme have not continued. The reinstatement of this scheme would greatly aid in providing revenue essential to the effective management of the property.

Issues related to the development of tourism were noted: rapid development of the tourism sector in northern Selous and unplanned tourism developments outside Selous at the entrance gates Matambwe and Mtemere are placing increased demands on both infrastructure and staff.

The mission also expressed concern about the lack of information on the hunting activities and therefore concluded it was unable to do a full assessment of the impact of hunting activities on the state of conservation of the property. While the general management plan has now been approved, it will be important for the World Heritage Committee to monitor its implementation. There have also been serious delays in the implementation of the 1998 Tanzanian Wildlife Policy, which includes important provisions to allow for community management of wildlife resources. This is important for the livelihoods of the communities living around the reserve. The mission was further informed that while a number of applications had been submitted for the exploration of minerals and hydrocarbons, these had not been approved but that other Government departments continued to put pressure to allow exploration in the game reserves. In addition, two potential dam projects were being considered, with major potential implications on the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property.

The mission developed a number of recommendations to address these issues. The key recommendations were included in decision **31 COM 7B.3**.

No report on the State of Conservation of the property or on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 mission was received from the State Party at the time of preparation of this document. Furthermore, the State Party did not submit the Environmental Impact Assessment for the dam projects requested since the 30th session.

However, The World Heritage Centre and IUCN received some information from a number of other sources on the State of Conservation of the property.

Hunting and poaching remain a serious concern. According to the information received, the numbers of tourist and hunting camps may be increasing despite the stress on infrastructure, management capacity and planning. A game reserve officer was reported to have been killed in May 2008 by a gang believed to be involved in game poaching. Further investigation is required to provide an understanding of the networks of poachers and the flows of poached products.

At recent meetings of the African Wildlife Consultative Forum (November 2007), which is a regular meeting among the Directors of Wildlife, there was a strong assertion that Tanzania needed to become far more proactive in the development of norms and standards and a Code of Conduct for hunting following concerns about the increase in trophy hunting coupled with a decline in trophy quality. IUCN encourages the State Party to monitor and report on the numbers of hunters, their take and associated revenue. At its last session, the Committee has already requested a further World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission to review the management and operations of the hunting activities in the Selous Game Reserve during the dry season in 2008/2009. The mission should visit in particular the southern hunting sector of the Selous, which has most of the wildlife and provides the vast majority of the revenues of the reserve.

The Selous-Niassa wildlife corridor is a landscape-scale conservation initiative between the Selous and the Niassa Game Reserve of Mozambique, the two largest elephant ranges of the world. The entire corridor is threatened by poaching for meat and ivory, habitat degradation due to wildfires and likely agricultural expansion. Unchecked, these processes will ultimately prevent the movement of wildlife populations between the Selous Game Reserve and Niassa Game Reserve, and the maintenance of the corridor is thus important to maintain the integrity of the property. The potential role of the *World Heritage Convention* in providing support to the wildlife corridor should be explored during the monitoring mission to the hunting areas of the property.

The property does not currently have a Statement of outstanding universal value and it is recommended that one should be developed by the State Party in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to provide a basis for the future monitoring of the state of conservation of the property. The State Party is encouraged to consult the relevant specialist groups of the IUCN Species Survival Commission to assess status of the key species of the property.

The State Party has not clarified the status of the dam projects. From other sources, it is understood that a Strategic Environmental Assessment was undertaken in 2007 by the World Bank, as part of the preparation Dar es Salaam Water Supply and Sewerage Project. This ranked a dam at Kidunda as one of two highest ranking options amongst 26 evaluated, but noted that it would "induce some flooding of the ecologically sensitive Selous Game reserve and require that a small number of inhabitants (300 – 400) be resettled involuntarily." A World Bank study has also noted that the relative financial costs for the different alternative scenarios have yet to be finalized, and the choice of water supply options has yet to be made. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN request the State Party to clarify the status and potential impacts of these projects on the values and integrity of the property.

With regard to mining, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre have received information that prospecting for uranium is presently carried out on large scale by two companies from Australia within the property and the Selous Niassa Wildlife Corridor, with equipment brought in and camps developed. The 2007 monitoring mission was not informed about this and no environmental and social impact assessments were submitted by the State Party. On May 30, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party, requesting information on the status and location of this prospecting.

Further information was received on a project to upgrade the Tundururu-Songea Road to the south of the property. The road would ensure access to agricultural fertile areas and areas rich in mineral resources and also facilitate access to the southern part of the property. No

information has been provided by the State Party on the status of the road project and the resulting environmental impacts. The planned monitoring mission should look into this issue and associated developments.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are very concerned that no State Party report was received, given the need to urgently implement the recommendations of the 2007 mission and the numerous reports on increasing potential and existing pressures from various development projects mentioned above.

In view of the issues related to tourism, uranium prospecting, community benefits, visitor management and sustainable finance, the State Party may wish to consider hosting a workshop on natural World Heritage in Tanzania. Such a workshop could serve to aid capacity building, and to strengthen partnerships between agencies, NGOs and World Heritage managers in Tanzania. IUCN could provide technical assistance for such a workshop.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.3

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.3**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Expresses its sincerest condolences to the family of the game reserve officer who was killed recently;*
4. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 mission;*
5. *Expresses its utmost concern about reports received by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN of uranium prospecting within the property and in the wildlife corridor; and reiterates its position that mining is incompatible with the World Heritage status of the property;*
6. *Urges the State Party to halt any prospecting or other mining developments within the property and calls upon the holders of any mining or exploration permit covering the property to respect international standards with respect to mining in World Heritage properties, as outlined in the International Council on Mining and Metals Position Statement on Mining and Protected Areas (2003) and not to mine or explore within World Heritage properties;*
7. *Notes with concern other potential developments inside or in the vicinity of the property which might impact its outstanding universal value and integrity, in particular planned dam developments and the proposed upgrading of the Tunduru- Songea road and also urges the State Party to submit information to the World Heritage Centre on the status of these projects and their potential impact on the property, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
8. *Further urges the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 2007 monitoring mission;*
9. *Requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, to develop a draft Statement of outstanding universal value, including the conditions of integrity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*

10. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission to the property as foreseen in Decision **31 COM 7B.3**, to take place during the 2008/2009 dry season in order to assess the state of conservation of the property, in particular the effective management and impact of hunting activities on the outstanding universal values and integrity of the property;
11. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including the status of wildlife populations, the levels of hunting and poaching, status of the planned and on going mining and development projects with potential impact on the property and on progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 monitoring mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

ARAB STATES

6. Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.5; 30 COM 7B.9; 31 COM 7B.12

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 35,000 for technical cooperation

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

No formal monitoring missions. World Heritage Centre missions in the framework of activities in Mauritania in 2002, 2003 and 2004

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal fishing;
- b) Mechanical shellfish harvesting;
- c) Oil exploitation;
- d) Tourism and increased accessibility due to the new Nouadhibou-Nouakchott road;
- e) Lack of management capacity and resources.

Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a state of conservation report which was requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007). Therefore progress on the implementation of previous decisions is difficult to assess. However, IUCN's regional office for West Africa has conducted a management effectiveness review of Banc d'Arguin National Park and has found that the management of the property has been improved. The property was found to have a valid management plan, for the period 2005-2009, and there is a sufficient number of staff with adequate skills, although their spatial distribution within the property could be improved.

Transportation means and logistics are quite good in the property, and communication means are operational. The property has been supported financially by the government of Mauritania and other international donors. A trust fund is being launched and should be

operational in the coming year. The property has developed good relations with the Imraguen local communities. Although the restrictions on access to some resources are still a source of conflict, the communities strongly support the exclusive fishing access which they have been granted within the property. They expect the park administration to be more proactive and to lobby the Nouakchott health and education administrations for additional attention to their needs. One of the recommendations of this study is that the zoning of PNBA needs to be finalized in order to clarify the role of the different territories.

The IUCN study found that coastal changes are causing birds to abandon their nesting sites and that sand dunes are encroaching on water holes apparently as a result of climate change. Illegal bird poaching and illegal logging continue to occur as well as overgrazing by camels during years with good rainfall. The illegal fishing in the marine portion of the property continues. The population of monk seal, one of the most threatened species of mammals which occurs in the Cap Blanc area, is being disturbed by line fishing from the seashore, resulting in a reduction of their habitat. Ghost fishing from lost nets also causes increased monk seal and fish deaths. In addition, this portion of the property faces threats from coastal erosion of cliffs, further reducing the key habitat for the seals, and wind-blown deposits of fine particles of iron. Marine aquaculture development also poses a potential threat to the marine values and integrity at Cap Blanc. No impact assessments or monitoring activities have been carried out. The State Party faces also political pressure from fishing lobbies, which are currently permitted not to fish within the property as marine resources outside the property are overfished but to date has resisted these lobbies. In the terrestrial portion of the property, invasive plants are depriving native plants of water though there has been successful management of one species- *Salvinia molesta*. An additional problem is the entry of polluted water from the Senegal River, containing agricultural run-off including pesticides.

The State Party did not provide an update on its progress in implementing the following previous decisions by the World Heritage Committee:

- a) To seek “particularly sensitive sea area” (PSSA) status from the International Maritime Organisation;
- b) To implement a programme to monitor the threats to marine resources;
- c) To produce and implement an Oil spill emergency response plan;
- d) Progress on mitigation measures for the new Nouadhibou-Nouakchott road;
- e) Recommendations on the legal framework of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that whilst the management effectiveness of the Banc d'Arguin is improving there are still a number of conservation issues and threats that require urgent attention, in particular in relation to the marine and coastal environment. A proper assessment of the situation is difficult because the State Party has not responded to the requests of the World Heritage Committee to report on progress and the status of the outstanding universal value of the property.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.6

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.12**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit a state of conservation report as requested at its 31 session (Christchurch, 2007);

4. Welcomes the findings of the IUCN Management Effectiveness Assessment on the positive progress in managing the property; but notes with concern the many threats which the property continues to face;
5. Requests the State Party to implement the recommendations of its previous decisions; and in particular to report on the following issues:
 - a) Monitoring the status of values of the property;
 - b) Protection of marine resources from overexploitation and pollution; and
 - c) Status of the proposed Oil spill emergency response plan;
6. Also requests the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2009** a report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress in implementing the previous recommendations, together with a copy of the management plan for the next period, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

7. Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia) (N 8)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(x)

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

1996-2006

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7A.8; 30 COM 7A.12; 31 COM 7B.13

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 100,000 for technical assistance, training activities and emergency assistance.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1999: World Heritage Centre / IUCN / Ramsar mission; 2000: IUCN / Ramsar mission; 2002: IUCN mission; June 2006: World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Adverse impacts of dam construction;
- b) Inadequate water flows for maintaining biological system;

- c) Inadequate management structure;
- d) Lack of management plan.

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted its reports on the state of conservation of the property on 27 February 2008, the 2006-2007 scientific monitoring report, and the meeting notes for phase 1 of the study on the application of the management and forecasting models for the property, as well as a copy of the final version of the management plan, approved at the end of 2007 as the outcome of a GEF project, which has been implemented since 2003.

The main features of the management plan are: the progressive establishment of an autonomous management structure for the Park; zoning proposals within the Park; management of water resources through consultation with the authorities responsible for the dams and through use of a mathematical model; participatory management with local communities; and valorisation through sustainable ecotourism.

The State Party has implemented the following recommendations of the 2006 reactive monitoring mission and recommendations of the World Heritage Committee:

a) *Management structure*

The management plan identifies a three step procedure for establishment of a management structure endowed with powers of decision and financial autonomy. As the first step, a Committee was set up by ministerial decision on 24 September 2007, and will meet regularly in 2008. The institutional members have been identified and plan to meet during 2008 to prepare step two for the establishment of the management structure.

b) *Water management*

The management plan identifies water management as an essential element of the management of the lake-marshes ecosystem, through a process of consultation with the authorities responsible for operation of the dams. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party continues to recognise Ichkeul as a net consumer of water, on par with agriculture, with the consequence that the property is included in the Ministry of Agriculture's planning documents.

Studies to update the 1996 mathematical model for predicting and managing water resources, a crucial issue for the proper management of the property, began in 2007, and a first test application was carried out in January 2008. The 2006-2007 scientific monitoring study reported on the management of water resources of the property and concluded that despite low water supply the modelling used to aid water resource management had resulted in improvements of the aquatic ecosystem and its dependent flora and fauna.

c) *Scientific research and monitoring*

A detailed report on scientific research and monitoring at Ichkeul is annexed to the State Party's report. This points out that the assemblage of ecosystems has recovered to a condition very close to that when it was first accepted on the World Heritage List. Thus, although inflow of water in the 2006/07 hydrological year was relatively limited, increased areas of submerged vegetation (notably *Potamogeton*) was recorded. Thanks to careful manipulation of the sluice, the marshes had extensive area of rushes *Scirpus*, numbers of water birds were comparable to the years before the dams were built, fish catches, notably of eels, resumed, and reed-beds around the edges of the lake began to reappear.

d) *Social aspects*

During 2007, several awareness raising activities were carried out including the production of documents on ecotourism, distributed to institutions, schools and visitors. Four schools surrounding the property created environmental clubs and two national workshops were

organised. A first draft of a national strategy for public education and communication was also produced.

The establishment of an Agenda 21 programme for Ichkeul began in January 2008 in association with the town of Tinja, the administrative centre in which the Park is situated and where the first Agenda 21 Committee has been established.

However, some of the recommendations of the 2006 reactive monitoring mission relating to water management and scientific monitoring, although planned, are not fully implemented and include:

- (i) Ensure the careful use of any water discharging from the Sidi Barrak Dam;
- (ii) Assess the effects on Ichkeul of the planned construction of three additional dams;
- (iii) Ensure that measures are put in place to restore the ecological functioning of the Joumine Wadi inside the Park; and
- (iv) Collect and store scientific data and reports relating to Ichkeul in a central location to enable their analysis; in particular, for the census of winter waterfowl and for mountain birds;

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recognise the significant achievements of the State Party in implementing the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and in restoring the values of the property. The operation of the sluice has made it possible to overcome the potential problems of limited rainfall and water intake in the last year, and the State Party is to be congratulated on its continued policy of recognising the property as a net consumer of water.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.7

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7A.12** and **31 COM 7B.13**, adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006), and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Commends the State Party for its successful management of limited water resources in 2006-7 and notes with satisfaction the continuation of the policy of considering Ichkeul as a net consumer of water;*
4. *Also notes that the State Party has begun the process of establishing a management structure, with powers of decision making and financial autonomy, as recommended by the 2006 mission, and has recently established an Agenda 21 Committee;*
5. *Welcomes the measures proposed in the management plan to achieve management of water resources through cooperation with the authorities responsible for the dams and through mathematical modelling;*
6. *Expresses its satisfaction at the continuing improvement of the state of conservation of the property, in particular the restoration of fresh water conditions, which have allowed the development of improved fish catches, greater extension of water plants and the numbers of aquatic birds;*

7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, an updated report on the implementation of the remaining recommendations of the 2006 monitoring mission and the implementation of the management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

ASIA-PACIFIC

13. Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

Criteria

(x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.8 ; 30 COM 7B.13; 31 COM 7B.17

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 80,000 (Enhancing our Heritage project on management effectiveness assessment)

Previous monitoring missions

2005: World Heritage Centre site visit; March 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Inadequate water supply and competition for water with neighbouring communities;
- b) Poor water (quality and quantity) management;
- c) Invasive species (*Prosopis*, *Eichhornia*, *Paspalum*).

Current conservation issues

The report submitted by the State Party on 29 January 2008 was reviewed by the joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission that visited the property from 10 to 14 March 2008. The full mission report can be consulted at: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008>. Current conservation issues include:

a) *Threats to the water supply*

The State Party advised the mission that the desirable annual inflow of water was 550 rather than 350 million cubic feet (MCft), as suggested during previous reports. The water availability in the property has worsened since 2005, due to the contrast between the good monsoon in 2005 which allowed adequate amounts of water to be released into the property, and the essential failure of the monsoons of 2006 and 2007 in the catchment areas that have historically fed the property. As a result, there had been little or no supply of water to feed wetland habitats in the property during 2006 and 2007, resulting in low numbers of both breeding and wintering water birds; furthermore, these dry conditions were conducive for the

continued invasion of the property by the thorny scrub *Prosopis* which covered 11,000 hectares (40% of the total surface area of the property) of wetland and grassland areas of the property by 2007, rendering extensive areas inaccessible for water birds and grazing mammals, and out-competing indigenous vegetation.

In a response to the drought, the Government of Rajasthan State has reportedly earmarked funds for a series of remedial measures, involving both rehabilitation of existing hydraulic structures and design of new structures which will provide new sources of water, and better protection against drought. The three main remedial measures include:

- i) **Chiksana Canal:** The Chiksana drain (which carries floodwaters) channels water away from sensitive lands, and passes directly through the property without diverting any of the floodwaters into it, thus presenting an opportunity to provide waters to the property's wetlands. Disabled hydraulic structures on the Chiksana drain were repaired, and a 3km side canal (Chiksana canal) extending into the property was built to channel that water directly into the property's wetlands. The canal, along with sluice gates were built and completed in early 2008 – these are now fully operational and await the June-July monsoon to demonstrate their effectiveness. This structure would provide up to 100 MCft of suitable surface water (containing fish and rich in nutrients) to the property during a normal monsoon.
- ii) **Piping water from the Govardhan Drain to the property:** The large Govardhan drain passes 15 km from the property and was built to divert the Yamuna river floodwaters away from populated areas. Its floodwaters are generated from rains falling in huge catchment area and thus less susceptible to irregular rainfall patterns affecting supply from the Chiksana Canal. A diversion of water from this Drain will provide up to 350 MCft to the property in a monsoon season with average rainfall. The mission team was informed that budgets had been earmarked, and contractors selected to begin the engineering work on the diversion soon after the mission. These waters would also be rich in nutrients. According to statements by senior state government officials, the diversion was planned to become operational in time for the 2008 monsoon (end of June).
- iii) **The Dholpur-Bharatpur drinking water supply project:** scheduled to be completed in 2009, this project will divert Chambal river water to Bharatpur for domestic purposes, with a proportion legally earmarked for diversion into the property (310 MCft for the first four years, then 62.5 MCft per annum). This water will not contain essential nutrients or aquatic organisms; however it could be mixed with other sources of water to provide suitable supplies for the property.

b) *Invasive Species*

The threat from invasive *Prosopis* scrub is being managed by funding local villagers, to remove trees and to use the timber for personal consumption (firewood and fence posts). The work involved is significant and is carefully supervised, ensuring that the entire root systems of the trees are also removed, preventing regeneration through coppicing. A regular flooding of the property in the 2008 monsoon season would guarantee the destruction of any seedlings and the seed-bank in the flooded area, as these do not tolerate water very well. However, a permanent control programme will be required to keep *Prosopis* from re-invading the property. The programme has also had the additional benefit of improving relations – often strained in the past - between the administration of the property and local villages. Some feral domestic cattle still graze in the property, but this issue is currently adequately managed.

In addition to *Prosopis*, *Eichornia* (a water hyacinth) is widespread in the property, and brought annually into the property by floodwaters. Water hyacinth impedes water flow, out competes native plants, and causes oxygen shortages and hence fish deaths. Anecdotal evidence points to water buffalo, previously permitted in the park, as being good control

agents for this plant. There is currently no control programme in place to deal with the water hyacinth.

Lack of water and the invasive species have affected the original bird diversity. The flagship Siberian Crane, to which the property is closely identified, has not been reported since 2002, after several years of dwindling numbers. Despite several requests for bird monitoring data neither the mission team, nor the World Heritage Centre, has received information on the current bird biodiversity and abundance. Given the very poor conditions over recent years, and the lack of information on actual bird numbers and bird diversity, there is serious concern that the property's outstanding universal value may have been compromised, raising the likelihood that the property may be a candidate for inscription onto the List of World Heritage in Danger.

In an effort to provide insurance against exclusive reliance of migratory birds on the property for the provision of nesting and wintering habitat, an effort has been made through the Enhancing our Heritage project (implemented through the World Heritage Centre, with the support of the University of Queensland, IUCN WCPA and the Wildlife Institute of India) to identify satellite wetlands within a radius of 30-40 km of the property. These wetlands have been inventoried, and plans to enhance their effectiveness as bird habitat are being developed. Providing a range of nesting and wintering sites for the birds will increase the overall resilience of their populations to temporary climatic or water regime fluctuations.

The mission considers that the two most urgent threats to the integrity of the property are the deficit in water supplies, and the problem of invasive plant species. Its principal recommendations therefore address these topics: the first recommendation emphasizes the importance of water supply, commends the State Party and the Rajasthan authorities for planning and funding the water supply projects and requests them to inform the World Heritage Committee of progress – particularly in time for these to be considered by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session; the second recommendation recognises the important effort in controlling *Prosopis* and calls on the relevant authorities to maintain this control in the future, and also to control invasive water plants such as *Eichornia* or *Paspalum* which may occur with the restoration of water supplies.

The mission welcomes the increasingly close relations between the KNP authorities and the local communities, as manifested by the establishment of ecodevelopment committees and by their participation in *Prosopis* control programmes. The mission also draws attention to the continuing influx of tourists and suggests that further investment on park infrastructure and tourism management is necessary, while suggesting a linkage in marketing between this natural World Heritage property and neighbouring cultural properties such as the Taj Mahal.

The mission team emphasises the critical on-going lack of quantitative information on the diversity and abundance of birdlife in this property inscribed onto the List of World Heritage precisely for this reason. The mission team recommends that this gap be urgently addressed.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.13

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.17**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes with concern the ongoing problems of water supply caused by reduced summer monsoon rains in the last four years and the resulting problems with invasive vegetation, notably *Prosopis juliflora* and *Eichhornia crassipes*;

4. *Also notes with concern the continuing absence of any information to gauge the effects of the repeated droughts on the diversity and abundance of birdlife in the property, putting in doubt its outstanding universal value;*
5. *Further notes the efforts of the State Party to address the water shortage as manifested by its investment in the Chiksana Canal and in the Govardhan Drain diversion projects, and in the proposed Dholpu-Bharatpur water supply project;*
6. *Welcomes the increased involvement of local stakeholders in the management of the property and suggests that formal structures be established to enable local stakeholders to be consulted on management and to participate in the conservation of the property;*
7. *Requests the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 2008 reactive monitoring mission, notably to:*
 - a) *Complete the Govardhan Drain diversion project in time to take advantage of the 2008 monsoon, and report on progress in the Dholpur-Bharatpur drinking water project;*
 - b) *Complete the Prosopis invasive plant control measures and put into place a permanent control programme for this, and other invasive plants;*
 - c) *Collaborate with local communities and stakeholders on management of the property in particular for the eradication of invasive vegetation;*
 - d) *Implement a monitoring programme of breeding and wintering birds in the property and in the region as soon as possible to enable monitoring of the outstanding universal value of the property; and to make the results of such monitoring available to international conservation organisations, engaging with conservation organisations as appropriate;*
 - e) *Continue to invest in the maintenance and improvement of the property's infrastructure, including tourism infrastructure;*
 - f) *Carry out a public use planning exercise with the objectives of better defining management authority, state and central government investments in this regard;*
 - g) *Support the efforts to identify and improve management of satellite wetlands surrounding the property as a strategy to enhance the resilience of bird populations to climatic and hydrological variations in the region;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress in implementing the above-noted recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, with a view to consider, in the absence of substantial progress, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger*

15. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

Criteria

(viii) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.12; 30 COM 7B.14; 31 COM 7B.18

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 45,000 for preparatory assistance and technical cooperation.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2004: IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Mining;
- b) Security limitations;
- c) Development threats;
- d) Exploitation of marine resources;
- e) Absence of a co-ordinating agency;
- f) Absence of a finalized strategic management plan;
- g) Park boundaries not physically demarcated;
- h) Inadequate financing.

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on 1 February 2008 on the management of the property, and the threats from the Lake Habema Road, mining, timber collection, poaching, and road construction. These issues were reviewed by a joint UNESCO / IUCN reactive monitoring mission, which visited the property from 26 March to 2 April 2008. The mission noted that although some earlier reported conservation issues have been either reduced (marine pollution) or are reportedly not currently active (illegal logging in swamp forests in Asmat region), serious threats to the outstanding universal values of Lorentz have increased markedly.

The mission identified three key issues requiring priority and immediate attention of the State Party: a) threats in the Lake Habema region; b) the functioning of the management agency; and c) Management of the southern lowlands region. The detailed recommendations and mission findings are available from <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008>

a) *Threats in the Lake Habema region*

The 2008 monitoring mission re-affirms the observations made in the 2004 mission report on the effects of threats to the property. Unauthorised road development in the Lake Habema glaciated landscape, under construction during the mission, is tangible evidence of the immediate threat now posed by a proposed major road construction programme in the alpine

and montane regions of the property. The greatest potentially irreversible damage has been caused by the new road construction near Lake Habema and the disease driven forest die-back in the high altitude Gondwanan *Nothofagus* forest adjacent to the Lake Habema road. The new road construction has the potential to cause on-going impact as peatlands and a perched lagoon are eroded and drained. Only a substantial and rapid rehabilitation of the road will prevent on-going impact on fragile high-value natural heritage features.

The 2007 State Party report noted a "Study on the road development impact" and the 2008 State Party report noted that a draft executive summary has been produced and some consultation has taken place with stakeholders. However, the report and results of this impact study have not been provided to the World Heritage Centre or to the mission team, which learnt that there have been no pathogenic investigations of the *Phytophthora* disease as a possible cause of forest die-back. The evidence from the 2008 mission indicates that the die-back associated with roads is continuing to spread, killing the relict *Nothofagus* forest.

The lack of progress in implementing these two priority actions, the Lake Habema road construction and forest die-back research and management, raised by the World Heritage Committee each year since 2004 is regrettable and explains the concomitant increased threat to the property. The State Party report noted potential economic benefits of roads from potential increased tourism revenue and increasing access to economic activity for residents of the property. However, the negative impacts on the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property from habitat degradation, forest fires, illegal timber cutting and landslides and the additional threats of forest die-back, invasive species and potential for increased illegal activities noted previously by the World Heritage Committee and reaffirmed by the mission, outweigh such potential benefits.

b) *Management agency functioning*

The unauthorised road construction is also symptomatic of the apparent failure of the new management regime to effectively engage in on-ground protection of the property. The forest dieback in the high altitude *Nothofagus* cool temperate rainforests reported by the 2004 mission has not been further investigated and has been observed to have expanded since 2004. The integrity and outstanding universal value of the alpine and montane landscapes of the Lake Habema precinct continue to be significantly impacted in the absence of effective field management by the Park management agency (Balai Taman Nasional Lorentz). Unless there is immediate and significant improvement in field management performance of the park authority, important areas of "outstanding universal value will be (further) degraded or lost".

The State Party has identified severe constraints to effective operation of the Park management including funding, limited monitoring and surveillance equipment, and limited staff capacity and technical expertise which deserves priority attention of the international community. The State Party reported that the budget for the Lorentz National Park Unit was only USD 710,000 in 2007, and not all activities planned were carried out. Further, the budget was to be increased to USD 1,000,000 in 2008, to cover salaries for 44 personnel (with the aim to increase this to 60 staff) and operating costs to manage more than 2 million hectares. The mission subsequently learned that all government programmes are to be reduced by some 30% in the next financial year.

c) *Management of the Southern Lowlands Region*

There are a variety of additional concerns and issues which have been raised in previous missions and still concern the effective management of the property including: boundary markings, lack of finality for the strategic plan, impacts of mining, invasive species (water hyacinth), and illegal fishing.

The boundary marking and mapping process is ongoing. The full extent of the park boundary has now been marked on the ground. However, the compilation map of the ground markers has not yet been completed and is expected to be completed later in 2008. The seaward boundary of the marine section remains unmarked and is a matter of concern.

The mission found no evidence of mine tailings entering or impacting on the marine section of the property, and considered that the monitoring programme maintained by Freeport Indonesia for periodically advising the Government agencies, including the Ministry of Forestry, represents a sound basis for the State Party to continue to monitor the situation in the property.

The Ministry of Forestry is encouraged to consider expanding the current monitoring in the marine part of the Lorentz property, in particular with regard to on-going discharge of effluents from mine tailings.

Given the immediacy of the road construction issue – one allegedly illegal road under construction at time of mission and many more planned – resolution of this serious threat to the alpine/montane section of the property is a matter of very high priority. Similarly, the related issue of forest die-back associated with roads needs to be dealt with concurrently and expeditiously.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that many threats are affecting the integrity of the property. While the outstanding universal value of the property is largely intact, unless a greater level of protection and management control is exercised in the immediate future, important vulnerable parts of the property could lose their integrity, and values could be seriously degraded or lost in the near future. Unless there is decisive management intervention in the immediate future, the current drift towards the whole property becoming threatened will continue. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the potential inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger be considered in 2010, if the priority and urgent recommendations of the 2008 monitoring mission have not been fully implemented.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.15

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.3**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes with concern the extensive threats to the property in the Lake Habema and southern lowland regions and the inadequate functioning of the management agency;*
4. *Acknowledges the increased funding allocated to the property in 2008 as compared to 2007 and the cooperation with international partners to improve conservation; however, also notes with concern reports of projected future overall funding reductions from an already inadequate level of funding;*
5. *Calls upon the international community to continue to support the property and increase financial and technical assistance;*
6. *Urges the State Party to increase political, financial and technical support for the property; and to engage more closely with the Papua provincial government to ensure that adequate legal protection and financial support is accorded to the property for its effective management;*
7. *Requests the State Party to fully implement the recommendations of the 2008 monitoring mission and to prioritise those which are most urgent, in particular:*
 - a) *Address the threats in the Lake Habema Region of the property from road construction, forest die-back and illegal logging through the following activities:*

- (i) Cease road construction, rehabilitate recently constructed roads and mitigate impacts;
 - (ii) Engage with local and provincial governments to resolve the threat of road development and potential impacts arising from decentralisation of government;
 - (iii) Engage with all indigenous communities within the property to identify options for sustainable development;
 - (iv) Identify and control dieback disease threatening the *Nothofagus* forests in the Lake Habema region;
 - (v) Address illegal logging;
- b) Improve management agency functioning through the following activities:
- (i) Finalise and implement the 2005 – 2010 (2007-2012) strategic plan;
 - (ii) Initiate consultation for strategic (precinct) planning of Lake Habema Region;
 - (iii) Seek external assistance for capacity building, technical assistance, equipment, and financing;
 - (iv) Increase capacity of staff through training and recruitment of technical experts;
 - (v) Survey and map ecosystems within alpine-montane landscapes in the property to improve basis of management;
 - (vi) Conduct independent technical and engineering assessment and design of road construction options in alpine-montane tract to minimise environmental impact;
- c) Improve management of the southern lowlands region through the following activities:
- (i) Mark marine boundaries and promote awareness within Government and the fishing industry to halt illegal fishing;
 - (ii) Collaborate with appropriate agencies on law enforcement to effectively protect the marine environment;
 - (iii) Initiate a program to control and prevent further spread of hyacinth into the property;
 - (iv) Develop liaison with Freeport for tracking of results of on-going monitoring of the impact of effluent discharge from mine tailings;
 - (v) Promote independent monitoring of marine portion of the property;
8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a report, by **1 February 2010**, on the state of conservation of the property, and progress on the implementation of recommendations of the 2008 monitoring mission, in particular on the cessation of damaging road construction, rehabilitation of existing roads, mitigation of impacts, and research into forest die-back, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

21. Danube Delta (Romania) (N 588)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1991

Criteria

(vii) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

24 COM I.21; 29 COM 7B.18; 30 COM 7B.24

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 30,000 for a training seminar (1999).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

October 2003: UNESCO (MAB) - Ramsar joint mission;

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Accidental cyanide pollution from mining;
- b) Deepwater navigation waterway through the Bystre mouth of the Danube River;
- c) Construction of petrol terminal at Gjugjurlesti (last report).

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report in February 2007 which included information on environmental monitoring, socio-economic issues, education, site management and navigation along the Danube for 2006. On 23 May 2008 two annual reports "Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve" dated February 2007 and February 2008 were received by the World Heritage Centre. However, no state of conservation report was provided by the State Party of Romania in 2008 as requested by the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee (**30 COM 7B.24**), nor any report by the States Parties of Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova.

The State Party had reported in 2007 that 2006 included record low flow during the winter and record high flow during spring in the Danube. The hydrological changes are having an impact on fauna including pelicans whose nesting sites are affected by variation in water levels and degradation of floating islands. These hydrological changes are linked to development in the river basin. Guidelines on architecture and building activities in the Danube Delta are being developed in consultation with local communities, however it is not clear if this effort to protect cultural heritage will also include guidelines to protect the property from uncontrolled and intensive development in the river basin. Information on

fisheries resources indicates a decline in fisheries harvest. Fishing represents the main economic activity for local communities and infringements of the fishery regulations are widespread. The Warden's Department were involved in 800 actions against illegal fishing in 2006 which resulted in confiscation of fishing gear and boats, and issuing fines.

The following progress towards implementation of the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee (Decision **30 COM 7B.24**) is noted:

- a) Implement the agreed activities of the 2006 trilateral conference held in Odessa and develop a shared vision between the States Parties of the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine;
 - (i) Expert group to prepare and implement a river basin management plan: Information available from the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR) indicates that, as set out in the EU water framework Directive, a draft river basin management plan will be prepared in 2008 and finalized in 2009.
 - (ii) Implement a single methodology for assessing the transboundary environmental impact of projects: No information was provided on a systematic approach for assessing the transboundary environmental impact of projects in the Delta.
 - (iii) Fully utilize legal and institutional tools for strengthening cooperation in conservation and sustainable development: The Lower Danube Protected Areas Commission that functioned from 2002 - 2003 as part of an EU Tacis project published, in 2005, a joint management plan for the Lower Danube Protected Areas, under an EU project led by the Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority (DDBRA). This plan laid the foundation for the UNESCO Odessa Declaration. The Commission should be revived, perhaps through funding from the EU Neighbourhood Programme. Such international support could assist in setting up a bigger Biosphere Reserve in the Lower Danube region of Ukraine and Moldova. Funding should be identified to assist in the implementation of the Odessa recommendations. Information on this meeting is available from http://www.ramsar.org/mtg/mtg_danube_conference2006a.pdf
- b) Develop and implement a master plan for the whole of the Danube Delta with a set of shared environmental standards and regulations to ensure and enforce compliance

The State Party reported on a master plan, but it is unclear if this is for the entire Delta, or for the Romanian portion of the Delta only. It is also unclear if discussions have been held to develop and adopt common environmental standards, regulations, and policies with Ukraine and Moldova. However, the heads of Delegation to International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR) from Moldova, Romania and Ukraine signed an agreement committing to develop a "River Basin management plan for the Danube Delta supporting Sustainable Development".

- c) Navigation routes, any actual or potential impacts on the Danube Delta World Heritage property, and the implementation of proposed mitigation measures

In December 2007 ICPDR adopted the Joint Statement on inland navigation and environmental protection, which outlines criteria and principles for development of navigation projects in the Danube River Basin. The Joint Statement was developed and agreed by the Danube Commission (Navigation) and the Sava Commission and included participation by Ukraine and Romanian officials from the navigation and environmental sector.

On 18 April 2008 an informal meeting was held in Geneva among relevant international agencies and Conventions with the participation of a representative of UNESCO on the

Bystroe canal project, on deep-water navigation in the Ukrainian sector of the Danube Delta. During discussions the status of protection and management of the Danube Delta was discussed and the lack of response from Ukraine to the following conventions was noted: The Bern Convention requested documentation on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and compensatory measures; the Ramsar Convention seeks to review the measures to address the impact of navigation projects; the Espoo Convention, in January 2008, found the State Party of Ukraine to be in non-compliance and made several recommendations; and concerns have also been raised on the Bystroe Canal Project through the Water Convention and the Aarhus Convention.

The discussions focused particularly on the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in a Transboundary Context (Espoo Convention), and key results included the following:

The organizations agreed: (a) to continue to coordinate their actions; (b) each to notify the other organizations on the outcomes of key events in the following months (including meetings of Parties); (c) to join, if possible and appropriate, a Bern Convention "on-the-spot appraisal visit" to Ukraine in July 2008; and (d) to meet again within one year to exchange information and experiences on specific issues common to the agreements and also to review developments on the matters discussed at the April 2008 meeting. The organizations agreed to invite the European Commission to the follow-up meeting, which would be more focused on implementation of practical measures. As a follow-up to this meeting, a letter from the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe was sent to the Ukrainian Minister for Environment regarding the Bystroe Canal. On 21 May 2008, the Meeting of the Parties took a decision stating that Ukraine had been in non-compliance with its obligations under the Espoo Convention, and asking Ukraine to take a series of steps in the coming months and up to the end of 2008 to bring about compliance.

IUCN has received reports that continued dredging and extension of the Sulina Channel after it was closed by a shipwreck as well as on continuous development of tourism and infrastructure along its length continues to represent a problem to the integrity of the property.

IUCN also notes that media and other reports have identified that several EU policies and development initiatives in the region contradict each other and the goal of conserving the biodiversity and functioning of the Danube Delta. The programmes and initiatives which aim to promote sustainable development and conservation include: Natura 2000 project to protect the white willows of Danube Delta's islands; LIFE-Nature working to protect the Dalmatian pelican; and the EU Water Framework Directive on river basin management. The effectiveness of these initiatives could be limited by the goals of the Trans-European Networks initiative (aiming to turn parts of the Danube into a shipping waterway) whose funding comes to Romania from EU Structural Funds and to Ukraine through EuroAid. Other industrial and infrastructure projects in Romania and in the other 18 States within the Danube River Basin should also be assessed in terms of downstream impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem function.

The State Party is encouraged to coordinate the protection of the property with national agencies and programmes on development and to discuss with relevant EU agencies the State Party's obligations regarding the protection of World Heritage and the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property.

IUCN has received reports that there is very low awareness of the Danube Delta World Heritage property as it forms only a small portion of the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. The State Party is encouraged to highlight the values of the property in line with the *Operational Guidelines I.C 15*.

d) Uncontrolled tourism development

The State Party reported significant changes in tourism activity in the Delta as a whole with an estimated 100,000 visitors/year. It is not clear what proportion is visiting the property, as it was noted that the visitor recording system was not very accurate. Associated with these high visitor numbers is increasing motor boat traffic on the river causing noise pollution which disturbs wildlife and increased wave action that can erode the river banks and wetlands. The DDBRA has drafted rules for navigation but these have yet to be approved and implemented. Development of tourism accommodation has increased and much of the buildings do not conform to local architectural style. The Cultural Heritage News Agency reported, in July 2007, on a Master Plan for tourism in Romania. One of the reported targets of this plan was for nature, ecotourism and leisure tourism in the Danube Delta, particularly within the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve.

IUCN also notes the risks to the birdlife in the Danube Delta from a birdflu (H5N1) virus outbreak and encourages the State Party to report on its management of this and any other risk from disasters and to take into consideration the World Heritage Strategy on Disaster Risk Reduction for the property.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.21

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.24**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),*
3. *Regrets that the State Parties of the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine did not provide a report as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th session, and also regrets that the State Party of Ukraine did not keep the World Heritage Centre and IUCN informed about the reopening of navigation routes, any actual or potential impacts on the Danube Delta World Heritage property, and the implementation of proposed mitigation measures;*
4. *Notes that the development of the Bystroe Canal does not conform to the Espoo Convention and that concerns have been raised through the Bern, Ramsar, Water and Aarhus Conventions on impacts associated with the canal;*
5. *Notes with concern that the European Union has a variety of economic and environmental projects in the River Basin of the Danube that are not harmonized or coordinated with the environmental requirements for the protection of the Danube Delta;*
6. *Urges the State Party of Romania to implement the recommendations and agreed actions of the Odessa Conference of 2006, and in particular to strengthen cooperation with the States Parties of Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova;*
7. *Requests the State Party of Romania to finalise, adopt and implement the following :*
 - a) *Rules for navigation in the Danube Delta;*
 - b) *Guidelines on architecture and building activities in the Danube Delta; and include mitigation measures for hydrological impacts from construction in these guidelines;*
 - c) *Tourism Master Plan, while making every effort to ensure the protection of the outstanding universal value of the property;*

- d) *Mechanism for transboundary cooperation on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of projects affecting the Delta;*
8. *Also requests the State Party of Ukraine to provide regular updates on the status of the Bystroe Canal project;*
9. *Further requests the State Party of Romania to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2009, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including a copy of the River Basin Management Plan for the Danube Delta and the tourism plan for the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

24. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.19; 30 COM 7B.18; 31 COM 7B.31

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 63,528 for Preparatory Assistance and Training.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1998: World Heritage Centre monitoring mission; 2001 and 2005: World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring missions.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of adequate management regime;
- b) Uncertain legal protection;
- c) Pollution;
- d) Illegal timber harvesting;
- e) Gas and oil pipeline project across the World Heritage property;
- f) Illegal construction on the Lake shore;
- g) Illegal sale of land;

h) Tourism development.

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted its report on the state of conservation of the property on 15 February 2008. The following key conservation issues are noted for the property.

a) *Management regime*

The membership of the Interdepartmental Commission for the protection of Lake Baikal was approved in August 2007 and a Work Plan for 2007-2008 adopted. The Commission met in October 2007 to consider four main issues: (1) a draft amendment to conform all other legislative acts of the Russian Federation to “*On the Protection of Lake Baikal*”, (2) a draft federal target program “*Protection of Lake Baikal and socio-economic development of the Baikal natural area,*” including tourism infrastructure development, and upgrading the monitoring system for Lake Baikal; (3) strengthened control over the Baikalsky Pulp and Paper Mill (BPPM); and (4) an environmental work plan for spatial planning and zoning of the central ecological zone. The State Party report did not provide clear information on the status of these activities or propose timelines for their implementation.

Whilst this meeting is welcome it is clear that improvements to the management regime for the property are still required.

b) *Uncertain legal protection*

The World Heritage Committee (**31 COM 7B.31**) requested the State Party to clarify potential amendments to the three federal laws entitled “On Environmental Impact Assessment”, “On Special Economic Zones in the Russian Federation” and “On Protection of Lake Baikal” (referred to below as the Baikal Law), as these changes might affect and potentially reduce the protective status of Lake Baikal. In its report, the State Party noted steps taken to date to harmonise laws which were inconsistent with the protection of the property. The State Party has not confirmed the timeline for completing this review and implementation of its findings. Steps taken to date focus on improving the regulations for environmental protection, ensuring rational nature resource management within the Baikal nature area, and introducing a legal and administrative framework for tourism management.

It appears that the Resolution 643 (30.8.2001) of the Baikal Law “On adoption of the list of activity types prohibited in the central ecological zone of the Baikal natural area” may not be consistent with both other parts of the Baikal Law or other relevant laws on environmental assessment. To address this problem, the State Party proposes to make environmental impact assessments obligatory within the Central Ecological Zone for projects of construction, reconstruction, or enlargement of economic entities.

It has been reported that the list of prohibited activities stated under Resolution 643 of the Baikal Law may be subject to exemptions in favour of development activities. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN request the State Party to provide translations, in one of the two working languages of the *Convention*, of the relevant clauses in the laws pertaining to tourism development or other economic activities within the boundaries of the property. It is possible that one such exemption could relate to mining activity. It is important to emphasise the importance of ensuring that mining continue to be prohibited within the property. In particular, the operation of the large Kholodninskoe zinc and lead deposit would have severe negative effects on water quality within the property and could consequently affect public health and the outstanding universal values and integrity of the property. There is an urgent need for the State Party to clarify the status of this concession and its policies towards mining.

Inconsistencies also exist with regional laws and regulations relating to Special Economic Zones and tourism for the districts and republics in the Lake Baikal Natural Area, including the regulations for establishing a special economic zone for tourism development and associated infrastructure in the Irkutsk Region and the Republic of Buryatia. Decisions on

land use and development at the district level do not always consider Federal Government Resolutions. To address this, a draft Baikal Coordination Procedure has been proposed which aims to prevent and avoid infringements of the law. The draft procedure was planned for review by the Baikal Commission in March 2008. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that it is important for the State Party to clarify these inconsistencies and their implications for the management of the property.

c) *Pollution*

Major sources of pollution continue to affect the property, the most severe being air pollution, sewage and waste-water, most notably from Baikalksy Pulp and Paper Mill (BPPM), and the pollution load in the Selenga River.

The State Party notes progress in measures to reduce the impacts from the BPPM plant. The establishment of a closed water-cycle for the mill has been completed. Unfortunately, the system cannot be put into service before construction of the Baikalsk municipal wastewater treatment facilities is completed. Lack of budget for this project has prevented its completion and additional funds are still required. With the closed water system not yet in use the total volume of sewage water disposal by BPPM amounted to just under 38 million cubic metres in 2007, which represents a 3% increase from 2006. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain seriously concerned about the further delays in addressing the pollution by the BPPM.

With regard to the Selenga river, the State Party notes that 40% of the chemical load of the river originates in Mongolia. Some progress in transboundary cooperation and data sharing is evident through both States Parties conducting parallel monitoring and sharing hydro-chemical and hydro-geological data. Lead pollution has been identified during water sampling of the river although it remains unclear if the State Parties have included monitoring of other heavy metals, polyaromatic carbohydrates and organochlorine compounds in their work, as requested by the 2005 monitoring mission.

The State Party reported limited progress on implementing the other recommendations of the 2005 mission, in particular to diminish and control other sources of pollution affecting the property. Ground water contamination and sewage disposal into surface waters remain issues of concern, and there is a need for further investment in sewage treatment plants. The State Party has allocated funds specifically for sewage treatment facilities in tourism destinations.

d) *Illegal timber harvesting*

The State Party has budgeted funds for forest restoration activities in the Irkutsk Region for the period 2008-2012 which should benefit over 16,000 ha of the property.

e) *Gas and oil pipeline project across the World Heritage property*

No plans are under consideration for construction of gas and oil pipelines.

f) *Illegal constructions and sale of land*

The State Party reported that limited information was available on land ownership. While most land was publicly owned, reported private land ownership was 5% higher in 2007 than in 2005 and this affected 9,000 ha of land. However, the legality of these claims on land ownership is questionable as they do not appear to be properly registered. The State Party also reported that inspections in Olkhon District identified leasing of land for construction for tourism and recreation that had not followed the specified legal procedures. It is unclear what impact the Federal Act of October 30, 2007 № 240-FZ, Federal Acts "*On special economic zones in Russian Federation*" and "*On transfer of lands and land plots from one category to another*" will have on land ownership, land use and construction activities

g) *Tourism*

The Districts of Irkutsk, and Pribaikalsky have each passed special economic zone resolutions to promote tourism development. However, since this time the Law on the Special Economic Zone for Baikal has been amended to enhance protection of the property. It is possible that these laws now contradict each other. There is still no legal and administrative framework to manage recreation and tourism within the property, nor a comprehensive strategy or plan for sustainable tourism. In the absence of these management tools, inappropriate, badly designed and poorly located development has the potential to create significant impacts as well as not providing appropriate quality of experience to visitors. Illegal construction is also associated with the existing tourism infrastructure.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN support the efforts of the Baikal Commission to improve the management of the property, address inconsistencies in legal regimes and to develop tourism infrastructure and plans. However, the integrity of the property continues to be affected by water, soil, solid waste and air pollution, and the lack of coherent zoning and management for development, including for sustainable tourism and associated infrastructure.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.24

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.3**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Welcomes the steps taken by the State Party to implement some of the recommendations from the 2005 monitoring mission, but notes that many have not yet been fully addressed;*
4. *Urges the State Party to implement the remaining recommendations effectively;*
5. *Requests the State Party to complete its review of the legal provisions relevant to the property and to ensure that the law “On protection of Lake Baikal” and other laws and regulations are effectively implemented*
6. *Also requests the State Party to provide detailed information on any exemptions or amendments to the prohibited activities listed in Resolution 643 of the Baikal Law, and to confirm that activities incompatible with the World Heritage status, including mining, will continue to be prohibited;*
7. *Encourages the State Party to ensure adequate funding for management and monitoring of the property;*
8. *Also urges the State Party to finalise, as soon as possible, the municipal sewage treatment facilities to enable the operation of the closed water system within the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Mill;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to set up legal and administrative frameworks to regulate tourism and recreation, to urgently develop and adopt effective planning regulations, and to establish a sustainable tourism strategy for the property;*
10. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a clear and detailed report on the state of conservation of the*

property addressing the points above, and including the status of the Kholodninksoe zinc and lead deposit, and outlining further progress made in implementing the remaining recommendations of the joint 2005 World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

25. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 14B.15; 28 COM 14B.16; 31 COM 7B.32

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2008: Joint UNESCO World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of management plan;
- b) Weakening of conservation controls and laws;
- c) Impacts of proposed tourism infrastructure development for Olympic Games;
- d) Road construction;

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on 15 February 2008. This report presented information on the status of the buffer zone and boundaries, Lagonaki plateau, management plan, management and use zoning, Biosphere Scientific Centre, roads, and Sochi 2014 Olympic Games developments.

As requested by the Committee (Decision **31 COM 7B.32**) a joint UNESCO World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission was carried out from 21 to 25 April 2008. The mission team assessed the state of conservation of this property and the factors affecting the outstanding universal value and integrity including: (a) management planning; (b) legislation; (c) potential impacts of tourism infrastructure development for the Olympic Games; (d) other developments

underway and planned, including in Lunnaya Poliana and Lagonaki Plateau; and (e) logging activities. The mission report will be available at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008>. The mission findings include concern over the following issues:

a) *Lack of management plan*

The State Party noted in its report that the management plan is due for completion in 2008. However, this covers only the Kavkaizky Biosphere Reserve and not the other protected areas comprising the property. Hence, it is imperative that a comprehensive management plan be developed covering all the six components of the property.

b) *Weakening of conservation controls and laws*

The buffer zone of the property in the Kavkazsky State Nature Biosphere Reserve of the Adygea Republic was established through Decree 322 in 1996. However, this decree was repealed by Decree 174 in 1998. The mission discussed the issues surrounding the status of this buffer zone and there is an urgent need to reinstate its legal protection, as it is a part of the inscribed property. There is also a need to strengthen the legal protection of those parts of the Sochi National Park which were formerly designated as the buffer zone of the Kavkaizky Biosphere Reserve and also to consider designating them as the buffer zone of the property.

c) *Impact of tourism infrastructure development, particularly for the Olympic Games*

While the 2008 State Party report stated that the 2014 Olympic Games development plans would have no effect on the property, the mission found that developments plans including the Sliding Centre (luge-bobsleigh), mountain Olympic village, and related infrastructure would affect some areas within the property, the boundary of the property, and winter wildlife feeding grounds and migration corridors of wildlife from the property. The Sliding Center as well as the road facilities for its access, located in the adjoining Sochi National Park and in the immediate proximity of the Southern boundary of the property, would adversely affect the biological processes that guarantee the integrity of the property and place it under potential danger. Alternative locations for the Olympic village outside the national park were discussed but no decisions have been made on the alternative sites.

IUCN and the World Heritage Centre note that there are extensive threats to the property in the northern area governed by the Adygea Republic and near Grushevy Ridge related to the Olympic Games developments as well as construction of a road and bridge at its Southern boundary. Also, future infrastructure plans for roads and tourism development would seriously degrade the integrity of the property and threaten the outstanding universal value of the property.

d) *Developments, underway and planned, including in Lunnaya Polyana and Lagonaki Plateau;*

A road to Lunnaya Polyana in the Northern section of the property is currently planned to be extended and developed. While Decree 274 of 1997 prohibits any activity leading to the disturbance of integrity of nature monuments, the existence in old plans of a forestry road dating back to the 1920s is being used to allow the rebuilding of a road to the Biosphere Scientific Center across the Pshekha and Pshehashkha Riverheads Nature Monument. The road would fragment habitat and disturb wildlife populations if further developed and if its use intensifies. In accordance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* the State Party should provide prior information to the World Heritage Committee of its intention to undertake restoration or construction works that may affect the outstanding universal values and integrity of the property.

e) *Logging activities*

Illegal logging has been identified in several locations associated with the upgradation of the old forestry road. Satellite imagery showing some of the areas logged, were provided to the State Party authorities accompanying the mission.

Based on the threats identified by the mission specific priority recommendations are included in the draft decision.

The following additional other recommendations of the mission should also be implemented by the State Party to strengthen protection and management of the property:

- i) Complete the on going delimitation process of the property by the end of 2008;
- ii) Finalise and implement a Management Plan for the property by December 2009, to ensure the six protected areas comprising the Property are effectively managed in line with a common vision and objectives;
- iii) Strengthen the legal protection of those parts of the Sochi National Park which were formerly designated as the buffer zone of the Kavkaizky Biosphere Reserve and also consider including them as the buffer zone of the property. The State Party should submit a proposal of designation of this buffer zone for approval of the World Heritage Committee;
- iv) Develop a tourism strategy and comprehensive plan to address the current and future impacts of tourism on the outstanding universal value of the property; all signs and publicity that promote the development of ski and tourism facilities inside the property, should be immediately removed from the field;
- v) Deny approval for the construction of roadway or railway lines, whether related or not to the 2014 Winter Olympics, whose alignment is proposed to pass through the Property or on its immediate proximity;

If development continues, as planned in the proposal reviewed by the mission, the impact on the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property will need to be reviewed. Conditions may exist for addition of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Finally, in addition to the recommendations to the State Party, the mission recommends that a position statement be adopted, based on the example of the 2003 ICMM statement on mining and protected areas. The World Heritage Committee should request the International Olympic Committee to develop principles and guidelines to enhance the preservation of the World Heritage properties when the Olympic Games venues are located close to World Heritage properties. It should also invite the International Olympic Committee to work with relevant international organizations, in particular IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM, on this task.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.25

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.32**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes with concern the current and potential threats to the property from Olympic development, roads, logging and lack of effective management;
4. Urges the State Party to halt all activities affecting the values and integrity of the property, in particular, the extensive risks to the property from the current plans for the developments for 2014 Winter Olympic Games, and road plans;
5. Requests the State Party to implement all the recommendations of the 2008 monitoring mission as a matter of urgency, and in particular the following:

- a) *Halt further construction of the road to Lunnaya Polyana, and ensure it is not enlarged, asphalted and used for recreational use, and the traffic is strictly regulated;*
 - b) *Restore the legal protection for the buffer zone of the property and ensure that it is managed fully in accordance with its World Heritage status;*
 - c) *Stop illegal logging of forests, rehabilitate the logged areas and monitor their ecological recovery;*
 - d) *Abandon plans for recreational use and development in Lagonaki Plateau, Mt. Fisht and Mt. Oshten areas, and ensuring that the use of infrastructure and equipment already existing on site is strictly limited;*
 - e) *Ensure that the Biosphere Centre built at Lunnaya Polyana is used for management, research and monitoring, or visitor information purposes only, and not converted into a recreational facility;*
 - f) *Prevent construction of facilities and infrastructure related to the 2014 Winter Olympics within or in the proximity of the World Heritage property, especially in very sensitive areas like Grushevyy ridge;*
 - g) *Identify alternative locations to the proposed locations of the Olympic Mountain Village, the Sliding Center and the Biathlon stadium, as well as associated roads and infrastructure, located in the adjoining Sochi National Park and in the immediate proximity of the Southern boundary of the property. Suitable international biodiversity experts should be involved with this process to enhance transparency and credibility;*
 - h) *Subject all construction projects of the 2014 Winter Olympics facilities and infrastructure to a full and independent environmental impact assessment (EIA) procedure which explicitly assesses the likely impacts of projects on the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property, as well as on the Sochi National Park;*
6. Requests the Director of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to develop a dialogue with the International Olympic Committee to put in place an agreement regarding Olympics and World Heritage to parallel the ICOMM position statement on the prohibition of mining in World Heritage Sites;
7. Also requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with copies of all infrastructure planning and environmental impact assessment documents, to include summary translations in one of the two working languages of the Convention for review as soon as these documents are available and before construction begins;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and progress in finding alternative locations for the Olympic Games development and infrastructure, and all the other recommendations of the 2008 monitoring mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

31. Iguazu National Park (Argentina) (N 303)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1984

Criteria

(vii) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

23 COM VIII.1; 30 COM 7B.31 (Iguaçu, Brazil – but with reference to Iguazú, Argentina); **31 COM 7B.38**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: 2001: USD 20,000: Oil spill impact evaluation; 2003: USD 30,000: Joint integrated management workshop with Iguazu National Park authorities (Brazil).

UNESCO extra-budgetary fund

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

September 2006: UNESCO mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Proposed development of hydropower dams;
- b) Uncoordinated developments;
- c) Lack of transboundary cooperation;
- d) Lack of sustainable financing;
- e) Problems associated with public use;
- f) Lack of a comprehensive public use plan.

Current conservation issues

As requested by Decision **31 COM 7B.38**, the State Party of Argentina provided on 19 March 2008 an invitation in coordination with the State Party of Brazil for a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission.

From 7 to 14 April 2008, the joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission visited the property. It met State Party representatives, a variety of stakeholders and protected area staff and was able to visit both properties. The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008/>

The monitoring mission found that the outstanding universal value for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List are still present, though materially impaired, and facing severe threats. Scenic and biological values have been degraded by the marked weekly variations in water volumes of the Iguazú River and Waterfalls, caused by the Salto Caxias Dam in Brazil. The severity and extent of biological impacts has not yet been quantified. Scenic values have been compromised by public use infrastructure on both the Argentinean and Brazilian sides, and the visual integrity of the natural setting is impaired by regular visitor use activities that cater to thrill-seeking rather than appreciation of World Heritage values. Of most immediate concern on the Argentinean side are the negative impacts of high visibility remains of a previous elevated walkway to the Garganta Overlook that have never been removed. Threats include the possibility of construction of new hydroelectric dams on the Iguazú and Paraná Rivers and agricultural development in the Argentine Peninsula, an area outside the properties in Argentina and Brazil, but which is a key biological corridor between them.

a) *Trans-boundary cooperation*

Management of both the Iguazú National Park (Argentina) and the Iguazu National Park (Brazil) would greatly benefit from a permanent and efficient mechanism for trans-boundary co-operation, especially with respect to resource protection, research, and public use. While informal consultation and cooperation takes place at the level of the Parks, it has proven difficult to develop formal mechanisms.

b) *Up-to-date management and public use plans*

The management plan for Iguazú National Park is out-of-date and requires total revision. A public use plan drafted in 1988 and partially revised in 1996, has never been officially approved or put into effect. A similar situation exists for the property in Brazil. The monitoring mission was pleased to note that the two Parks will launch coordinated but separate revisions of the two management plans, including public use issues, starting with a series of informal joint meetings. A first joint workshop will reportedly take place during the first week of August 2008.

c) *Public Use*

The mission observed that, while the current general level of visitor flows is managed efficiently, the Park faces occasional unmanageable peaks in visitation, and an upward trend in numbers. A strategy is required to smooth out these peaks in space and time, and deal with the ever-increasing numbers of visitors. It was further noted that there are yet no clear policies or standards on visual and audio impacts on the integrity of the property's aesthetic values from tourism infrastructure, or with respect to architecture styles, sighting of infrastructure, or the choice and location of tourism activities. Of particular concern are the visual and audio impacts from infrastructure and adventure sport water craft and infrastructure developments encroaching on the scenic quality of the overall falls sector landscape. The tendency toward visitor experiences geared to thrill seeking rather than the appreciation of World Heritage values is of particular concern.

The monitoring mission was pleased to note that the hot air balloon concession has been firmly rejected and the issue is resolved. The property designated for the balloon concession is now overgrown with natural vegetation, and no visual impact exists.

d) *Hydroelectric dams*

The monitoring mission considers the greatest current degradation of the scenic qualities of the property to be the fluctuation of the volumes of water flowing over the falls, changing their visual quality. A key factor is the hydroelectric dams on the Iguazu River, the closest of which is the Salto Caxias dam, in Brazil. The dam is closed on the weekend when there is less demand for energy, and results in a drop in the volume of water in the Falls. This action already degrades the visual qualities of the visitor experience during the first part of the

week, and if combined with a dry season and the possible effects of climate change, could dramatically reduce the amount of water in the falls in the future.

Evidence regarding the intention to move ahead with the construction of the proposed Corpus Christie Hydroelectric Project on the Paraná River of Argentina and Paraguay is mixed. It was learned from a newspaper article that the Bi-National Commission for the Paraná River of Argentina and Paraguay is issuing contracts for a feasibility study for the construction of the Corpus Christi Dam. However, the Mission Team was received by the Argentinean National Committee for World Heritage on 11 April 2008 and presented with a document stating again that no action would be taken on this project until the outstanding issues existing at the hydroelectric dam Yacireta were completed and that no studies had taken place for the execution of the project. If the project were to be undertaken, assessments would be needed to determine both economic and environmental impacts, particularly those which have the potential to affect the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property. A letter to the World Heritage Centre from the Argentine Permanent Delegation, dated 7 May 2008, reiterated that all studies on the Project have been suspended and that to date there has been no decision by the governments on the project.

e) *Biodiversity*

There is a lack of data on many of the species for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List. Thus, there is a need for research and subsequent data sharing between the two properties to determine baseline data for assessing the status and trends of these populations. The monitoring mission took note of the importance of the "Argentine Peninsula Bottleneck" a stretch of private land in Argentina that serves as a biological corridor between the two properties.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.31

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.38**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes that the outstanding universal value of the property is present though degraded, but also notes with serious concern the various specific threats which the property currently faces in particular threats due to biodiversity and visual impacts;*
4. *Notes with satisfaction the rejection of the hot air balloon concession;*
5. *Urges the State Party, in coordination with the State Party of Brazil, to implement the following recommendations of the 2008 World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission in order to the strengthen the management and protect protect the biodiversity values of the property:*
 - a) *Create a permanent and effective mechanism for trans-boundary co-operation, in particular for research, resource protection, and public use oriented to the appreciation of the outstanding universal values of the property;*
 - b) *Continue joint efforts with Brazil toward a coordinated revision of the management plans for the two adjacent properties, including development of shared indicators and standards for minimising visitor impacts, and establishing acceptable limits of change for biological and aesthetic values, including visual and audio impacts for all tourism and public use activities and associated infrastructure;*

- c) *Carry out a study of the short-term oscillation of water levels in the Iguazú River and Falls to quantify biological and visual impacts, and develop a monitoring process to track change and regularly inform decision-making;*
 - d) *Carry out a study of the economic benefits of tourism to the local economies and an inventory of those local attractions that could aid in diverting visitation away from the Falls area and that would contribute to building local constituencies;*
 - e) *Remove as soon as possible the unsightly remains of old elevated walkways that affect the visual integrity of the Garganta del Diablo overlook and vicinity, and restore the natural riverscape;*
 - f) *Develop and implement a research and monitoring strategy for the key species that were specifically listed when site was inscribed;*
 - g) *Carry out a joint study to determine the technical and economical feasibility of acquiring the lands of the Argentine Peninsula Bottleneck for inclusion to the Iguazú National Park;*
6. *Also urges the State Party through its National World Heritage Committee to implement an early warning system to alert the World Heritage Committee in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines to any plans for the development of a hydroelectric project on the Paraná River of Argentina and Paraguay that would impact the property;*
7. *Requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

32. Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N 355)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986

Criteria

(vii) (x)

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

1999- 2001

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.28; 30 COM 7B.31; 31 COM 7B.39

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 30,000 for training.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 50,000 under the Brazilian World Heritage Biodiversity Programme for fire fighting planning.

Previous monitoring missions

March 1999 and March 2005: UNESCO / IUCN missions

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Proposed development of hydropower dams;
- b) Pressure to re-open illegal road;
- c) Illegal logging and hunting;
- d) Uncoordinated developments;
- e) Lack of transboundary cooperation;
- f) Lack of sustainable financing;
- g) Problems associated with public use;
- h) Lack of a comprehensive public use plan.

Current conservation issues

As requested in Decision **31 COM 7B.39**, the State Party of Brazil provided on 25 March 2008 an invitation in coordination with the State Party of Argentina for a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission.

From 7 April to 14 April 2007 a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission visited the property. The mission met State Party representatives, a variety of stakeholders and protected area staff and was able to visit both properties. The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008/>

The monitoring mission found that the outstanding universal value for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List is still present, though materially impaired, and facing severe threats. Scenic and biological values have been degraded by the marked weekly variations in water volumes of the Iguazu River and Waterfalls, caused by the Salto Caxias Dam in Brazil. The severity and extent of biological impacts has not yet been quantified. Scenic values have been compromised by public use infrastructure on both the Brazilian and Argentinean sides, and the visual and aural integrity of the natural setting is impaired by regular visitor use activities that cater to thrill-seeking rather than appreciation of World Heritage values. Threats include the possibility of construction of new hydroelectric dams on the Iguazu and Paraná Rivers and agricultural development in the Argentine Peninsula, an area outside the properties, but which is a key biological corridor between them.

a) *Trans-boundary cooperation*

Management of both the Iguazu National Park (Brazil) and the Iguazú National Park (Argentina) would greatly benefit from a permanent and efficient mechanism for trans-boundary co-operation, especially with respect to resource protection, research, and public use. While informal consultation and cooperation takes place at the level of the Parks, it has proven difficult to develop formal mechanisms.

b) *Up-to-date management and public use plans*

The management plan for Iguaçu National Park requires extensive revision. A public use plan drafted years ago has never been officially approved or put into effect. A similar situation exists for the property in Argentina. The monitoring mission was pleased to note that the two Parks will launch coordinated but separate revisions of the two management plans, including public use issues, starting with a series of informal joint meetings. A first joint workshop will reportedly take place during the first week of August 2008.

c) *Public Use*

The mission observed that, while the current general level of visitor flows is managed efficiently, the Park faces occasional unmanageable peaks in visitation, and an upward trend in numbers. A strategy is required to smooth out these peaks in space and time, and deal with the ever-increasing numbers of visitors. It was further noted that there are yet no clear policies or standards on visual and audio impacts on the integrity of the property's aesthetic values from tourism infrastructure, or with respect to architecture styles, sighting of infrastructure, or the choice and location of tourism activities. Of particular concern are the visual and audio impacts from infrastructure and adventure sport water craft and infrastructure developments encroaching on the scenic quality of the overall Falls sector landscape. The tendency toward visitor experiences geared to thrill seeking rather than the appreciation of World Heritage values is of particular concern.

d) *Hydroelectric dams*

The monitoring mission considers the greatest current degradation of the scenic qualities of the property to be the fluctuation of the volumes of water flowing over the falls, changing their visual quality. A key factor is the hydroelectric dams on the Iguaçu River, the closest of which is the Salto Caxias dam. The dam is closed on the weekend when there is less demand for energy, and results in a drop in the volume of water in the Falls. This action already degrades the visual qualities of the visitor experience during the first part of the week, and if combined with a dry season and the possible effects of climate change, could dramatically reduce the amount of water in the falls in the future.

The mission team was informed that programmed within the National Development Plan of Brazil is the construction of a hydroelectric dam project somewhere within the 25 kilometer stretch of river from the falls area upstream to the Salto Caxias dam on the Iguaçu River.

e) *Biodiversity*

There is a lack of data on many of the species for which the site was inscribed on the World Heritage list. Thus, there is a need for research and subsequent data sharing between the two properties to determine the status and trends of these populations. The monitoring mission took note of the importance of the "Argentine Peninsula Bottleneck" a stretch of private land in Argentina that serves as a biological corridor between the two properties.

In addition, agreements between the Federal Police of Brazil and IBAMA, Brazil's Environmental Ministry, for patrolling of Iguaçu National Park have been suspended. Patrols are carried out by State Police not specifically trained in addressing issues of law enforcement in relation to the property's biological values.

f) *Estrada do Colono*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN notes the regional court decision on the continued closure of the Estrada do Colono in the Brazilian property and that this has been appealed by the local government to the Supreme Court.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.32

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.39**, adopted at its 31th session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes that the outstanding universal value of the property is present though degraded, but notes with serious concern the various specific threats which the property currently faces in particular threats due to biodiversity and visual impacts;
4. Urges the State Party, in coordination with the State Party of Argentina, to implement the following recommendations of the 2008 World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission in order to the strengthen the management and protect the biodiversity of the property:
 - a) Create a permanent and effective mechanism for trans-boundary co-operation, in particular for research, resource protection, and public use oriented to the appreciation of the outstanding universal value of the property;
 - b) Continue joint efforts with Argentina toward a coordinated revision of the management plans for the two adjacent properties, including development of shared indicators and standards for minimising visitor impacts, and establishing acceptable limits of change for biological and aesthetic values, including visual and audio impacts for all tourism and public use activities and associated infrastructure; and short-term oscillations in the water levels of the Iguazu River and Falls;
 - c) Carry out a study of the short-term oscillation of water levels in the Iguazu River and Falls to quantify biological and visual impacts, and develop a monitoring process to track change and regularly inform decision-making;
 - d) Carry out a study of the economic benefits of tourism to the local economies and an inventory of those local attractions that could aid in diverting visitation away from the Falls area and that would contribute to building local constituencies;
 - e) Develop and implement a research and monitoring strategy for the key species that were specifically listed when site was inscribed;
 - f) Carry out a joint study to determine the technical and economical feasibility of acquiring the lands of the Argentine Peninsula Bottleneck for annexation to the Iguazú National Park;
 - g) Develop a qualified Ranger Corps for the Park specially trained in addressing conservation issues;
5. Also urges the State Party to implement an early warning system to alert the World Heritage Committee to any plans for the development of a hydroelectric project on the Iguazu River that would impact the property;
6. Requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on progress in the

implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

35. Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1983, extension 1990

Criteria

(iv) (vii) (viii) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

27 COM 7B.24; 28 COM 15B.32; 31 COM 7B.36

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

February 2008: World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Construction of hydroelectric dams near the property in Panama and associated effects (greater human presence near the property, interruption of aquatic species migratory corridor);
- b) Encroachment (settlements, cattle ranching).

Current conservation issues

The State Party of Panama report was received by the World Heritage Centre on 20 February 2008. It consisted of a response to the 2007 Danger listing petition by the International Environmental Law Project received by the World Heritage Centre and was written as a point by point rebuttal of the statements presented in the petition. The State Party of Costa Rica also submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property to the mission team members, addressing issues raised in the previous decision of the World Heritage Committee and reporting on progress made against the recommendations of the 2004 bi-national report on the management of the property. Both reports were in Spanish, restricting their accessibility to the *Convention* stakeholders.

The States Parties invited a joint UNESCO World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission to the property, which took place in February 2008. The full mission report can be consulted on-

line at the following address: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008>. The following issues and recommendations are noted from the mission and from the analysis of the State Party reports:

a) *Hydroelectric dams and infrastructure*

Two hydroelectric dam projects located in Panama have been approved – a large one on the Changuinola river, which is already under construction and a smaller one on the Bonyic river, which is still in the planning phase. No part of these dams, their respective reservoirs nor construction infrastructure will be located within the property boundaries.

The two dams in question will create insurmountable barriers to the migration of seven non-endemic migratory aquatic species (including an eel, gobies and shrimp species) leading to their local disappearance from a significant number of waterways that originate within the property, with possible effects on the food supply of species within the property that prey upon this aquatic life.

The dams will lead to the displacement of five indigenous communities (total population up to 1,000) of the Ngobe and Naso. Efforts are underway to provide new settlements (outside the property) for these people, though active resistance to the move was observed among an unspecified proportion of community members and has been the source of several publicized demonstrations at the construction site. Concerns were voiced that some members could decide to resettle nearer to, or within the property.

The mission team observed that the topography and hydrology of the area could likely be suitable for further dam construction. Though mention of this eventuality was made by the authorities in Panama, no firm plans in this regard were being considered at this time.

Various other infrastructure and development projects, such as roads and utilities corridors are also taking place, or proposed in the areas located between both the Caribbean and Pacific coasts, and the property. These may pose a threat to the ecological connectivity of the overall ecosystem, particular in light of climate change effects predicted for the area.

b) *Cattle ranching*

Cattle ranching is common in parts of the property, particularly in Panama, where ranchers must drive their cattle across the property, over the continental divide, to reach markets. In so doing, ranchers appear to have established increasing numbers of pastures within the property, which are visible via satellite imagery, with the objective of fattening cattle before bringing them to market. Several thousand hectares within the property (Panama and to a lesser extent Costa Rica) already consist of privately owned land used for cattle ranching.

c) *Illegal commercial fishing, pollution*

The mission received reports of a decline in the abundance of migratory aquatic species in the Changuinola river, and anecdotal reports suggest the reasons for this may include illegal commercial fishing in the lower reaches of the river system, and pollution in the river delta, originating from use of fertilizers and pesticides in the surrounding banana plantations, and also from the lack of wastewater treatment facilities in nearby communities.

d) *Encroachment and poaching*

Overflight of the property revealed apparent encroachment underway within its boundaries by scattered groups of indigenous people on the Caribbean side (Costa Rica), where some concerns were expressed over low abundance of vertebrate species arising from intensive poaching.

e) *Management*

The presence and effectiveness of the management authority in both States Parties within the property is low and does not appear to reflect the actual management needs, particularly

given the capacities of either State Party to field technical staff and maintain their operations within their protected area networks.

Sentiments were repeatedly expressed by individuals that follow-up of environmental infractions denunciations is poor, reducing the incentive of reporting such events (Panama).

Transboundary coordination structures are in place and have received high level political support, but are limited to the exchange of information between senior government officials and rely largely on financing from external donors. Though the property is the nucleus of a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve, there is no evidence of a functional Biosphere Reserve Committee, which could act as a framework and mechanism for bi-national multi-stakeholder involvement in management issues. Thanks largely to extrabudgetary sources, notably from the Nature Conservancy and the Global Environment Facility, projects are being prepared with the objective of strengthening transboundary cooperation on the Caribbean side, but there appears to be ample room to improve ground level effectiveness and to incorporate field-level stakeholders.

The State Party of Costa Rica has reported on a series of recent initiatives designed to consolidate and strengthen management of the property located within their national boundaries, with the support of funds from NGOs, foundations and multi-lateral sources.

Management plans are in place and being implemented in both States Parties, though little bi-national coordination in plan development takes place.

As a result of the mission, a series of prioritised recommendations have been made and are noted below in the Draft Decision.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.35

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.36**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Regrets that the States Parties did not submit their reports in one of the two working languages of the World Heritage Convention (French and English);*
4. *Notes with concern the observations reported by the World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission to the property, in particular:*
 - a) *Absence of any planned measures to mitigate the impact of the hydroelectric dams on the seven aquatic species which would otherwise be lost from the affected river systems;*
 - b) *Significant incidence of cattle within the property, including the creation of illegal pastures within its boundaries;*
 - c) *Longer term risk to the property posed by potential piecemeal development of hydroelectric dams and their associated infrastructure;*
 - d) *Risk that communities displaced by the dam construction may migrate into the property if their needs are not adequately addressed;*
 - e) *Low presence of the management authority at the property;*
 - f) *Absence of an effective participatory management process involving civil society and government authorities;*

5. Requests the States Parties to jointly address these concerns by urgently carrying out the following recommendations, noting points a)-e) as priorities:
 - a) Design, implement and monitor the effectiveness of mitigation measures in relation to the need to maintain the migratory corridors of the Changuinola and Bonyic rivers for the affected aquatic species; implement measures downstream to reduce mortality from pollution and illegal fishing (Panama);
 - b) Develop and implement a plan to control and manage cattle within the property; integrating private lands into the property by 2018 (Costa Rica, Panama), and cease or rigorously control and manage the movement of cattle through the property (Panama) to avoid any effects on the outstanding universal value and the integrity of the property;
 - c) Ensure that the needs of all members of communities that may be displaced by the building of the hydro-electric dams are adequately met, ensuring that the property is not negatively affected (Panama);
 - d) Identify and implement appropriate increases in management authority presence to support the effective management of the property (Costa Rica, Panama);
 - e) Re-activate and support the bi-national Biosphere Reserve Committee for the property, incorporating government and non-government stakeholders, providing effective landscape level input into management planning issues, and use existing bi-national cooperation agreements, particularly those existing under the framework of the CCAD, to further enhance this work (Costa Rica, Panama);
 - f) Carry out a analysis of the cumulative effects of potential further dam construction outside of the property (Panama).and of other infrastructure development (Costa Rica, Panama) on the property's outstanding universal value and integrity to better guide future decision-making and restoration/mitigation programmes;
 - g) Implement a systematic ecological monitoring system to improve understanding of the "defaunization" reported to be taking place (Costa Rica, Panama);
 - h) Carry out detailed assessment of observed encroachment taking place on the Caribbean side (Costa Rica), and implement appropriate response to stop further encroachments and to ensure property boundaries are respected and their control enforced;
 - i) Assess the effectiveness of the follow-up on environmental crimes reporting, and implement corrective measures where necessary (Panama);
6. Reiterates its request to the States Parties to develop jointly, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010;
7. Also requests the State Party of Panama to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the progress made in regards to the identification and implementation of mitigation measures in relation to the need to maintain the migratory corridors of the Changuinola and Bonyic rivers for the affected aquatic species as noted in point 5a) above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
8. Further requests the States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a joint report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementaiton of the recommendations noted in points 5a)-i) above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

37. Sangay National Park (Ecuador) (N 250)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1983

Criteria

(vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

Years of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

1992 - 2005

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7A.11; 30 COM 7B.30; 31 COM 7B.40

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 58,500

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 80,000

Previous monitoring missions

1999: IUCN mission; 2005: IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Poaching;
- b) Illegal livestock grazing;
- c) Encroachment along the Park's perimeter;
- d) Unplanned road construction.

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted on 26 March 2008 the requested report (in Spanish) together with a map to the World Heritage Centre.

The State Party provided an improved map, as requested by the World Heritage Committee (Decision **31 COM 7B.40**); however according to the map minor discrepancies are evident between the boundaries of the northern part of the national park and the property.

The State Party notes that the 15,659.97 ha along the Highway of Guamote - Macas have been formally excluded from the National Park in 2004 to become a "special buffer zone" (zona especial de amortiguamiento) that lies within the extended southern zone of the National Park and not within the World Heritage property which is located north and west of this zone.

The second and updated report of "Enhancing our Heritage" (EoH) from August 2007 notes that the Highway crosses the National Park for about 39 km. Of this section, 7.85 km fall within the property and 31.23 km within the widened buffer zone. The EoH report notes that

1.11% or 3004.82 ha of the World Heritage zone lie within the 2km-radius of the road and that 712.92 ha or 0.26% of the natural vegetation in this area of the property has been modified to become pasture or cropland.

The State Party notes that 1,150 ha or 0.4% of the property is privately owned. The privately owned land represents mainly communal land with land titles pre-dating the inscription of the property, dating back to colonial times.

To address some of this agricultural encroachment, the park administration is negotiating with a family involved in pastoral and cultivation activities between the rivers Llushín Chico and Llushín Grande inside the property to facilitate their resettlement, and is also seeking financing for further resettlement activities.

An area of about 150 ha in the high altitudes (páramo ecosystems) in the northwest part of the property is ancient communal land which the park administration has recognized. A management plan has been developed for this area, and the community committed to not burn the páramo.

An additional 150 ha around Plazapamba has been given to communities for grazing of cattle and about 100 ha of the páramos in Culebrillas given to the Association of Autonomous Workers (Asociación de Trabajadores Autónomos Anga – Llacta de Alao San Antonio).

With regard to the area adjacent to the Highway of Guamote – Macas, the State Party report notes that on 12 March 2008 representatives of the Ministry of Environment met with representatives of the Ministry of Public Works to define actions to control activities with major impact on natural resources in the special buffer zone of the national park. However no management actions were reported for the 7.85 km of the road which are situated inside the property.

IUCN notes that while the updated “Enhancing our Heritage” report of 2007 shows overall progress and strengthened management effectiveness, there remain important threats from cattle herding and cultivation, uncontrolled tourism.

The EoH report further noted the positive intention to expand the analysis of management effectiveness to all protected areas in the country.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.37

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.40**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party didn't submit its state of conservation report in one of the two languages of the Convention (French and English);*
4. *Commends the State Party for its implementation of the “Enhancing our Heritage” management effectiveness toolkit;*
5. *Urges the State Party to continue monitoring the impacts of the Highway of Guamote – Macas, particularly on the section within the property; in particular to monitor changes in vegetation, wildlife behaviour and any sign of ecosystem fragmentation and to develop and implement an recovery programme where vegetation has been affected;*

6. Welcomes the clarification on boundaries, buffer zones and land tenure provided by the State Party; and notes that the area of the World Heritage property has not been reduced;
7. Requests the State Party to clarify the discrepancies in the maps provided between the boundaries of the World Heritage property and the northern part of the national park and to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2008**, clear maps in this regard, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

38. Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

Criteria

(vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

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

1996-2007

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7A.12; 30 COM 7A.15; 31 COM 7A.13

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 190,025 for technical cooperation and training.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 80,000 under the management effectiveness assessment "Enhancing our Heritage" project.

Previous monitoring missions

1995 and 2000: IUCN monitoring missions; 2003 and 2006: World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring missions

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal settlements;
- b) Illegal livestock grazing and agricultural intrusions;
- c) Illegal logging;
- d) Poaching;
- e) Invasive exotic species;
- f) Management deficiencies;
- g) Potential impacts from hydroelectric development project Patuca II.

Current conservation issues

As requested in Decision **31 COM 7A.13** the State Party submitted a report on the implementation of the recommendations made by the 2006 World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission. The report was prepared based on input from all the key institutions involved on the management of this property, and it is supported by four Annexes that provide detailed information on some of the issues discussed in the report. Highlights on progress achieved on the implementation of each of the recommendation from the 2006 monitoring mission is noted as follows:

Recommendation 1: To assure swift and strict enforcement of the law regarding illegal settlement, land use and logging, particularly by ensuring the implementation of the full cycle of the law.

A number of aerial surveys implemented in the core zone of the property show that areas previously affected by illegal settlers already removed from this zone are in the process of being recovered by natural processes. The State Party continues to take measures, supported by the Forest Agency and the Army, to remove eleven families that were ranching cattle illegally in the south-eastern part of the core zone. However, no information was provided on the proposed deadline to complete their removal.

In relation to changes in land use, a project was implemented to assess these changes using satellite images for the years 2002-2005. This assessment found that the forest coverage is increasing in over 1,000ha of the core zone previously affected by agricultural activities. In the buffer zone of the property, where 80% of it was affected by agriculture, more work is still required for its full recovery; however forest regeneration is taking place in 14,500ha (representing 7% of the buffer zone) of areas previously affected by agricultural activities. To reduce further pressures from local communities on the natural resources of the property, a number of projects on sustainable practices supported by capacity building activities are under implementation.

With support from the Army and the Navy, the State Party has enhanced control and patrolling activities to reduce illegal logging and traffic of forest products. As a result, 1,297 m³ of wood was confiscated in 2007 and four cases have been taken to court. In addition forest stewardship arrangements have been promoted with local communities and other key actors to further reduce illegal logging.

Recommendation 2: To complete the cadastral survey process of all lands surrounding the property, and provide legal titles to the owners of these lands.

The State Party has completed a cadastral survey in the Buffer Zone of the property. Legal titles are being issued to local communities and indigenous people, which will help to address land tenure issues and facilitate a more active involvement of local communities and indigenous peoples in the conservation and management of the property.

Recommendation 3: To demonstrate effective participation of local organizations and communities in the management processes of the property.

The State Party reported significant progress in the implementation of this recommendation including: (a) development of a participatory process for co-management of natural resources in the property and its buffer zone; (b) the signing of eleven buffer zone agreements for managing forest areas by local community cooperatives with two more under development; (c) adoption of co-management agreements to manage seven small watersheds under protective status in the buffer zone, and; (d) the negotiation of a Global Environment Facility (GEF) project to support natural resource co-management with the local community.

Recommendation 4: To demonstrate that decommissioned wood is not re-entering the market, but disposed of in a manner that eliminates all profit incentives.

The State Party has clarified in its report that this recommendation does not apply in the case of Honduras. It is noted that according to the National Forest Law all decommissioned wood needs to enter the market through a public auction and funding obtained from these sales is used to support the work of the State's Forest Administration. The new Forest Law that is under discussion proposes to change this system to prevent decommissioned wood entering the market. However, the State Party noted in its report that concerns about sales of decommissioned wood are unfounded and such sales only occurred in 2006 since when this issue has been addressed and the situation is now well under control.

Recommendation 5: To quickly identify any new intrusions into the property and to deal with them swiftly, so as to further discourage this practice.

In order to implement this recommendation the State's Forest Administration and the Army have identified twelve control points that are essential to stop and prevent any new intrusions to the property. Infrastructure exists in eight of these points and temporary facilities will be developed in the other four. The Army has enhanced its communication system within the property to ensure effective and coordinated actions. It has been proposed to establish a "Green Army" which would receive specialized training in conflict resolution and how to deal with the prevention and prosecution of environmental crimes within the property. The State's Forest Administration and the Army are in the process of gathering the data and information required to develop an integrated Action Plan to further enhance the control of the property and the eviction of illegal settlers from the core area of the property.

Recommendation 6: Provision of a map clearly indicating the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone.

A map was provided showing the boundaries of the Biosphere Reserve as defined in the decree that established it in 1980. However, it is noted that the boundaries of the core zone were not clearly identified at that time. The State Party is currently updating its maps to define more clearly the boundaries of the core zone. Once this work is completed, a revised map will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre. However, the State Party has not proposed any tentative deadline for the completion of this recommendation.

Whilst the report shows that the State Party is doing its best to enhance the protection and management of this World Heritage property, IUCN is still receiving information from a number of NGOs and experts in Honduras, which note that the situation is still very fragile within the property and express concerns that, in light of the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Government might not keep the same level of priority and support to the conservation of this property.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.38

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7A.13**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Commends the State Party for its efforts in implementing the recommendations from the 2006 monitoring mission and encourages international donors and partners involved in the conservation and management of this property to continue supporting the State Party efforts for the effective implementation of these recommendations;*
4. *Urges the State Party to expedite efforts for completing the action plan required for the effective implementation of Recommendation 5 of the 2006 monitoring report and for finalizing a detailed map for the property clearly demarcating its core zone; and to*

submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2008**, the finalized map, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;

5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on further progress achieved on the implementation of the recommendations made by the 2006 monitoring mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

39. Manú National Park (Peru) (N 402)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

11 COM; 31 COM 7B.41

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 28,750 (Rapid Response Facility - RRF)

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Agricultural encroachment;
- b) Cattle ranching;
- c) Deforestation/ Illegal logging;
- d) Hydrocarbon concessions.

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted its report with maps on 30 April 2008 (in Spanish). The report argues that pressures within the park are minor, as are those emanating from human activities located near the south western and south eastern park boundaries. It indicates that management effort has been strategically directed at those areas in greatest need (Ajcanaco-Boca Manu and Tayacome-Yomibato inside Manu National Park, and Mapacho-Yavero and Pilcopata-Alto Madre de Dios in the buffer zone of the Biosphere Reserve). Activities include over flights, patrols, land use plans, and sustainable development and

environmental education projects, though no information is provided in relation to how these activities have helped control the threats.

The State Party report does not provide information on any potential or real threats that may be associated with nearby hydrocarbon concessions, though it does provide a map which clarifies that concession number 76, previously suspected of overlapping with property boundaries, does not in fact do so. IUCN has received reports that hydrocarbon concessions and infrastructure developments in the region have affected the livelihoods of indigenous people and rural communities, pushing some of these to migrate to the Manu National Park, leading to increased pressure on the property.

The State Party submitted an updated map of the property to the World Heritage Centre, as the one in the original nomination (1987) was of low resolution and imprecise. However, the report makes reference to the Manu National Park and the Biosphere Reserve, but in the map, the latter's boundaries are not clearly indicated, and as a result, there remains room for doubt as to the location of exact property boundaries.

In 2002, the State Party extended the National Park, indicating that it had increased its surface area by over 14% (from 1,500,757 ha to 1,716,292 ha). The original nomination file indicated a total surface area of 1,532,802 ha. Although it appears likely that this discrepancy is due to the application of better technologies in measuring surface areas, formal confirmation from the State Party is required. The map provided by the State Party does not indicate the location of the extensions, and though the report provides an overall description of the property's values and management, it does not clearly differentiate between the part inscribed in 1987, and the proposed extension.

The State Party also notes that plans are in place for managing the property: management plan (plan maestro); plan of tourism use – regulations in the sector of the Manu river; plan of the tourist area of the Manu river; anthropological plan (under revision); and a proposed contingency plan to deal with indigenous peoples living in voluntary isolation. However copies of these plans were not submitted with the report.

The property benefits from significant international assistance – including from the Frankfurt Zoological Society (FZS), the German KfW (Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau) and the European Union. The FZS has supported the preparation of a work plan to improve protection of the National Park. This effort has been complemented with USD 28,750 of the UNESCO – WHC / Fauna and Flora International Rapid Response Facility, which have been used for over flights, capacity building and emergency actions to address cases of illegal logging, workshops and special patrols. An aerial inspection in 2007 noted that indigenous people have crossed the river and opened up new cultivations within the south-eastern limit of the park. Incursions along the eastern boundary have been in dispute until recently due to imprecise delimitation of the boundary.

IUCN has learned that chainsaws have been distributed by community leaders and used for illegal logging and land clearing within the property, underlining a need for increased awareness raising, community outreach and collaborative management. Incidents of illegally extracted wood have been reported around Tono, Palotoa, and Diamante. Lumber felled inside the park has been reported to be transported on waterways, to Shintuya and other points along the road Pilcopata-Shintuya, and from there by trucks to Cuzco.

Increased presence of strangers and assaults of tourists have been reported to IUCN, coinciding with a reported increase of coca plantations in the buffer zone in the southeast of the park. It has become dangerous for outsiders to venture into the area of the Cosñipata Valley, especially around the village of Patria.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.39

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.41**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Regrets that the State Party didn't submit its state of conservation report in one of the two languages of the Convention (French and English);
4. Requests that the State Party provide an updated high resolution map of the World Heritage property clearly indicating the original boundaries as per the 1987 nomination dossier, and explaining the discrepancy between the surface area indicated in the original nomination dossier, and the current value of the property's surface area and the area being proposed for extension;
5. Invites the State Party to submit a clear request for boundary modification, including a precise map illustrating lands proposed for extension, and encourages the State Party to consult with the World Heritage Centre on statutory requirements for preparing and submitting such request;
6. Notes with concern continued reports on threats to the conservation and integrity of the property, including incidents of deforestation, agricultural encroachment, invasion and insecurity;
7. Requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
8. Also requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2010** with a report on the state of conservation, including full details on the reported threats and any other potential threats directly and indirectly affecting the integrity of the property, along with management response to these threats, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

40. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(vii) (viii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.42

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

Development pressures associated with tourism and housing

Current conservation issues

The State Party provided its report on 10 May 2008, thus limiting the ability to consider information presented therein.

The State Party provided a copy of a newly completed Soufrière Region Integrated Development Plan (the plan) in March 2008. The plan includes a detailed analysis of the property and its surrounding areas. It proposes five main zones, or policy areas, within the property against which specific development control policies would be applied, taking into consideration the property's outstanding universal value while at the same time recognizing the existence of extensive private land holdings within its boundaries and concomitant development pressures. The zones include: (i) a rigorous "no-construction" zone, which includes the actual volcanic Pitons and the steep and highly visible ridge of land joining the two; (ii) the sulphur springs zone, which protects unique geological features; (iii) a coast area zone, which permits tourism development, with certain building restrictions; (iv) the remaining lands within the property, where organic residential development and agricultural infrastructure is permitted, again with some restrictions and (v) the marine zone, restricting development there. The plan has not yet been formally incorporated into State Party planning processes.

The plan substantiates concerns that there are considerable pressures for residential and tourism related development in the area, particularly on coastal sites, and that all current planning applications are on hold. Potential developments include villa development in the area above the Jalousie resort, which is located between the two Pitons including refurbishment and new building activity in the Jalousie Resort, villa development on the Beau Estate, a possible marina and hotel resort complex at Baron Drive and a boutique / green hotel at L'Ivrogne. The report also notes that there are existing developments at Malgretoute which lie within the part of the PMA currently termed the 'no-build zone', and considers that there needs to be a stronger enforcement policy to ensure that similar developments do not occur. There is also no mention of what measures are to be implemented to address these illegal constructions.

The plan reviews the external boundary of the PMA and no changes are proposed. However, following a detailed review of the internal zones of the property a number of recommendations have been made to provide an equitable balance between development and conservation, permit certain tourism-related development within strict environmental controls, and to provide opportunities for local people with regard to housing and employment all of which the report considers would not place the World Heritage status at risk.

In the view of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, the Plan is a pragmatic response to the realities of the PMA – a natural World Heritage property inscribed despite the presence of important resort developments and significant residential development within its boundaries. These and other concerns had been noted by IUCN at the time of the inscription. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned that the level of development within the property may set inappropriate precedents as to what should be expected of a property inscribed under criterion (vii) of the *World Heritage Convention*. It is also clear by the number of development applications under consideration in the short time since inscription that development pressures over time risk eroding its outstanding universal value unless a very clear and rigorous planning process is put into place immediately, strictly enforced and closely monitored.

The State Party provided a follow-up report in response to the World Heritage Committee Decision **31 COM 7B.42**, received by the World Heritage Centre on 10 May 2008. The report indicates that the plan is currently being considered by the Cabinet of Ministers for adoption, along with a proposal to declare the property as a Special Enforcement Area, which would reportedly deter illegal and unauthorized development. However, it is not clear how, should it be adopted, planning and development decision making processes will be articulated with the plan.

Three points of concern are noted by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN:

- The plan is a consultant's report and has no implications on planning processes unless its provisions are formally recognized by the State Party.
- The plan does not make clear the extent of development and landscape impacts that might result within the property, and hence, the extent of further development should be more clearly specified in order to assess the acceptability of the plan and to track its implementation. In this regard, baseline data precisely indicating the current level of development in the property would be helpful.
- Any further development within the PMA not strictly conforming to an agreed planning policy should be regarded as providing a clear basis to recommend inscription of the property in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN has received additional information on the status of the management of the property, and concludes that the current management of the property needs to be strengthened. Areas noted of particular significance include:

- Enhancing the role of the management committee for the property and the level of consultation and engagement with the community and stakeholders;
- Capacity building of the existing management body which includes training, particularly in participatory approaches and conflict management;
- Identification, development and use of creative means of financing the management of the PMA; consideration should be given to having appropriate management staff and stakeholders take the on-line "Business Planning for Sustainable Financing of Protected Areas" course recently developed with the support of the World Heritage Fund;
- Encouraging development outside the property and enhanced support for sustainable business enterprises and entrepreneurs outside the property; and
- Sustainable tourism development including an appropriate marketing plan, prepared in partnership with the St Lucia Tourism Board.

There are also some clear opportunities to forge new alliances in support of effective management of the property. The new GEF Small Grant's Programme managed by UNDP in St Lucia has as its Programme Focus to "contribute to the effective management of the Pitons Management Area World Heritage Site". IUCN is also developing a new regional Caribbean programme (IUCN Caribbean Initiative) and this provides the potential opportunity

to provide support to the PMA. IUCN-WCPA Caribbean has also indicated that it is prepared to provide some technical assistance to the Government of St Lucia and the PMA with regards to management of the PMA.

The PMA has drawn on a capacity building exchange with the Dorset and East Devon Coast World Heritage Site supported by the United Kingdom authorities. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note this as an example of good practice that could be developed further as part of the establishment of effective protection and management of the PMA.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.40

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **28 COM 14B.11**, and **31 COM 7B.42**, adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes with concern that development continues to affect the integrity of the property, which if not urgently addressed is likely to lead to significant loss of the outstanding universal value of the property;*
4. *Welcomes the preparation of an integrated development strategy for the property and requests the State Party to take the necessary steps to adopt its recommendations as the foundations of a binding planning framework for the property under the laws of St. Lucia, noting the need for the State Party to reflect further on its recommendations in order to ensure that the anticipated levels of development that might result from this strategy do not prejudice the outstanding universal value of the property;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to develop activities with local partners, including UNDP and IUCN, for a programme to strengthen the management of the property, including in relation to the capacity of the management agencies and the communities within and adjacent to the property to protect, manage and benefit from the World Heritage status;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a full State Party report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the recommendations above, including detailed baseline information on current land use within the property and a description of the development application and review process, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

MIXED PROPERTIES

ASIA-PACIFIC

41. Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982 / 1989

Criteria

(iii) (iv) (vi) (vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

Previous Committee Decisions

23 COM X.29; 30 COM 7B.32; 31 COM 7B.43

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

Commercial logging in areas adjacent to the World Heritage property

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a comprehensive state of conservation report on the property on 28 January 2008, including responses to each of the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **31 COM 7B.43**.

At the invitation of the State Party, a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN / ICOMOS mission took place between 15-20 March 2008, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, to assess the state of conservation of the property, focussing on the appropriate management of areas of heritage value which are currently outside the property, fire risks and their management, and the impacts of proposed forestry operations and roads on the outstanding universal value of the property. The full mission report can be consulted on-line at the following address: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2008> and a summary of the findings is given below:

a) *Cultural attributes*

Cultural aspects of the outstanding universal value of the property are attributed principally to Aboriginal archaeological and cultural sites in caves on the Franklin and Gordon Rivers. These are an outstanding example of a traditional way of life in extreme southern latitudes in the last 34,000 years during the last glaciation and recession of the Pleistocene Era. Little has been reported on the conservation status of these cultural sites and landscapes. The mission is of the view that the existing sites within the inscribed property Tasmanian

Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA) are now better documented and remain an exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition. However, there is a lack of detailed conservation management planning.

The property needs to have better re-definition of themes in both Aboriginal and European land occupation and history (although these latter are not related to outstanding universal value), cultural landscape analysis and appropriate management, improved interpretation, improved partnerships and consultation and better training, documentation and data bases.

b) *Additional cultural areas of potential outstanding universal value*

The mission noted a range of sites outside the inscribed area that could potentially demonstrate outstanding universal value and augment the context of the existing inscribed sites, by setting them into a wider context of Aboriginal land-use practices. Various NGOs have recommended that areas in the Western Tiers (north-east of the inscribed area) and Recherche Bay (south-east) should be included within an expanded boundary for the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. The mission could not provide a recommendation on whether the parts of the Western Tiers or Recherche Bay should be included in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area without further survey and documentation. The mission did however note that logging immediately outside the inscribed area might be having an impact on cultural sites of potential outstanding universal value.

Despite the presence of archaeological and Aboriginal cultural sites of potential outstanding universal value outside the property, in the view of the mission there is not an overriding argument in terms of protection of these sites for extending the boundaries as these sites are being protected by other means.

The mission considered that following further survey and research, the State Party might wish to consider, at its own discretion, nominating certain areas as an extension of the existing property or as a serial nomination. There are areas such as the upper Florentine that have both archaeological sites that relate in some way to the existing inscribed archaeological sites and have high natural values such as the mixed rain forest tall eucalypts. Meanwhile these sites should be managed for their cultural values. The mission also commented on the potential of the property to be re-nominated as a cultural landscape.

c) *Resources*

The mission recommends that resources should be greatly enhanced for identifying, recording and protecting archeological and aboriginal sites both those within the property and those adjacent which might have the potential to demonstrate outstanding universal value. Resources should be increased to enable the Tasmanian Aboriginal Land and Sea Council (TALSC) to conserve its cultural sites and improve land management capability, and also for identifying, monitoring, interpreting, and managing aboriginal and historical sites, and cultural landscapes, demonstrating Aboriginal land-use. The Aboriginal Relics Act also needs to be updated and passed into law.

d) *Natural attributes :*

The natural values of the property include undisturbed wilderness, encompassing most of the last temperate rain forest remaining in Australia, as well as tracts of tall eucalypt forest. The mission noted that 46.3% of Tasmanian native forest communities are protected by a system of formal and informal reserves, including national parks and the TWWHA. These reserves include about 79.3% of all remaining old growth forests of the state. Since inscription, better science on conservation planning and additional knowledge of the attributes of potential outstanding universal value, both within and outside the property is available on the ecology, biodiversity and cultural values. Climate change, invasive species, connectivity and the integrity of ecological processes add to protected area management challenges and have led Australian NGOs to suggest a re-consideration of the World Heritage property boundaries.

The mission noted that contour or a straight line boundary for a protected area, such as that set for the TWWHA adds to the management challenge of assuring the ecological integrity, connectivity and the integrity of ecosystem processes. However, the choice of this boundary in 1989 was based on a consultative process that also took into account socio-economic considerations. Under the Tasmanian Community Forest Agreement a series of CAR (Comprehensive, Adequate and Representative) reserves have been established adjoining the TWWHA. These areas, together with the TWWHA, currently provide a basis for addressing these challenges.

e) *Appropriate management of areas of natural heritage value which are currently outside the property*

The mission noted that forested areas adjoining the World Heritage Property are governed under the Regional Forestry Agreement (RFA), signed in 1997, between the Commonwealth and State Governments. However, a subsequent supplementary Tasmanian Community Forest Agreement (TCFA) was signed in 2005. The RFA is a framework that covers both public and private lands. Under the RFA, the adjoining area to the property has different management objectives to those of the TWWHA. Under the RFA and TCFA, a range of commitments were made which have a direct bearing on the management of areas adjoining the Tasmanian Wilderness Area, including a system of informal and formal reserves, control of pesticides, and specifications for regeneration of felled areas in native forests. Reserves set up under the RFA are subject to mineral exploration unlike the lands in the TWWHA. Biodiversity-rich zones have been identified and are managed for special species timber harvesting. Clear felling is not allowed in these zones. Many of these special management zones are located directly adjoining the TWWHA borders. The RFA includes a range of other commitments regarding forest conservation noted in the mission report.

The mission noted a five year review of the RFA was completed earlier in 2008 and a number of its observations are relevant to the management of the area adjoining the TWWHA, including the need to complete management plans of reserves and provide resources to implement them, the need to review mechanisms to ensure that forest harvesting does not impact on the integrity of the boundary of reserves, publish compliance auditing, and to implement an environmental management system. Threatened species information is also lacking and thus is not available to guide land use decisions. Furthermore, subsequent changes in legislation and practices require amendments to the RFA and the implications of logging practices on water catchments require further consideration.

The mission notes that a fundamental underlying component of the RFA is the Forest Practices System. Compliance is detailed in the Forest Practices Code, which has been assessed to be comprehensive and amongst the most prescriptive in the world.

f) *Risk from regeneration fires in areas adjacent to the World Heritage property and effectiveness of fire management*

The mission noted that regeneration of Eucalyptus forests through regeneration burns and seeding is an accepted silviculture treatment and is used in production forests for regenerating Eucalyptus, a fire dependent species. If there is no fire, the tall eucalypts become 'senescent' and in time very old southern beech will dominate. Fire management however has inherent risks in its application which require careful management.

It was reported to the mission that in the past twenty years of regeneration fire treatments there has only been one fire escape (in 1989) among the over 500 regeneration burns carried out.

The mission noted that tall Eucalyptus forests within the TWWHA and forest reserves provide an opportunity to apply a holistic management approach through a landscape-level/scale vegetation plan that addresses fire use. Having managers of national parks and the forestry reserve estate prepare and implement such a plan jointly would be preferable to the various parties planning separately. The State Party has reported that an integrated Fire-Risk

Management Plan for Tasmania is in the process of being prepared and would be completed by end of 2009.

g) *Impacts of proposed forestry operations (including the construction of new roads) on the outstanding universal value of the property,*

The mission noted that construction of roads, use of regeneration fires and logging operations are all strictly regulated under the Forest Practices Code (FPC) of 2000, which is currently undergoing a process of review. Logging roads in close proximity to the Tasmanian Wilderness Area provide access to the property and if unregulated can lead to possible damage to cultural sites or sensitive vegetation, and threaten rare and endangered species and may provide access for invasive species. Forestry Tasmania are conscious of the above as well as of the risk posed to expensive equipment on site and in response have instituted a gated system to control motorised access.

The mission considers that the standards applied to road building activities include significant requirements for environmental design, but also noted that there may be ways to reduce the need for road construction using the most modern equipment. The mission also noted that where roads are not longer needed their rehabilitation would enhance the aesthetics of the property.

h) *Climate Change*

The mission noted that the size of the area and the diversity of its ecosystems contribute to its adaptive capacity to climate change. The property would benefit from an active programme for monitoring the impacts of climate change, including for carrying out a vulnerability assessment for both natural and cultural (archaeological) resources and to prepare an adaptation strategy on that basis. This could be integrated within the recommended strategy and action plan for reducing risks to the World Heritage property.

i) *Minerals leases*

The mission noted that areas with high mineralization zones were left out of the TWWHA at the time of inscription or not included in national parks. In the 1989 technical evaluation of the revision of the 1982 inscription of the property, IUCN had drawn attention to small-scale mining operations at several locations such as Oakleigh Creek, Adamsfield, Melaleuca, and Jane River. When approving the extension to the property, the World Heritage Committee noted with satisfaction the statement by the Australian observer that legislation had been passed to revoke all mining rights within the World Heritage site. While some of these areas, such as the Adamsfield conservation area had already been incorporated into the World Heritage property (though not included in a National Park), the mission is of the opinion that all the remaining areas including those noted by IUCN in its evaluation should be incorporated into the World Heritage property as soon as the existing leases expire and that renewal or granting of any new leases should not be considered.

j) *Statement of outstanding universal value*

Since the inscription and subsequent expansion of the property, new knowledge has come to light on the ecology and biodiversity values of, for example, the Tall Eucalyptus Forest of Tasmania, and cultural values arising from subsequent archaeological and Aboriginal evaluations. The original and the subsequent Statement of outstanding universal value at the time of expansion do not measure up to the 2008 *Operational Guidelines* standards expected of sites presently under consideration.

k) *Additional natural areas of potential outstanding universal value*

In its decision (**31 COM 7B.43**) the World Heritage Committee also urged the State Party to consider the extension of the World Heritage property to "*include critical old-growth forests to the east and north of the property, or at least to manage these forests in a manner which is consistent with a potential World Heritage value*". According to RFA sourced statistics provided to the mission by the State Party, the vegetation types in all age classes dominated

by the four Eucalyptus species that characterize tall Eucalyptus forests (*E. regnans*, *E. delegatensis*, *E. nitida*, and *E. obliqua*) total 237,000 ha in Tasmania. Of this area, the old growth in reserve status totals 172,000 ha or 73%. The TWWHA and areas managed under its management plan, contains 90,900ha or 38% of Tasmania's tall old growth forests dominated by the four named Eucalyptus species.

The mission noted that there are currently 21 protected areas, mainly to the north and east, which are excluded from the boundaries of the World Heritage property but covered by its management plan, and recommends an extension of the property to include these areas. The management of these areas is essentially the same as that of areas within the boundaries. In the draft 2007 Management Plan of the property, which has been prepared as a result of the ongoing review of the 1999 management plan, the State Party indicates that these areas, which are considered by the State Party to have World Heritage values, will be considered for inclusion into the World Heritage property in 2009. Such a proposal would need to be evaluated through the standard processes of the World Heritage Committee as a boundary modification or a proposed extension

l) *Comments from IUCN*

IUCN notes that the current eastern boundary of the property is not ecologically based and represents a past compromise between different opinions and views. It is noted that there are many areas of the boundary on the eastern side of the property which follow contours across mountain slopes. In the opinion of IUCN the boundary as currently established, whilst functional to date, is not ideal or consistent with current best practice for boundary demarcation for World Heritage properties.

IUCN has consistently noted that there are areas of Old Growth Eucalyptus Forest adjoining the existing World Heritage property which have potential as to be added to the property. The mission received new information on the values of these adjoining areas adjacent to the property in a detailed report from the Environmental NGOs, which suggested the ecological diversity of the tall eucalypt ecosystem is incompletely represented in the World Heritage area, and, in particular, that only 29% of tall eucalypt forest is included within the property. It has also been suggested that the values outside the property are different and complementary to those of the tall eucalypt forest included in the property. Areas of high potential value as World Heritage have consistently been identified, including tall eucalypt forests in the Styx valley and the Upper Florentine.

IUCN notes the long history of discussion regarding the boundaries of the property both before and after the last extension. In the view of IUCN the decision to prepare any further World Heritage nomination is a matter for the State Party. The possibility of extension of the property is not a matter for IUCN in detail because it would also be the evaluating body of any proposal for an extension or boundary modification. However, IUCN notes that there is a clear body of evidence that there are areas which may have potential to demonstrate outstanding universal value which are outside the existing boundary of the property.

In the view of IUCN, it would be desirable that a moratorium on logging activity in areas of potential outstanding universal value be considered, as logging in these areas would foreclose the option of adding these areas to the property.

IUCN considers the proposed extension involving the 21 new additions could be valuable, noting these areas are under no direct threat from logging and associated activities and may not necessarily reflect the most important areas of tall eucalypt forest.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.41

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.43**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Takes note of the findings of the recent World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN monitoring mission to the property, and requests the State Party to:
 - a) Institute a mechanism through the future Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA) management plan reviews, and involving all relevant stakeholders, to monitor, assess and manage for ecological integrity the TWWHA and adjoining reserves by considering activities related to forestry operations, road construction and regeneration fires in the areas adjacent to the property;
 - b) Submit a proposal for modifying the boundaries of the TWWHA to include the adjacent 21 areas of national parks and state reserves, which are currently not a part of the inscribed World Heritage property but are covered by its management plan;
 - c) Not to renew the existing leases for mineral exploration and exploitation within the property and immediately adjacent to it (such as in the Melaleuca Cox Bight area), after their expiry and to rehabilitate the areas concerned and to incorporate them into the World Heritage property. Further, no new mining licenses should be granted within the property or in the areas which are being recommended for addition;
 - d) Maintain and improve the resourcing for the research, documentation, protection, monitoring and effective management for archaeological and Aboriginal cultural sites both those within the TWWHA and those in the adjacent forestry areas that reflect the wider context of Aboriginal land-use practices and are of potential outstanding universal value;
 - e) Manage the forestry areas outside the inscribed property in order to protect cultural sites of potential outstanding universal value;
 - f) Ensure logging roads in areas adjacent to the TWWHA consider the ecological integrity, possible cultural sites and aesthetic values of the property, and reclaim roads no longer required;
 - g) Prepare and implement a vegetation management plan covering the TWWHA and the adjoining forest reserves jointly by national parks and the forestry authorities, to address representativity of vegetation types and to reduce risks, particularly from fires and climate change;
 - h) Implement the recommendations emanating from the recently completed 2008 review of the Tasmania Regional Forest Agreement;
 - i) Establish an active programme for monitoring the impacts of climate change on the property and incorporate this programme into a risk-reduction strategy and action plan;
4. Also requests the State Party to revise the Statement of outstanding universal value for the property to include relevant recent natural and cultural knowledge available regarding the site, for approval by the World Heritage Committee;

5. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to consider, at its own discretion, extension of the property to include appropriate areas of tall eucalyptus forest, having regard to the advice of IUCN; and also further requests the State Party to consider, at its own discretion, extension of the property to include appropriate cultural sites reflecting the wider context of Aboriginal land-use practices, and the possibility of re-nominating the property as a cultural landscape;*
6. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, including a revised Statement of outstanding universal value and progress related to the above mentioned issues, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

44. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1983

Criteria

(i) (iii) (vii) (ix)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.33; 30 COM 7B.35; 31 COM 7B.45

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 103,825 for fire suppression equipment; Master Plan development; and consultancies, such as a stone specialist for assessment of restoration work required on the Intihuatana stone sculpture.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 15,000 for the social participation workshop requested by the World Heritage Committee (Decision **30 COM 7B.35**).

Previous monitoring missions

Six missions since 1997: IUCN / ICOMOS mission October 1997; World Heritage Centre / IUCN / ICOMOS mission October 1999; World Heritage Centre / IUCN / ICOMOS mission 25 February-1 March 2002; World Heritage Centre visit 23 October 2003; World Heritage Centre mission 15-16 April 2005; World Heritage Centre / IUCN / ICOMOS mission 23-30 April, 2007.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Delays in reviewing the master plan and developing detailed yearly operational plans, and inadequate budgetary support for effective implementation;
- b) No evaluation of transport options, related geological studies, or the impact of bus traffic on increasing the risk of landslides;
- c) Lack of impact studies related to the carrying capacity of the Citadel and Inca Trail;
- d) Delays in the development and implementation of a public use plan;
- e) Delays in implementing urban planning and control measures for the village of Aguascalientes, immediately adjacent to the property and its main point of entry, which has impacted on the visual values of the property;
- f) Lack of effective management of the property;
- g) Lack of risk management plans related to natural disasters;

- h) Inadequate governance arrangements including lack of adequate coordination of activities between different institutions and stakeholders involved in site management.

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted, on September 30 of 2007, an updated Annual Operation Plan (POA) prepared by the Management Unit (UGMP). The State Party did not submit the requested strategy regarding control of the Western Access of the Sanctuary as requested by the World Heritage Committee's Decision **31 COM 7B.45**.

On 7 March 2008 the State Party submitted a progress report in Spanish on activities implemented within the property. This report includes information from the National Cultural Institute (INC) and the National Institute of Natural Resources (INRENA) but does not include inputs from other participating institutions in the Management Unit (UGMP), such as the Ministry of Tourism (MINCETUR) and the Regional Government.

According to the State Party report INC has limited its efforts to the area of the citadel resulting in better management of tourist flows around the citadel, and improved interpretation strategy, cleaning and consolidating the Inca drainage system, improving official access facilities at the Citadel and repairing the Inca trail paths in the buffer and core areas of the Sanctuary.

a) *Management plan and governance*

The management unit for the property was re-established 19 July 2007. Minimal implementation of the priority actions identified at the 2007 workshop on participatory management has been achieved. No actions have been undertaken yet to update the management plan by a participatory process. In terms of governance, the UGMP has not been able to enhance institutional coordination, for example with the Ministry of Transport and Communications or urban planning institutions.

b) *Evaluation of transport options, landslide risks and risk management plans*

IRENA has not yet finalized a map showing the risk assessment for the property. This is essential for preparing the risk preparedness plan requested by the World Heritage Committee. No mention was made in the report on fully assessing and addressing the risk of landslides on the Hiram Bingham Road, where most landslides have occurred in previous years. Actions have been limited to prohibiting the cleaning of buses on the road, which has been previously associated with accelerated erosion.

No actions have been undertaken to clean the Alcamayo Riverbed or reinforce the river retaining walls throughout Aguascalientes, as proposed by the 2007 Monitoring Mission. Moreover the contract established by INC and the University of Kyoto on landslide risk assessment and technical support was cancelled; no final report was officially submitted and no capacity building programme or transference of knowledge were offered to local technicians. The terms of reference for the risk preparedness plan have been discussed by the UGMP, but the National Institute of Civil Defense (INDECI) has not yet approved the proposed terms of reference, which is a requirement before a tendering process can be implemented.

As noted by the State Party on 22 August 2007, a fire affected 161 ha. of the Sanctuary. As a result of the incident, a monitoring system has been installed to control the high-tension cable network on a permanent basis. Fire prevention system trials are also underway in the area of Torontoy. INRENA recognizes that the lack of a fire detection system in the Sanctuary, combined with potential threats from flammable fuels that are required for management operations and the lack of adequate policies, regulations and sanctions for infractions that could lead to fires continue to be a significant cause for concern.

In addition to the issues noted above, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies were informed in January 2008 of the re-establishment of helicopter flights over the Sanctuary,

with landings at El Rocotal, 2km from the Citadel, and 1km from the Aguascalientes. The World Heritage Centre has requested that official information be provided by the State Party on this issue. Over the past 9 years the World Heritage Committee has reiterated the need to define, through the development and implementation of a transportation plan, appropriate alternatives for transportation to the Sanctuary supported by studies on their possible impacts as noted in Decision **28 COM 15B.38**. Collectively, these developments have a significant impact on the outstanding universal value of the property in relation to the archaeological, landscape and aesthetic values of the property that are the basis for its inscription.

c) *Lack of impact studies related to the carrying capacity of the Citadel and Inca Trail and delays in the development and implementation of a public use plan*

INC has developed an *Emergency Plan of Machu Picchu* focused on visitor management of the Citadel, which indicates alternative paths to avoid bottlenecks in strategic areas of the citadel, and establishes new itineraries and alternative entry and exit points. The State Party also included information on the proposed installation of a fibre optic system at the Sanctuary to monitor the flow of tourists and to provide internet and phone access, however no Environmental Impact Assessment of this development was included in the report. The State Party report noted that the UGMP has elaborated "Rules for a Controlled Use of the Road Santa Teresa-Colpani-Rail Station" (western access of the Sanctuary) which has not yet been approved by the Regional Direction of Transport and Communication, although this document was not included in the State Party report as requested in Decision **31 COM 7B.45**. The State Party report also notes a range of unresolved issues. These include an increase in the number of visitors arriving at the Citadel at 5:30 am via unauthorized access or paths, which demonstrate that reinforced security measures taken over the last five months, have not been effective. It is likely that visitation will be increased as a result of the listing of the property as one of the "new" Seven Wonders of the World by a private initiative.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies continue to receive information on problems associated with uncontrolled traffic, poor road conditions and unsafe tourist services which, at their most serious, seem to have caused the death of two teenagers in November 2007. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned that despite the urgent request of the World Heritage Committee last year, no public information programme has been developed to advise visitors and tourism operators of the landslide, fire, building failure and health risks associated with overnight stays at Aguascalientes.

The implementation of the public use plan continues to suffer delays due to the lack of finance. The State Party decided to call for tenders for the preparation of a public use plan. A second call for tenders was opened for a tourism public use plan; and a third call is proposed for a study on the carrying capacity of the property. The State Party reported that these three processes are on hold due to a lack of resources. The proposal to have three different studies instead of an integrated approach, as recommended by the 2007 monitoring mission, is likely to lead to duplicated and ineffective efforts.

d) *Delays in implementing urban planning and control measures for the adjacent village of Aguascalientes which have impacted the property*

No means have been put in place to prevent further uncontrolled construction in Aguascalientes. No urgent measures have been taken to avoid the rapidly increasing population growth of the village, as recommended by the reactive monitoring mission in 2007. The growth of Aguascalinetes presents a major threat to the World Heritage property, accentuated by new pedestrian and vehicular access points in the western part of the Sanctuary.

Urban planning regulations continue to be ineffective and no action has been undertaken in terms of visual disorder, environmental impact, uncontrolled constructions, and the increased number of buildings set up on the banks of the Vilcanota River. A new seven floor hotel has been constructed without permission. The State Party also reported that 43 unauthorized

constructions have been registered in the protected area in recent months which is affecting the scenic values of the property. Nor has any adequate solution been found for solid and liquid waste which is affecting the quality of the water in the river flowing through the property. In terms of territorial planning, no diagnostic study on local and national transportation strategy has been prepared.

The report explained that the implementation of urban planning is the responsibility of the municipality of Aguascalientes, and that the establishment of a department to deal with this task is planned for 2008. No information have been provided on the role and responsibilities of this proposed department, nor on its composition, task or functioning.

e) *Absence of authority in managing the property*

In summary there is a continued lack of progress in implementing most of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee, which have resulted from six monitoring missions over the last ten years. A series of new problems continues to arise as a result of the lack of adequate integrated management, poor governance and institutional coordination. There does not appear to be either sufficient political commitment and/or technical capacity of the State Party to effectively address the needs of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies conclude that there is clear evidence that the property, and specifically the values that led to its inscription on the World Heritage List, are in danger. The threats illustrated in paragraphs 179 and 180 of the *Operational Guidelines* already affect the cultural and natural values of the property, and have the strong potential to continue to increase.

Key specific threats include:

- (i) The failure of governance mechanisms in establishing effective and integrated management of the Sanctuary, and the lack of participation of all stakeholders in the development and review of the management plan.
- (ii) The lack of effective measures to address serious risks threatening the property such as from landslides, the danger of building collapse and fire.
- (iii) The uncontrolled growth of Aguascalinetes, resulting in direct and indirect impacts from development affecting the property, and associated risks to visitors from unsanitary conditions, health threats and social conflicts.
- (iv) Inadequate and unplanned visitor management resulting in uncontrolled use, inadequate access planning related to the capacity of the property, congestion in both Aguascalientes and at the Machu Picchu Citadel, and a lack of control of the western access to the property.

The factors threatening the integrity of the property are amenable to improvement by human action and therefore also meet the requirements of Paragraph 181 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The property should remain on the Danger List until the effective implementation of the following corrective measures which are in line with previous recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and those proposed by the 2007 monitoring mission:

- (i) Establishment of improved and effective governance and integrated management of the property, particularly the Sanctuary, and involving the participation of all key stakeholders.
- (ii) Establishment of an effective management plan addressing all of the relevant cultural and natural values of the properties and an adequately resourced means of its implementation.
- (iii) Development and implementation of a comprehensive risk reduction plan to identify and respond effectively to the range of risks noted within this report.
- (iv) Development and implementation of a urban plan for the Aguascalientes to effectively address the following issues which impact on the aesthetic values and integrity of the property and the experience and safety of visitors:

- a. the high risk of landslides caused by developments on very steep slopes which affect the stability of the slopes;
 - b. the absence of control on the amount, location, height and quality of the construction of the buildings;
 - c. the limited capacity of medical and fire services for the local population and visitors;
 - d. the impact of solid and liquid waste and lack of adequate disposal systems;
 - e. the level of poverty and problems of conflict of interest between illegal tourism development and decision makers.
- (v) Development and implementation of effective plans to manage visitor use and provide alternatives for transport and access, addressing the increasing congestion of the Aguascalientes and the Machu Picchu Citadel.

The state of conservation required for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, the detailed corrective measures, and the timeframe for their implementation should be developed by the State Party in collaboration with other stakeholders of the property, as well as with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger could be an important means to secure the political commitment at the highest level for the conservation and management of this property. It also provides a means to promote enhanced international cooperation to assist the State Party to obtain additional technical and financial resources required for the long term conservation of this property.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.44

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.45**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit its report in one of the working languages of the World Heritage Convention (French or English);*
4. *Takes note of the reported progress made by INC and INRENA in preserving the archaeological and natural values of the property and the awareness programmes for the local population;*
5. *Also regrets the limited progress in addressing a series of critical ongoing issues identified in past decisions of the World Heritage Committees, including:*
 - a) *lack of effective governance mechanisms for the property,*
 - b) *lack of effective measures to address risks to the property,*
 - c) *uncontrolled growth of Aguascalientes and resulting impacts on the property and a lack of adequate infrastructure including waste disposal systems,*
 - d) *inadequate and unplanned visitor management;*
6. *Expresses its deep concern over the potentially negative consequences on the aesthetic values of the property by authorizing helicopter flights over the Sanctuary*

without respecting provisions under Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and urges the State Party to suspend this practice until a public use plan is developed;

7. *Also urges the State Party to take immediate action, supported by adequate human and financial resources, to effectively implement the following measures:*
 - a) *Establish improved and effective governance and integrated management of the property and particularly the Sanctuary, through the participation of all key stakeholders in the review and further implementation of the Management Plan;*
 - b) *Develop and implement a comprehensive risk preparedness assessment to identify and respond effectively to the range of risks noted above;*
 - c) *Develop and implement an urban plan for Aguascalientes to address effectively the following issues:*
 - (i) *the high risk due to landslides;*
 - (ii) *the uncontrolled number and height of buildings;*
 - (iii) *the absence of controls on properties and the quality of the construction of the buildings;*
 - (iv) *the very limited capacity of medical and fire services for the local population and visitors;*
 - (v) *management of solid and liquid waste and lack of adequate disposal systems;*
 - (vi) *measures to support sustainable economic and community development consistent with the values of the property.*
 - d) *Develop and implement effective plans to manage visitor use and provide alternatives for transport and access, addressing the increasing congestion of the Aguascalientes and the Machu Picchu Citadel;*
8. *Requests the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the international community to work closely with the State Party to provide additional technical and financial support to enhance the local and national capacity to urgently and effectively implement these measures, and to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN mission to start planning an action plan for the property, as part of the revised Management Plan;*
9. ***Decides to inscribe the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;***
10. *Also requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity prior to the arrival of the mission, and a draft of the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*
11. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and progress achieved on the implementation of the measures for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

46. Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(i) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

22 COM VII.31-41; 29 COM 7B.34; 30 COM 7B.39

International Assistance:

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 4.78 million by the Italian Funds in Trust for the "Aksum Archaeological Site Improvement Project": Preparatory studies for the re-erection installation of the Obelisk and capacity building for archaeological conservation" - Phase 1, and "Re- erection of the Obelisk"- Phase 2.

Previous monitoring missions

2005, 2006, 2007, 2008: Missions of the World Heritage Centre and experts for the implementation of the project.

Main threats to the property identified in previous reports

- a) Insufficient delimitation of this serial property;
- b) Lack of conservation and management plans;
- c) Lack of appropriate urban planning and building regulations;
- d) Lack of cartography, documentation and equipment.

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee had requested a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM mission to Aksum to assess its state of conservation and submitting a report for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session in 2008. This mission aimed amongst other matters at evaluating the impact of the works on the property.

Due to delays in the re- installation works of the Obelisk, the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with ICOMOS and ICCROM, decided to postpone the joint mission until the works are completed, and prepared the present state of conservation report on the basis of the data collected regularly by the World heritage Centre and experts.

Following the return of the Aksum Obelisk / Stelae 2 from Rome to Aksum in April 2005, the World Heritage Centre, in close collaboration with the Ethiopian Authorities, undertook the preparatory studies for the re-installation of the Obelisk, and launched in July 2007 the works

for its re-installation. The works are well advanced and the three blocks of the 152 ton, 24.3 metre high Obelisk will be installed at the end of July 2008. The Obelisk's restoration and the final arrangements at the site will be undertaken before the end of December 2008.

“The Ethiopian Cultural Heritage Project – Pilot Project” funded by the World Bank (USD 700,000) was implemented and is currently being finalized. The project outputs affecting the property are the construction of a site museum and annexed services, the rehabilitation of a 19th century building into a cafeteria (both constructions are in the Stelae Field) and signage.

The plans of the World Bank project shown to UNESCO in January 2006 were implemented with a change in the original design: the height of the museum entrance has been raised to two stories instead of the foreseen one storey; this is regrettable since the museum was built inside the Stelae Park. In addition, with increasing tourism, the location of the entrance in the back of the Stelae Park will transform the later into a crossing area to access the museum.

Ventilation elements in iron and glass - aesthetically arguable - have also been put in place over the underground galleries of the Stelae Park.

Rising water table in the Stelae Park area is causing regular flooding in some of the underground tombs. The site manager is currently dealing with this problem by pumping the water out.

The Tigray regional authorities have worked on the definition of the limits of the property and its buffer zone which were not submitted originally with the nomination file, and have shared the information with the local community. Consequently, they prepared a bill to be submitted to the regional parliament proposing revised limits and a buffer zone. At the time of drafting this report, no maps had been submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

The regional authorities have also taken several positive measures in the field of site management including regular maintenance works, allocating funds for the employment of guards and dispatching them in all the areas of the serial property, closing a stone quarry in Gobadre in the vicinity of the ancient Aksumite quarry, and controlling new constructions within the property.

The World Heritage Centre held a Training Workshop in Aksum from 31 May to 5 June 2008 to which a multidisciplinary team of national and international experts took part. Forty participants including site managers and decision makers from Aksum and other Ethiopian World Heritage properties attended the workshop. The participants produced, with the guidance of the experts, an Outline site management road map document which identifies the problems and the needs of the property, the technical and administrative means to respond to these needs and the mechanism to start-up a management process at the property.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B 46

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.39**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction that significant progress has been achieved in the implementation of the Aksum Obelisk re-installation project;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2008**, the map of the property indicating clearly the boundaries of the World*

Heritage core and buffer zones, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;

5. *Encourages the State Party to submit an International assistance request to address the issue of rising water table level at the Stelae Park;*
6. *Requests the State Party to implement the site management road map and to take the necessary protective measures;*
7. *Also requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission to Aksum end of 2009 with a view to assessing its state of conservation and to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on progress made in the management of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

47. Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia) (C 18)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1978

Criteria

(i) (ii) and (iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.40 ; 31 COM 7B.46

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property : USD150,000 for the « Analysis of Conservation Problems at Lalibela » (World Monuments Fund).

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property : USD 300,000 for the « Conservation Action Plan for Lalibela » (Norwegian Funds-in-Trust).

Previous monitoring missions

July 2004 and March 2005, World Heritage Centre missions; June 2006, World Heritage Centre ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission; March 2007, World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS monitoring mission; 2007, three follow-up missions for conservation projects by

the World Heritage Centre and experts; March 2008, World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS monitoring mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) No boundaries for the property nor for the buffer zone ;
- b) Impact of the four recently constructed temporary shelters ;
- c) Absence of a management plan for the property;
- d) Insufficient urban and architectural regulations;
- e) Urban development around the property;
- f) Impact of rainwater and humidity ;
- g) Geological and architectural characteristics of the churches.

Current conservation issues

In accordance with earlier missions, the shelter project and the conditions for its implementation have been modified by the Authority for Cultural Heritage Research and Conservation (ARCCH), the State Party supervising body. The revised project was developed following the main recommendations made by the World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission, and Decision **30 COM 7B.40** of the World Heritage Committee.

Work began in February 2007 and should have been completed just after the joint mission in April 2008. The temporary shelters have a rainwater evacuation system concentrated at one main point per shelter.

The present situation is as follows :

- a) Works on the shelters were carried out respecting the integrity of the property ; the works caused no notable damage to the environment ; the microclimatic effects of the shelters on the monuments should however be carefully monitored. The evacuation of rainwater remains problematic and requires monitoring during the rainy season and, if necessary, modification;
- b) The last shelter constructed over Biet Aba Libanos had been advised against by earlier missions due to a risk of landslides on the hill where the church is carved, which could potentially damage the church. Moreover, this church already has large cracks due to landslides that have occurred over time ;
- c) The visual result of the shelters, although minimized in comparison to the original project, remains impressive, but is of a reversible nature and may be dismantled once a definite solution is found to waterproof the churches ;
- d) Following this project, sustainable conservation and management solutions for the protection should be found without employing external physical means, and a regular monitoring on the effects of the shelters on the churches ;
- e) The State Party has planned to carry out monthly monitoring of the shelters during the first year following the end of the works and requested the construction company to provide a maintenance and dismantlement plan of these shelters ;
- f) Among those churches not protected by a shelter, Biet Gabriel Rufael requires restoration work; the World Heritage Centre is currently preparing a complete decay analysis ;
- g) Different factors – pose a threat to the environment immediately surrounding the property, with no clearly defined buffer zone at present :

- (i) Public and private constructions, and tourism infrastructures;
- (ii) Potential widening and modification to roads and paths;
- (iii) Urban development linked to the construction of housing units around the property;
- (iv) Lack of urban and architectural regulations protecting the integrity of the property.

With regard to management, the present situation highlights the following issues :

- a) No integrated management plan for the property ;
- b) Need for participation by local communities concerning the property and its management plan.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.47

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7B.40** and **31 COM 7B.46**, adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property and the Statement of outstanding universal value requested at the 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) ;*
4. *Commends the State Party for having extensively modified its temporary shelter project in accordance with the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and constructed them respecting the integrity of the property and its environment by using reversible constructions ;*
5. *Requests the State Party :*
 - a) *To urgently undertake appropriate restoration and conservation measures for the Aba Libanos and Gabriel Rufael Churches;*
 - b) *To monitor closely :*
 - (i) *The shelter of the Aba Libanos Church due to the unstable ground upon which the foundations are built;*
 - (ii) *In general, the establishment of the temporary shelters, verify their effectiveness and possible impacts on the integrity of the monuments ;*
 - c) *To clearly identify the boundaries of the property and an adequate buffer zone to allow for the control of constructions and land development surrounding the property and the respect of its outstanding universal value, notably by :*
 - (i) *The production of maps and documents concerning the property and its environment and their submission to the World Heritage Centre, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009 ;*
 - (ii) *The implementation of suitable legal and regulatory protection;*
 - (iii) *The study of suitable urban and infrastructural solutions ;*
 - d) *To improve the sanitary conditions in the village associated with the property ;*

6. Encourages the State Party to implement the Conservation Action Plan for the property, respecting its integrity aimed at the complete restoration to its natural state, without the artificial shelters for protection against bad weather. This Plan should, in particular :
 - a) Identify and analyze the decay factors of the monuments ;
 - b) Identify and implement the most suitable sustainable solutions for the conservation of the property over and above the construction of the temporary shelters ;
 - c) Involve the local partners in the framework of sustainable economic and social development ;
7. Reiterates its request to the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a Statement of outstanding universal value, evaluating the conditions of authenticity and integrity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009 ;
8. Also requests the State Party to establish a management plan, integrating the conservation action plan, the measures for sustainable development involving local populations and the touristic enhancement of the property, the regulatory provisions for the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone ;
9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and the construction of the shelters, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

49. Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev)

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add.2*

52. Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape (South Africa) (C 1265)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2007

Criteria

(iv) (v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 8B.20

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20.000 Preparatory assistance in 2004

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Current conservation issues

Despite the recent inscription, the World Heritage Centre was informed in November 2007 that the State Party had granted to Bushmanland Minerals (Pty) Ltd a "Prospecting permit to prospect for all minerals on the portion of the farm Richtersveld No. 11", and that the "execution of this prospecting right" had taken place at the Directorate of Mining and Energy (DME) office in Kimberly on 5 September 2007, after which a permit was received by the Bushmanland Minerals Company on 13 September 2007. A copy of a letter received by the Centre and dated 2 November 2007 informs that the Bushmanland Minerals Company "plans to send out a team to the prospecting area to commence work on Monday 5 November 2007"; that, "prospecting will initially consist of surface mapping, surface sampling and geophysical surveying and no invasive prospecting will take place at this state without further consultation with affected parties". The letter further states that, "the Company has also been in consultation with the chairman of the Richtersveld Communal Farming Community, who is aware of our intent to commence work on 5 November 2007". An "extract report" from the prospecting work programme showing the extent boundaries of the actual prospecting area is also included in the letter compiled in conformity with the Prospecting Right in terms of Section 16 of the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act of South Africa. It is reported in the extract report that the prospecting is to be carried out for a period of five years and will consist of surface mapping, geo-chemical sampling, geo-physical prospecting, percussion and core drilling. Through a telephone discussion with the head of the Bushmanland Minerals, the World Heritage Centre was informed that the Company was not informed of the intentions of the State Party to nominate Richtersveld for the World Heritage listing. The World Heritage Centre was further informed that the Company had applied for a mining permit early in 2007 and granted in September of the same year, and that the expected prospection would include an area estimated at 83,000 hectares of the properties' 160,000 hectares of the core zone, and including part of the 398,425 hectares of the buffer zone.

The World Heritage Centre notes from the Government Gazette Notice Number 30043, dated 4 July 2007, that the Government had issued a Proclamation (no. 563) of the Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape as World Heritage property following the decision adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007). It further notes that the Government issues two months after the inscription a mining prospecting permit for the property.

The World Heritage Centre further notes that in a National Treasury "Special Adjustment Budget Speech 2007/08" of 12 September 2007, the Finance Ministry reports to have signed, on 22 April 2007, a "Deed of Settlement" in the land claim made by the Richtersveld community, and subsequently approved by the Cabinet in relation to diamond mining and outlining the roles of Alexkor, the State owned mining company and the Richtersveld Mining Company, giving the Richtersveld community 49% of Alexkor and the State, 51%. It is in

this relation that the Bushmanland Minerals Company had contacted the World Heritage Centre, informing that it had been given rights to prospect within the 51% share.

Following the World Heritage Centre's expressed concern to the State Party, the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) informed the World Heritage Centre through an e-mail dated 28 March 2008 that it was investigating on the matter, and that on 5 March 2008 it had met with the Bushmanland Minerals to inform them "about the potential negative impact that their activities could have on the property, and the fact that no mining or prospecting activities were permissible in a property, in terms of the National Environment Management and Protected Area Act" of South Africa. The World Heritage Centre has been informed through an e-mail dated 28 March 2008 that a meeting is being planned to take place between DEAT and DME with the objective to request DME to withdraw with immediate effect the mining permit granted to Bushmanland Minerals. The Conservancy management of the Richtersveld has also proposed the need to start up a dialogue between the Richtersveld Community Conservancy, the DEAT, DME, Community Property Association and Richtersveld Municipality in order to work out a lasting solution concerning the World Heritage property and its buffer zone.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the mining permit should be rescinded at the earliest opportunity in order to avoid the property being considered in danger. In line with assurances given at the time of nomination, as set out in the ICOMOS Evaluation (WHC-07/31.COM/INF.8B.1): "*Mining is not a threat within the nominated property or its buffer zones due to the protection afforded in the municipality's Integrated Development Plan and by various conservation restrictions. The National Protected Areas Act prohibits mining and prospecting in areas that are under protection. This is specifically referred to in the Regulations under the National Heritage Resources Act.*"

In line with these discussions, the World Heritage Centre understands that the State Party is concerned not only in the Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape but also in other World Heritage properties such as the Cape Flora Region Protected Areas, Fossil Hominid sites of Sterkfontein, Swartrans, Kromdraai and Environs, and Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape to streamline the emerging issues concerning boundaries, human use systems and other developments. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies encourage the State Party to continue with its efforts and particularly to use modern methods to delineate properties and to promote community participation in conservation especially in a multi-stakeholders environment.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.52

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 8B.20**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Expresses its concern that despite being given insurances in the Nomination file, that prospecting mineral licence was issued for a considerable part of the property and its buffer zone two months after the inscription;*
4. *Appreciates the efforts being undertaken by the State Party to resolve the issue;*
5. *Requests the State Party to organize as soon as possible the planned meeting between the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) and the Department of Mines and Energy (DME) with view to eventual withdrawal of mining prospection permit issued to the Bushmanland Minerals;*

6. Also requests the State Party to hold as soon as possible a meeting between the stakeholders and the Richtersveld local authorities in order to resolve the mining issue more generally in the Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape;
7. Urges the State Party to review site protection decrees for the property and to initiate, where necessary, additional legal and legislative instruments to ensure protection of the property from mining and other resources exploitation, and calls upon the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to assist as necessary in reviewing and/or drawing up such an instrument as appropriate;
8. Also urges the State Party to continue its efforts in solving boundary, human use and management issues facing the Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape World Heritage property and other World Heritage properties in South Africa;
9. Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess its state of conservation; evaluate the extent to which the above recommendations have been met and meet with both the State Party and other stakeholders;
10. Requests moreover the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop, prior to the arrival of the mission, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
11. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

54. Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2000

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.49

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

5-9 May 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Development pressures;
- b) Environmental pressures;
- c) Natural disasters and lack of risk-preparedness;
- d) Visitors/ tourist pressures;
- e) Lack of resources;
- f) Lack of legal framework.

Current conservation issues

A joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out between 5-9 May 2008, at the invitation of the State Party following a request made by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), in order to assess the state of conservation of the property and factors affecting its outstanding universal value, and progress made in implementing an impact assessment of the Malindi Stone Town Port development project.

The State Party's report requested in Decision **31 COM 7B.49** was only made available to the mission experts at their arrival to the World Heritage property. The mission report provides detailed background on the rationale for the Port development project and on steps in project implementation since its initiation in 2004. To summarize:

- a) The current project, funded by the European Commission has been planned to rectify the failures of an earlier attempt (1989-1991) to extend the original 1927 British colonial period quay.
- b) The *Feasibility Study and Recommendation for the Rehabilitation of the Malindi Port* performed for the State Party in February 2004, indicated two possible options: Option A (a suspended concrete slab and pile solution, similar to the existing, described as the most feasible option if a sizable percentage of piles could be re-used with the least obvious disadvantages/impacts), and Option B (a vertical wall and fill solution, less costly than A, but possibly having negative impacts on the marine environment). Option A was chosen for implementation by the government of Zanzibar.
- c) Prior to commencing the project, the contractor's study of the condition of the existing piles indicated all would have to be replaced and that the cost of this option would increase from 16 million dollars to 40 million dollars.
- d) Based on a Hydraulic Study and a Wave Movement and Water Level Study carried out by the European Commission in Sept. 6 (which suggested that environmental impacts of Option B would be incidental), the European Commission informed the State Party that it could only support proceeding with Option B.
- e) The Port Authority agreed with this proposal formally in Nov. 2006, given that operations associated with analysis of the two options had already resulted in a large loss of income for the Port over 9 months, and loss of confidence in users of the Port, and the Port Authority's belief that the European Commission would withdraw funding if Option B were not pursued. However the Port Authority made its acceptance of Option B conditional on a Baseline Survey of current sea conditions and impacts being conducted, followed by a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and an impact monitoring process after 5 years of use (with full participation by World Heritage Centre experts); the Port Authority also stressed that the project should have

no adverse impacts on the natural and heritage environments, that the terms of reference (TOR) of the Baseline Study and the EIA should be drafted by the Zanzibar Department of Environment, (and include assessment of impacts on the cultural environment of Stone Town, as well as provisions for mitigation if required after the 5 year monitoring process mentioned above), and that the European Commission accept to pay for the Baseline Survey and EIA work.

- f) From this point, poor communications among all project partners (the European Commission, the European Commission's environmental consultant, the Port Authority, the Department of the Environment of the Government of Zanzibar, the National Authorising Officer of the State Party, the Stone Town Conservation and Development Authority - STCDA), have resulted in the project proceeding without any of the necessary or agreed approvals, surveys or environmental assessments being in place.
- g) The Department of Environment of Zanzibar insisted, in the absence of the Baseline Survey and EIA, that there was still a need for an Environmental Impact Audit of Option B, inclusive of the bio-physical and cultural environments, with accompanying monitoring for a 5 year period, in order to be able to identify causes for possible negative impact/s as well as responsibility for possible remedial actions.
- h) Construction of the Port will be complete in November 2008. At the time of the mission, with 66% of the work completed, only a very limited Baseline Survey had been performed. Further, the mission uncovered additional and previously unreported impacts related to the changeover from Option A to Option B. This includes dumping of imported fill related to dredging operations in the green belt of the Stone Town, unauthorized and undocumented demolition of two protected 1927 warehouses contrary to the provisions of the 1994 Stone Town Heritage Act, unauthorized erection of a large yellow steel stop-barrier which offers a "huge negative impact on the cultural environment in terms of form and colour" and a new connecting bridge between the jetty and quay, also erected without review or approval, again with a large negative visual impact, and the revival of the original concerns with Option B, that it could cause an increase of transfer of diagonal wave forces on the sea wall of the waterfront, already in poor condition, and which could result in failure of the wall, with accompanying impact on the sea front historical buildings and the waterfront road.
- i) While the World Heritage Centre has stated by letter of 15 January 2007, that results of an EIA were required in order to determine whether there would or would not be any negative impacts on the property resulting from the Malindi Port project. During this discussion it transpired that the European Commission had never once referred to the Nomination Dossier Map which shows the limits of the World Heritage property, and that issues relating to the property were not wilfully neglected, but rather because they did not realise the need for consideration of potential risk to the World Heritage property. This was due to the fact that the Port rehabilitation project was executed in 1989-91 before Inscription, and that the current activities were only intended as remedial work, similar to the existing.
- j) In conclusion, the mission report regretted that the Malindi Port rehabilitation project was not conceived in regard for the protection requirements of a World Heritage property and its outstanding universal value, nor executed in accordance with the requirements of the *Operational Guidelines*. The mission report believes that this was due to a series of fundamental but unintended procedural errors at the start of the project, because the Port Authority and the National Authorising Officer were under the impression that the project involved remedial work on an existing project begun before Inscription on the World Heritage List, and therefore not perceived as a new project requiring assessment. Also, according to discussions held during the mission, the European Commission was under the impression that the Port was located outside the World Heritage core area , following consideration of a map of the conservation area,

included in the 1994 Heritage Act. The mission further regretted that Option B has been implemented without the compilation of a comprehensive and suitable Baseline Survey and EIA. The lack of such a survey now makes it impossible to fully ascertain how Option B will perform relative to Option A.

- k) Accordingly, the mission report suggests that by immediately carrying out a thorough and independent study, it will be possible to adequately ascertain any negative impacts caused by the completed Option B by conducting an Environmental Impact Audit on both the cultural and bio-physical resources. The mission report notes that both World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS should be involved in a review of the Impact Audit document and its findings, and that the Department of Antiquities, as the relevant focal point for management of World Heritage in Tanzania, must request the National Authorising Officer to formally request the European Commission to undertake this Impact Audit and Monitoring project.
- l) The mission report further suggests that the location and remains of the demolished 1927 warehouses should be documented (through drawings) by a heritage specialist if these do not exist in the Archives, and the drawings subsequently lodged with the STCDA.

The mission report (May 2008) also includes a comprehensive and detailed state of conservation review. The visit to the World Heritage property showed that it was still in a “fair” state of conservation. However, the mission pointed out significant problems related to development pressures, loss and degradation of historical buildings and elements, lack of integrated management, and lack of interpretation and presentation of the criteria for outstanding universal value. The mission report notes that an awareness of what World Heritage status implies and requires is not sufficiently internalised by all the stakeholders of the World Heritage property. Actions need to address this lack, and to bring together stakeholders who have up to the present been intervening in isolation, in order to harmonise and optimise interventions. The mission report notes the need for an harmonious working relationship through an urgent stakeholders meeting that will attempt to create a cooperation among various stakeholders, and establishing a formalized platform for stakeholders to share common visions and objectives for the sustainable conservation of Stone Town, within the framework of an appropriate management and conservation strategy (inclusive of an Integrated development plan and heritage management plan).

The mission report notes that the *Report in Preparation for the Periodic Review* (Pound & McDermott, Feb 2006) stated that if there was no improvement in the rate of loss of historic buildings over the next 3 years, the property would be ready to be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. While the mission report notes insufficient means or time to verify the precise status of the property, the rate of loss seems to have diminished to an extent that Danger Listing does not seem appropriate, even though urgent attention to the problems of the property remain a high priority. Despite noting many conservation problems, the mission report recorded a general positive attitude towards conservation.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.54

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision 31 COM 7B.49 adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007);

3. *Reiterates the importance to conform with the deadline set by the World Heritage Committee and takes note of the results and recommendations of the World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission undertaken to the property;*
4. *Regrets the decision of the State Party to proceed with the Malindi Port Development project without first undertaking the planned baseline survey and environmental impact assessment requested in Decision **31 COM 7B.49**;*
5. *Expresses its concern about the negative impacts to the outstanding universal value of the property caused by work on the Malindi Port development project, including loss of two historic warehouses, and erection of new inappropriately scaled and designed port facilities without prior approval;*
6. *Requests the State Party to urgently:*
 - a) *Carry out an immediate and independent Environmental Impact Audit on both the cultural and bio-physical resources, in full collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, before November 2008;*
 - b) *Ensure that the Environmental Impact Assessment includes a 3-5 year monitoring project in order to mitigate to the greatest extent negative impacts of work carried out and described in the mission report;*
7. *Expresses its appreciation to the efforts undertaken by the State Party to strengthen conditions for conservation, and acknowledges the ongoing challenges to maintain the state of conservation of the World Heritage property;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to finalize the currently prepared integrated management plan with full participation of all the relevant stakeholders, by organizing a stakeholders meeting aiming at setting up a platform for the integrated management of the World Heritage property;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to finalize the Review of the 1994 Heritage Act in order to gain greater autonomy and greater effectiveness in the long term conservation of the property outstanding universal value;*
10. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*
11. *Invites the Director General of UNESCO to approach the European Commission in order to explore possibilities of establishing a working mechanism whereby all projects to be implemented in World Heritage properties, meet all the requirements set by the World Heritage Committee;*
12. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, on the results of the Environmental Impact Assessment activities carried out, and progress made with regard to implementation of a 3-5 year monitoring project of Port rehabilitation, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

ARAB STATES

57. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add.2*

59. Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(i) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.41; 30 COM 7B.51; 31 COM 7B.57

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 16,000 for technical cooperation

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March-April 2005: ICOMOS mission ; November 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission ; March 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Unstable structures and lack of security;
- b) Lack of comprehensive conservation plan;
- c) Lack of management structure and plan.
- d) Important tourism development project with new constructions.

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 24 January 2008, which notes that the European Commission funded project "Protection and Promotion of Cultural Heritage in Jordan" will be complete by April 2008 and includes a visitors' centre, visitors' pathways, a new shelter for the St. Stephen's complex and protective fencing. The report notes that the original shelter provided under this project, to which the World Heritage Committee had

objected, was replaced by a protective roof in a simple design and compatible colour and will not include any curtain wall or glass wall which could cause adverse environmental effects. The report also notes that an NGO to promote awareness in the community for the importance of the heritage of Um er-Rasas has been established in partnership between the local community and the Department of Antiquities.

The State Party's report also responds in more detail to the priority issues identified by the joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS mission of November 2006, including its efforts to:

- a) Define site boundaries and provide perimeter fencing;
- b) Acquire adjacent lands to provide a buffer zone;
- c) Set up a team to carry out site maintenance, including consolidation of fragile walls and backfilling trenches dangerous for visitors;
- d) Provide pathways for visitors;
- e) Establish procedures for protecting mosaics;
- f) Consolidate fragile architectural elements;
- g) Stop restoration and reconstruction work on collapsed fragments;
- h) Stop all archaeological excavation until a comprehensive management plan is established and agreed;
- i) Discuss a future management structure and financial support system with the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities;
- j) Review the Management and Conservation plans initiated since 2005.

The joint UNESCO World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission carried out from 24-27 March 2008 has also provided a positive view of the State Party's efforts to strengthen conservation of the property. The report notes that the "mission members agreed that the situation at the site has been substantially improved following the measures undertaken by the responsible authorities in order to address the main issues raised by the World Heritage Committee" and that consideration of possible inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger "seems not to be necessary anymore."

The mission report addressed the same issues mentioned by the State Party in its report:

- k) The European Commission funded project, conceived to promote tourism, has been substantially modified to give weight to conservation concerns including the elimination of the road initially planned between two archaeological areas and the replacement of the former St. Stephens shelter with a new shelter appropriately designed to cover the whole complex, to eliminate biological deterioration problems and to be supported by foundations outside the perimeter of the churches.
- l) The State Party has acquired lands around and between the two main archaeological areas of the property thus defining a homogeneous core area now fenced in for full site protection. The State party has also sought application of new control regulations to adjacent lands within what could belong to a future redefined buffer zone. In due course, proposed boundary modifications to both core and buffer zones designed to facilitate the implementation of a Management plan and Conservation plan for the site, could be submitted to the World Heritage Committee.
- m) Dangerous trenches have been marked, covered and/or refilled to prevent harm to visitors. While constituting a substantial improvement since the mission of November 2006, this work of signage can be continued and improved.

- n) The installation of clearly delineated and visually integrated pathways improves preservation of the most fragile areas of the property by allowing visitors to understand where access is permitted and not. Here again, signage system improvements could be achieved.
- o) Most of the mosaic floors on the site have been preserved under thin earth or sand layers, and plastic sheets replaced with more suitable permeable membranes. The use of geo-textile membranes has not been possible at this stage given their high cost, but this could be addressed in the future.
- p) The State Party has constituted a team to consolidate the endangered architectural elements, and applied best practice techniques to the consolidation of the plaster surfaces of the walls of the “villa” and its fragile supporting structures.
- q) The restoration and reconstruction of collapsed elements has been halted pending the completion of a future plan for treating such elements.
- r) Efforts to cover St. Stephen’s mosaics to accompany the removal of the old shelter involving a saw dust layer beneath impermeable plastic sheeting without biocide treatment could increase biological damage. It was noted however that the new open shelter, and an improved rainwater drainage system will reduce humidity problems. The mission report also recommended further documentation on the mosaics.
- s) The State Party has put in place a new management structure which seems quite effective from a functional point of view. The mission report notes the importance of an annual operations budget to complement the State budget for site management.
- t) The report notes substantial progress in re-orienting the site’s management plan from tourism to conservation aided by policy shifts which have given the Department of Antiquities full responsibility for developing management plans. The report also noted the utility of building on the Conservation Plan (concerning best practice guidance) recently prepared by the Department of Antiquities, and suggested linking this to an intervention schedule and funding needs.

The mission report also recommends that the State Party submit a “technical document” to the World Heritage Centre which would include detailed documentation on many of these recent initiatives including site boundaries after acquisition of new lands, a technical description of the new shelter and its perceived advantages, a technical description of the mosaic covering installed during the erection of the new shelter, technical descriptions of all site conservation and consolidation measures implemented, and a technical description of all security measures undertaken, including new visitor pathways and the cancellation of the road linking the two archaeological areas. The report also recommends that this technical document should address overarching management issues such as details of the new management structure, of progress on the development of a conservation plan (including benchmarks for short and long term corrective measures already identified), and of ongoing discussions with the municipality of Um er-Rasas regarding the regulations to be applied to adjacent lands. As well, the mission report recommends that the State Party be encouraged to develop a financial system with a minimum annual operations budget, a possible revision of the boundaries of inscribed and buffer zone, as well as a needed archaeological research policy, all linked to a timeframe for expected implementation.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.59

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,

2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.57**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Expresses its satisfaction to the State Party for the quality and extent of conservation measures undertaken since the mission of November 2006;*
4. *Notes that the steps being taken by the State Party have removed the threat to loss of outstanding universal value, and sustained the site's authenticity and integrity, and that there is no need at present to consider World Heritage in Danger listing;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre a technical document including detailed documentation of all initiatives described in its state of conservation report, and supplementary information on the new management structure and staffing, the completion and initial operations of the visitor's centre, the definitive organization of the pathway system, progress in development of the conservation plan and in the elaboration of a management plan;*
6. *Encourages the State Party to:*
 - a) *Develop a financial system with a minimum annual operations budget,*
 - b) *Prepare a possible revision of the boundaries of the inscribed and buffer zones,*
 - c) *Develop benchmarks for short and long term corrective measures already identified (conservation, maintenance and monitoring plans for ongoing consolidation and security works), as well as a needed archaeological research policy, all linked to a timeframe for expected implementation;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February, 2009**, on its progress in implementing the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

63. Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.58

International Assistance

Total amount allocated to the property: USD 149,690 for Technical Cooperation.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount allocated to the property: USD 10,000 for expert technical missions in (2007/2008)

Previous monitoring missions

March and December 2007: World Heritage Centre missions for the King Faisal Road project; April 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Poor state of conservation;
- b) Inappropriate restoration techniques;
- c) Lack of a buffer zone;
- d) Lack of a management plan.
- e) Development projects threatening the significant historic fabric.

Current conservation issues

In January 2007, the Syrian authorities informed the World Heritage Centre of a large scale project in the King Faisal Street area, adjacent to the northern perimeter of the city walls, which would have involved the demolition of substantial urban fabric of historic value. The World Heritage Committee, during its 31st session, requested the State Party to submit a report by 1 February 2008, and to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission to assess the state of conservation of the property.

The State Party submitted a report on 24 January 2008. Its first part includes sections concerned with statement of significance, statement of authenticity/ integrity, and management of the property. This section outlines the official policy towards the Ancient City of Damascus and, although somewhat confusing, the spheres of action of the responsible government departments. In particular, the Commission for the Safeguarding of the Old Town, responsible for strategic planning, has produced a "structure plan", elsewhere called "Action Plan" or "Integrated Development and Conservation Plan for the Old City of Damascus" in order to give greater attention to the land use patterns and achieve the interior balance between living community and commercial activities, as well as a clear distinction between activities compatible with the area's historic and environmental qualities.

The report also details a number of other initiatives facilitating urban improvements, such as the technical co-operation programme with Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), focused on urban planning for the sustainable development of Damascus, and the Municipal Administration Modernization (MAM) Programme, funded by the European Union, aiming at improving the quality and effectiveness of local governance in six cities across the country. In Damascus, the MAM project is working to protect and revitalise the Old City; and several plans have been prepared including the draft of the "Integrated Development and Conservation Plan for the Old City of Damascus". The German Agency for Technical Co-operation is also supporting the preservation of the Old City of Damascus through financial incentives of the private sector.

The State Party report concludes by summarizing the major threats facing the property and the historical zones surrounding it, including the possible negative impact of development projects which will affect the "outstanding universal value" of the Old City, trendy conversions of many traditional Arab homes, the lack of conservation policy for the historical zones outside the walled city, and inappropriate regional planning projects.

The State Party report also includes a thorough progress report (dated 30 January 2008) by a MAM Programme consultation defining a buffer zone for the World Heritage property. The

report documents the current status of the historic suburbs, noting that “four of the five historical suburbs north and west of the Old City have come under protection by the Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums (DGAM) between 1988 and 2006 under the terms of the *Antiquities Law*. A “Committee for the Protection and Development of Old Damascus and its Buffer Zone” had been created by the Prime Minister on 16 May 2007 to ensure the coordination of planning activities *intra* and *extra muros*”. The definition of the buffer zone will be completed by the delineation of specific sub-areas for protection, rehabilitation and redevelopment, approval of the necessary regulatory instruments and institutional structure, and the formal endorsement of the buffer zone by the relevant Government departments prior to its submission to the World Heritage Committee.

While the State Party report shows a strong commitment to address the problems of reviving the social, cultural and economic dimensions of the historic city, there are a number of shortfalls in ensuring these mechanisms will retain the outstanding universal value of the property:

- The statements of significance and of authenticity/integrity presented (in place of the Statement of outstanding universal value requested) are not prepared in accord with the requirements of the *Operational Guidelines*. As such the results can not be integrated into the management plan requested by the World Heritage Committee.
- There appears to be no clear management mechanism which would coordinate the many projects in place funded externally by international cooperation programmes and internally.
- A conservation oriented management plan requested by the World Heritage Committee, whose emphasis on integrated decision-making could provide the overarching planning instrument mentioned above, is of utmost importance in order to ensure priority retention of the outstanding universal value of the property, while integrating the development concerns of all sectors concerned with the Old City.
- Finally the DGAM, acting essentially as a development control agency (but not a planning agency), despite its efforts, lacks the authority, the resources and the status to place concern for outstanding universal value at the core of urban decision making for Damascus.

A joint reactive monitoring mission (World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS) was carried out in April 2008, focusing on the different issues raised by the World Heritage Committee.

The mission report recalls a visit by World Heritage experts, invited by the State Party in December 2007, which confirmed the results of a study carried out by 18 local experts, namely that the King Faisal Street Project would negatively impact on the World Heritage status, even though situated outside the core area of the inscribed property. The mission report notes that local and international experts agreed that “the project would have implied a serious threat for the integrity of the whole historic fabric and the meaning itself of the World Heritage site of the “walled city”. The property would have remained definitively separated from its northern suburbs, with negative effects on its environmental conditions and economic and social vitality that would have added to the deterioration of its urban fabric and heritage values”. During the April 2008 mission, its members were notified that, excluding the portion concerned with the restoration of the City walls, the project had been cancelled.

The mission report documents the social and economic pressures and conditions combining to increase rates of deterioration of the building stock, in spite of the many conservation works carried out to preserve the major traditional souqs and monumental sites in the central core of the Ancient City. Large parts of the remaining historic fabric, within and outside the city walls, suffer from a severe physical and functional decay, reflecting the transformations occurred since the 1930s which developed the modern City Centre adjacent to the Old City and modified its functions and role with relevant changes in the socio-economic structure and land-use. It appears that the deterioration and the misuse of the historic residential stock are

rapidly increasing, largely due to the poor economic conditions of the largest part of the resident population. Many houses are empty and in a state of advanced disrepair, particularly in the Jewish quarter, where many properties have been abandoned by the owners, and the absence of legal tools, which would allow their re-use for housing or other compatible activities.

The most important public works program consists of the comprehensive renovation of the infrastructural network, concerning the main spine of the Ancient City – the Medhat Pasha street, also called the “Via Recta” – and the major perpendicular streets of the roman grid. The program is due to be implemented in 2008, with a complex and integrated set of interventions. The mission report underlines that whereas these works represent a fundamental step forward to the physical and environmental rehabilitation of the Ancient City, the works have unfortunately been carried out without a previous archaeological impact assessment and, apparently, with insufficient supervision by competent staff, due to time and budget limitations. The infrastructure improvements have been strategically combined with an extensive program of refurbishment and restoration of the street fronts; even if the quality of the materials and the execution are quite appropriate, and testify of a very effective site implementation management, these important works suffer from an uniform and sometimes insensitive design that in many cases do not adhere to the internationally established conservation requirements.

The mission report also notes shortcomings in the restoration and rehabilitation process taking place for some decades in the historic city. It stresses notably that recent interventions have implied large demolitions and redevelopment without respecting the texture of the historic fabric, and definitely represent a harmful precedent. The report however notes that a remarkable effort in the conservation of the major architectural heritage has been made in recent years by the Governorate’s Directorate of Old Damascus and the DGAM and that the issues of urban rehabilitation are nowadays addressed by several projects and studies carried out by different institutions, demonstrating that the need to ensure a consequent effort in conservation seems to be largely shared by all the concerned bodies.

The mission report underlines that, nevertheless, many of the recent and ongoing interventions still demonstrate that more sensitive planning as well as architectural and archaeological approaches, which would consider the whole historic urban fabric and not only the individual registered monuments as heritage to be preserved, need to be adopted. To this regard, an effort has to be made to raise awareness amongst officials and public opinion about heritage values of the Old City, and to increase management capacities and technical skills on conservation methods and techniques.

The mission notes further that definition of a buffer zone for the Old City is now well advanced on the agenda of the State Party. However, the World Heritage Committee’s request during its 31st session “to consider extending the boundaries of the property in order to include its valuable historical neighbourhoods” has not been addressed.

There is an urgent need to ensure a better coordination amongst the various public institutions, both in performing the planning process and in implementing the most relevant projects, and the new planning tools under preparation should provide a clear definition of the different levels of protection to be applied to the different parts of the urban fabric, with an accurate identification of the types of interventions required or permitted.

Draft Decision : 32 COM 7B.63

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,

2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.55**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Takes note with satisfaction that the State Party has decided to cancel the urban development of King Faisal Street, and requests, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to be informed in advance of any proposals to re-design or re-shape the Faisal Street area, and of any other major project planned;
4. Also requests the State Party to ensure that:
 - a) All future infrastructure and sub-surface works on structures include archaeological impact assessment, salvage excavation and mitigation as may be necessary to conserve archaeological resources;
 - b) Traditional approaches to conservation, restoration, repair and maintenance of building fabric be employed in all work within the inscribed zone and its neighbouring historic quarters within the buffer zone, in order to maintain the integrity of the property;
 - c) Conservation and planning procedures for adaptive re-use of the important stock of abandoned buildings within the property and the foreseen buffer zone be established, and implemented;
5. Regrets the construction of the new cultural centre on Medhat Pasha Street, and urges the State Party to transmit all available information on the project to the World Heritage Centre, and to study how to mitigate the negative impact on the values of the urban historic context;
6. Reiterates its invitation to the State Party to consider extending the boundaries of the property in order to include its valuable historical neighbourhoods and further requests the State Party to complete its work on defining the proposed buffer zone to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, for approval by the World Heritage Committee;
7. Also reiterates its request to the State Party to develop and implement a management plan intended to ensure co-ordination of all actions affecting the property and its surroundings, and which would bring together the many existing planning mechanisms, strategies, and international co-operation programmes in a framework which ensures respect for the outstanding universal value of the property;
8. Invites the State Party to explore the means to grant the bodies responsible for the Ancient City of Damascus, the authority, resources and status to develop, and implement the management plan mentioned above;
9. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a progress report on the above recommendations and on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

ASIA-PACIFIC

77. Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

Criteria

(vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.56

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2002: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission; November 2007: UNESCO mission; April/May 2008: UNESCO mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Post tsunami response;
- b) Need for development and management plan;

Current conservation issues

Following concerns expressed by the National Commission of Sri Lanka with regard to the construction of an international test cricket stadium in the buffer zone of the property, as well as a port development project in the Bay of Galle, two missions have been undertaken to assess the situation and to provide advice to the national authorities. With the support of the UNESCO Italian-Funds-in-Trust the first mission was carried out in November 2007 by an expert in port development projects. The second mission was carried out from 27 April to 7 May 2008 by the UNESCO Office in Delhi with a view to assess the general state of conservation of the Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications, to examine the issues related to the construction of the cricket ground and to review of the plans for the port development project in the Galle harbour.

General state of conservation

The property faces a number of challenges ranging from a large number of illegal constructions and unregulated interventions to historic properties and buildings, as well as decaying private homes and public buildings, both linked to problems in the planning and building permission processes; lack of professional capacity and monitoring ability on site,

lack of advice and guidelines for private and public owners, both resulting in sometimes low conservation standards; lack of tourism strategy, lack of archaeological and historic research on which to base conservation decisions, and last but not least lack of a comprehensive conservation and management plan. It has been envisaged for several years to change the core and buffer of the property to include outstanding marine archaeological remains in the harbour of Galle and protect them from the current threats of the port development. It is the recommendation of the 2007 mission to improve on the above shortcomings and increase staffing and funding for the Galle Heritage Foundation.

Cricket Stadium

The construction of the international test cricket stadium was planned over a number of years with several planning stages and also objections. The stadium in its current built form consisting of two tribunes, a three storey viewing building, raised grass embankment, fences and gates, a large screen, as well as foundations for further constructions, has never been given final approval by the planning authorities. Several buildings are thus illegal. In addition, although the World Heritage Centre had repeatedly asked for clarifications and documents on these constructions in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines* no detailed documentation was received.

The international test cricket stadium has a strong impact on the physical and visual integrity of the property. The buildings, fences, gates and the screen are all obstructing the views of the Fort and increased traffic at the time of the games in this central part of Galle will create congestion.

The Urban Development Authority, together with the Municipality has offered an alternative ground for the Sri Lanka Cricket Board to build a stadium and comprehensive sports facility, which is strategically better placed, also in terms of traffic management.

Therefore the mission has recommended that the international cricket test stadium should be removed from the buffer zone of the World Heritage property. However, the mission has recommended proceeding in two stages, short term and long term:

- *In the short term (until 31 March 2011)*, lower the middle building by one storey; remove the illegal building to the west of the ground as well as all related structures (batting area, temporary buildings, embankments, plantations, screen) and reduce the impact of fences.
- *In the long term (after 1 April 2011)*, fully remove all structures of the international test cricket stadium on the 'Esplanade', including fences, parking, embankments, and restore 'Esplanade' to an earlier state on the basis of archaeological investigations and historic research.

Galle Harbour

The development of Galle Port as a multipurpose port for regional needs is an important 150 million USD project financed as a loan with Japanese funds and jointly proposed since 1991 by the Sri Lanka Port Authority (SPLA) and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). The feasibility study and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) were completed in November 2000 by Japanese consultants and Sri Lankan Engineering Consultants respectively. The mission carried out in November 2007 assessed the impact of the construction of the port on the property, with specific reference to the expected modifications of the wave pattern induced by the new works and to the potential risks of blasting for dredging the submarine rocky seabed. On both aspects, while recognizing that this new development would "affect the present bay hydro-morpho-eco dynamics", the mission found that the proposed port would not critically affect the World Heritage property and the adjacent underwater heritage, if the recommendations of the Environmental Impact Assessment are fully implemented.

The planned port development, however, will have a strong impact on the visual and physical integrity of the property and the bay. The recommendations made by the two missions are to reconsider the feasibility of the overall project and, if total abandonment was not possible, to scale down and modify the port layout and design with respect to the sensitive environment and its integrity. In connection with the conservation of the bay and its underwater archaeology, the missions recommend the revision of the boundaries of the core and buffer zone.

Complete or partial revision of project

In light of the development of a new large-scale industrial-commercial port in Hambantota 150 km east of Galle, the Galle port could be rehabilitated and modernized for cruise and tourist boat traffic. In this way the overall appearance and setting of Galle Bay will not change and its character as a major historical (port) and tourist attraction will remain untouched and may be even enhanced. The UNESCO mission also found that the port development would be coupled with industrialization of the urban environment and the increase in cement factories close to Galle Fort, which would have an impact on the environment.

Modification of existing project

The modifications for the port layout and its design aim at reducing negative visual and physical impact. The port should be adapted to the morphology of the bay and constructions should only come up away from sensitive areas and historical sites such as of the underwater archaeological remains of shipwrecks, which were clearly mapped in a 2007 survey by an Australian team.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.77

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.56**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes the findings and recommendations made by the 2007 and 2008 UNESCO missions to Galle concerning the port development project in Galle Harbour and the international test cricket stadium in the buffer zone and the general state of conservation of the property;*
4. *Urges the State Party to:*
 - a) *Remove the constructions of the cricket stadium as recommended by the mission;*
 - b) *Consider abandoning the current port development project;*
 - c) *Submit to the World Heritage Centre revised boundaries of the core and buffer zone;*
 - d) *Improve the capacity and processes of the relevant authorities to plan, monitor, manage and conserve the urban heritage of Galle;*
 - e) *Develop a comprehensive conservation and management plan;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the progress made concerning the above mentioned recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

80. Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley (Andorra) (C 1160 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 14B.36; 29 COM 7B.71; 30 COM 7B.80

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Legal protection for buffer zone;
- b) Completion of management plan and inventory.

Current conservation issues

In its report submitted on 31st January 2008, the State Party reported progress on legal protection, and the management plan.

a) *Legal protection*

The State Party reported that the Law to protect the property as a cultural landscape, the details of which were given in the report to the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee (Vilnius, 2006), were finally adopted and entered into force on 26 July 2006.

b) *Management plan progress*

The State Party reported that there have been difficulties in getting agreement to an overall approach for the management plan from all the four communes within the inscribed property. At the time of inscription, the development of a management plan was well advanced with the involvement of all the communes. However since that time, two of the communes, Encamp and Escaldes-Engordany, have instigated legal proceedings against the Government stating that the inscription of the property and measures to protect it as a cultural landscape have challenged their competences. This matter was considered by Constitutional Tribunal and the challenge not upheld. However progress with the

management plan was halted during the time taken to resolve these issues and this has set back the overall timescale.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.80

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.80**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),*
3. *Notes that the Law to protect the property as a cultural landscape entered into force in July 2006;*
4. *Also notes delays in finalizing the management plan while awaiting the outcome of legal challenges;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a progress report on the implementation of the management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

82. Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2001

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

26 COM 21B.35; 27 COM 7B.57; 28 COM 15B.83

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission to neighbouring property of "Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn"

Current conservation issues

The State Party has provided a state of conservation report on 7 March 2008 to the World Heritage Centre. This report responded to concerns expressed by ICOMOS concerning impacts on the visual integrity of the property given the height of proposed structures within the main train station project. The State Party report noted that *“the City of Vienna is committed to avoiding any negative effects the Vienna Central Train Station project could have on the Historic Centre of Vienna”*.

The report further noted that the State Party has *“reduced the height of the high-rise buildings and made changes in their locations. These measures have ensured that only one of the total number of 11 high-rise buildings is visible from the park of the Belvedere Palace, which forms part of the World Heritage site”*. The report noted also that the changes constitute part of the *“now legally valid Vienna Land Use and Development Plan.”* The report emphasized that only the highest one or two storeys of the 100 metre high-rise building would be visible from the park, protruding above the tree line, and that the integrity of the view of the place is maintained.

Finally, the State Party report noted the importance for the Republic of Austria and the City of Vienna of the construction of this new *Vienna Central Train Station* given its role as a hub of the Trans-European network.

ICOMOS Austria has also expressed by letter of 5 May 2008 its concerns with the methodology used to assess the impact of the new structures on the World Heritage property. ICOMOS Austria suggested that in order to come to a preferably transparent and objective assessment it would indeed be necessary that the visual axes were determined from a standpoint of World Heritage compatibility. In this respect, ICOMOS Austria was referring to the earlier ICOMOS comment of 19 November 2007 that was transmitted to the Austrian authorities.

This comment noted that the revised master plan for the property (February 2006) shows that some high-rise buildings were modified (reduction of one of the two 100 metre towers to 60 m., certain changes in locations). However, these changes would not ensure sufficiently complete compatibility of the proposal with the integrity of the World Heritage views.

The ICOMOS comment of November 2007 further noted that the City of Vienna’s computer simulation appears to suggest that the views along the historic central axis from the Lower Belvedere Palace to Upper Belvedere Palace would remain largely undisturbed. This comment further noted that the 100 meter tower would appear above the trees to the right of the Upper Belvedere Palace and seriously disturb the visual integrity of the Palace from a lateral perspective. It was also noted that the tower would be much more visible in certain conditions: in winter, when trees are without leaves, and at night, when the tower would be illuminated.

The ICOMOS comment also noted that the City of Vienna’s evaluation did not examine the consequences of the new high-rise buildings for the south front of the Upper Belvedere Palace, and the area of the park (part of the core zone of the World Heritage property) immediately adjacent the Vienna Central Train Station project grounds.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are concerned that the height of the 100 metre tower which will protrude above the tree line will have an unacceptable negative impact on the World Heritage property. It will also constitute a precedent which could encourage such intrusive projects in the future. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS believe that this part of the project should be halted and reviewed further, following a methodological assessment of the impacts of the proposed 100 metre building and other project structures on the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage property, taking into account the parameters for view assessment raised in the ICOMOS report of November 2007. This assessment should provide recommendations for maximum permissible heights

for the 100 m. structure concerned, and any other structures deemed to have negative impacts. The results of this review should be presented to the World Heritage Committee.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.82

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **28 COM 15B.83**, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),*
3. *Requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *Halt the construction of the 100 m building of the Vienna Central Train Station project, of which the height would protrude above the trees on one side of the Belvedere Palace Park;*
 - b) *Carry out, in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, a comprehensive visual impact assessment of the entire project, fully sensitive to impacts on the outstanding universal value of the property, and addressing the parameters included in the ICOMOS report of November 2007;*
 - c) *Report to the World Heritage Centre on the results of this assessment;*
4. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on its efforts to respond to the above for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

83. Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(i) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.73 ; 30 COM 7B.81

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Current conservation issues

In 2005, it was communicated to the World Heritage Committee that the responsible planning authority of the City of Vienna decided to stop the high-rise project of Kometgründe-Meidling, and to support the development of the area through smaller scale projects. In March 2006, a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission reviewed the state of conservation of the property. The State Party had also provided a letter to the World Heritage Centre on 16 June 2006 which stated that *“based on the discussions during the joint UNESCO / ICOMOS mission, the project has been revised in the meantime (beginning of June 2006). Following the ideas of the investors, the project will now be built at a much lower height (maximum 60 metres).”* The World Heritage Committee noted with appreciation the decision by the Vienna authorities to stop the high-rise Kometgründe-Meidling project, as well as the results of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission in March 2006.

However, the State Party by letter of 29 May 2007 presented contradictory information about the height of the new structure; it notes on the one hand that the new project (main structure 60 meters) was presented to the 30th session of the Committee in July 2006 and refers to a project folder including *“all the details of the current state of the project which showed that the main structure (60m) has three additional levels on top”*. The letter also noted that *“the presented project was taken note of by the members of the World Heritage Committee without any objections”*, without specifying which project height was understood to be under consideration. The same letter noted that the structure was further raised in autumn 2006 to 73 m *“for proportion and artistic reasons”*.

By the end of 2007, the World Heritage Centre was informed by private citizens and NGOs that the project height was set at 73 to 78 m.

In response to queries from the World Heritage Centre, the State Party noted by letter of 1 February 2008, that it had *“not made any changes regarding the height of buildings in the “Kometgründe” project in Vienna’s district of Meidling since spring 2007, which means that the absolute building height of 73 metres, as outlined in the letter by UNESCO of 10 January 2008, will remain valid.”* By letter of 7 February 2008, ICOMOS Austria reminded the State Party that the World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS Mission in March 2006 agreed on an “outmost height” of 60 meters. The letter noted that while *“the building would also appear clearly with this height”*, that nevertheless *“this would be within a tolerable scale”*.

This letter also noted that in order to evaluate the visual impact of a building with a height greater than 60 m, it would be necessary to refer to the visualisations produced in March 2006. This should be possible with little technical effort as basic data is already available.

ICOMOS strongly believes that the integrity and authenticity of a baroque complex such as the Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn which dominates its surroundings with view axes and was laid out on the basis of certain symmetry are seriously affected by modern interventions in the form of high-rise buildings. Therefore, by exceeding the agreed height of 60 metres, this structure threatens the outstanding universal value of the property.

Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS strongly believe that the height of the planned new structure, as proposed by the State Party, exceeds the height of 60 metres reported by the State Party to the World Heritage Committee in 2006, and therefore, that the State Party has not upheld the commitment it made to the World Heritage Committee in 2006, to limit the height of this building. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS believe that the State Party should be requested to halt the project, until such time as impact visualisation

tests to measure the impact of the proposed new structure on the World Heritage property and its outstanding universal value, can be arranged, in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, and the results of these tests have been reported back to the World Heritage Committee.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.83

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.81**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),*
3. *Expresses its concern that the project plans for the new Kometgründe-Meidling structure suggest that its height exceeds the 60 metres which the State Party had agreed to maintain in June 2006;*
4. *Requests the State Party to halt the project immediately and to submit as soon as possible to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS visual studies in order to review the potential impacts of the proposed structure (73 – 78 m) on the outstanding universal value of the property and to report back to the World Heritage Centre on the results of the evaluated visual impacts;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2010**, on its efforts to respond to the issues above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

86. Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1992

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.94

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: Emergency Assistance (USD 50,000) in 2003 (floods).

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

27 February – 2 March 2008 : World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Current conservation issues

The State Party's report of 1 February 2008 responds to the issues highlighted in the World Heritage Committee's Decision **31 COM 7B.94**, and also provides a comprehensive overview of the history and present status of approaches to the conservation and management of the Historic Centre of Prague.

This overview includes detailed information on current monument care issues identified by state authorities (including basic characteristics and information regarding the property; legislation, urban planning and the management of the protection of the City's Monument Fund; monument care issues in the Historic Centre of Prague and its buffer zone; city population and environment; institutional cooperation in protecting monuments), and a detailed description of all larger restoration works, changes and new buildings within the preserved area in accordance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, for the period 2004 -2007 (including financial support as well as restorations, renovations, new buildings and planned constructions implemented or in progress). This overview also contains annexes including a study on the visual integrity of the Historic Centre of Prague, a conceptual framework for more efficient conservation, analysis of the urban development project for the Pankrác Plain and impacts on the outstanding universal value and visual integrity, as well as maps of large development areas, analysis of constructions in terms of proportions, capacities and scale against the "historic dominants in the skyline of the Historic Centre of Prague, and comparative photographs. This report is an exemplary model of its kind and the State Party should be commended for the great attention to detail within it.

The State Party report also provided a basis for the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission to the World Heritage property requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session, which was carried out from 27 February to 2 March 2008.

The mission acknowledged the progress made by the authorities involved with the property, noting that the City of Prague has been able to manage successfully an important restoration and conservation programme and that significant improvements have been brought about in the overall legislative, planning and management system related to urban conservation.

The mission specifically covered the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee, in particular the proposal for new high-rise building projects within the Pankrác Plain, and their potential impact on the visual integrity of the Historic Centre of Prague.

Concerning the development of high rise constructions on the Pankrác plain, the State Party report pointed out that this area has long been treated as a "future citywide centre" and that this concept was indicated in the "draft development plan of the City of Prague, confirmed by the comprehensive approval issued by the Prague City Council as of 31.10.1996". The development plan envisaged development of local and city-wide municipal facilities "to increase the attractiveness of the area and to facilitate reducing the concentration of city-wide functions in the Historic Centre of Prague." The State Party report notes that the three constructions to date were built in conformity with the development vision of the City at the time, and concerning the present proposal (2004), it notes:

“The presented conception of Pankrác Plain with two high-rise buildings, apartment house and a hotel is in compliance with the applicable development plan of the City of Prague and with the status of the Prague city heritage site. The lot lies outside the area where the Development Plan restricts construction of high-rise buildings.”

Concerning this proposal, the mission takes a more cautious attitude about perpetuating existing negative visual impacts. It concluded that the solutions to be adopted should at least not extend the visual intrusion on what would be – otherwise – “one of the best preserved European urban historic landscapes”. The mission recommended limiting the height of the new high-rise constructions to a maximum of 60-70 m, to limit the visual impacts on the historic urban landscape of the World Heritage property. This height level has been proposed to mediate between the height of the tallest existing buildings (100 m) and the height of the existing commercial centre (about 35 m). This would require reduction of the height of the two new proposed buildings, planned originally to be 80 m and 104 m. The mission suggested that this height reduction would maintain the viability of the investment, while reducing significantly the visual negative impact on the historic landscape.

The mission also looked into the adequacy of existing planning measures in the face of the ever increasing development pressures confronting the city, now attracting 4 million tourists a year. It has made a number of strategic recommendations, developed in consultations with the State Party aimed to streamline processes and to strengthen the management of the World Heritage property.

These include:

- Strengthening the current “advisory” role of the National Heritage Institute so that its views are given more authority and can help orient the main decisions affecting the integrity of the Historic Centre of Prague;
- Clarifying and integrating the rules presently in force to manage development processes such as infill, reconstruction, rehabilitation and conservation by introduction of a unitary code to strengthen the integrity of the original fabric of the city;
- Completing and formally adopting the conservation plan for the historic centre (a set of conservation guidelines are already informally in use) in order to provide an effective zoning and planning tool in the historic centre;
- Completing the management plan of the property within the year 2008. The management plan is a comprehensive tool for the coordination of the different regulatory and policy frameworks existing or foreseen for the historic centre, and for strengthening scope and implementation of zoning.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.86

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.94**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Acknowledges the ongoing improvements of the overall legislative, planning and management system for urban conservation;*
4. *Requests the State Party to improve the effectiveness of its existing planning, management and conservation measures for the property, as recommended by the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission, by:*

- a) *Strengthening the authority of the National Heritage Institute to enable it to orient the main decisions affecting the integrity of the Historic Centre;*
 - b) *Clarifying and integrating the rules presently in force to manage processes such as infill, reconstruction, rehabilitation and conservation in a unitary code to improve the ability of the responsible authorities to maintain the integrity of the original fabric of the city;*
 - c) *Urgently completing and approving the conservation plan for the Historic Centre in order to provide an effective zoning and planning tool for the conservation process in the Historic Centre;*
 - d) *Completing the management plan of the property within the year 2008 as a comprehensive tool for the coordination of all the different regulatory and policy frameworks existing or foreseen for the Historic Centre, for eventual review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to adopt the following measures proposed by the joint World Heritage centre / ICOMOS mission to reduce further negative impacts of high rise construction in the property and its buffer zone:*
- a) *Complete and adopt the high-rise limitations plan, in order to avoid possible visual intrusion into the historic urban landscape of Prague;*
 - b) *Conduct an evaluation of the present buffer zones of the Historic Centre in order to assess their effectiveness in protecting the visual integrity of the city and, if needed, extend these and adopt appropriate related zoning regulations;*
 - c) *Limit, in the case of the Pankrác Plain, the height of the new high-rise constructions to a maximum of 60-70 m, in order to avoid visual impacts on the historic urban landscape of the property;*
 - d) *Inform the World Heritage Centre, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, of any project that could affect the visual integrity of the World Heritage site;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress reports on efforts to address the measures proposed above, and in particular concerning the recommendation to curtail heights of planned high rise structures in the Pankrác Plain, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

88. Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (France) (C 85)

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add.2*

89. Bordeaux, Port of the Moon (France) (C 1256)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2007

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 8B.38

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Current conservation problems

The property of Bordeaux, Port of the Moon was inscribed on the World Heritage List by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch 2007). However, very shortly afterwards, two major river crossing problems arose, threatening the outstanding universal value of the property : the first concerns one of the wet docks of the Port due to the destruction of the metal Pertuis swing bridge, in December 2007, and the other concerns the bridge project across the River Garonne.

These questions were the subject of letters from the World Heritage Centre to the State Party dated 25 October, 9 November, 26 November, 17 December 2007, 8 February and 11 March 2008.

Located in the core zone of the inscribed property, the metal Pertuis swing bridge was, at the time of inscription, considered to be a rare work of art, and apparently the last surviving testimony of this type of construction in France. ICOMOS judged it to be an engineering feat of uncontested value, situated in the central area of the wet docks, and part of the ensemble declared as World Heritage. It was therefore part of the outstanding universal value of Bordeaux, Port of the Lune.

Technical solutions to adapt this historic construction to traffic demands were outlined and they appear to respond to the needs of contemporary transportation, in particular tramway lines. Nevertheless, an extremely rapid decision for the destruction of the bridge was taken and carried out by the local authorities in the weeks following the inscription, without any prior impact study on the outstanding universal value of the property and contravening the management and conservation commitments undertaken at the time of inscription.

An important project for the construction of a bridge across the Garonne between the Bacalan and Bastide quarters, directly affecting the inscribed property, was only very superficially referred to during the nomination process, and no study on the impact of this project on the integrity of the river and urban landscape was provided. This project, which

according to some sources, is not a recent one, was the subject of additional information provided by the State Party in June 2007 to the World Heritage Centre, as an annex to the management plan of the property (additional action plan). No alternative to the bridge has been presented.

The project for the drawbridge across the Garonne aims at providing a prolongation of terrestrial traffic, between the two river banks, to the level of the boulevards upstream of the Port and at the river mouth of the city. The dimensions envisaged for the mobile section are substantial in order to permit the passage of large ships: the horizontal part is planned to measure 110 m with a raised capacity of 55 m above water level. Four fixed pylons in the centre of the river, each one measuring 60 m, would support the mechanism, with a width of 450 m at that point.

The visual impact on the Port entrance and on its architectural and townscape, central to criteria defining the outstanding universal value of the property, appears critical, but remains to be specified. The bridge would consequently comprise a monumental gateway in the heart of the open area when entering the city by way of the river, thus totally modifying the integrity of the present townscape

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that the impact studies on the outstanding universal value of the property were not carried out before the destruction of the Pertuis Bridge, and that they are very insufficient for the drawbridge project across the River Garonne. The extreme haste in the destruction of the Pertuis Bridge gives the impression that this was already planned by the local authorities during the evaluation process of the property. The active consultation procedures regarding these urban projects, guaranteeing the conservation of the property and its outstanding universal value, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, have not been respected.

By letter of 11 March 2008, the World Heritage Centre requested detailed information from the State Party to evaluate the impact of the proposed bridge project across the Garonne, or any other alternative projects, on the outstanding universal value of the property and its visual integrity.

On 15 May 2008, the World Heritage Centre received information from the Mayor of Bordeaux concerning an impact study carried out in the framework of the bridge construction project with some photographic simulations, presenting the insertion of the bridge at the property. This documentation has since been evaluated by ICOMOS.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that the impact study provided is not set in any context : no mention is made of when the study was executed, nor by whom. It would be preferable that « *the complete studies having led to the choice of this project* » as indicated in the Mayor's letter, also be communicated.

Moreover, on 15 May 2008, the World Heritage Centre received a letter from a group of seven associations concerned about soundings and work already begun at the site. Confirmation of this very important information on the part of the State Party would be necessary.

Draft Decision : 32 COM 7B.89

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 8B.38**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),

3. *Also recalling that, according to the Convention, States Parties have the obligation, to protect and conserve world cultural and natural heritage, situated on their territory, and in particular to ensure that effective and active measures are taken for the protection and conservation of this heritage,*
4. *Strongly regrets the destruction of the Pertuis Bridge by the State Party, without prior consultation or impact study, contravening Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and affecting the property, only a few months following its inscription on the World Heritage List;*
5. *Considers the environmental impact studies on the current drawbridge project to cross the River Garonne very inadequate and that such a drawbridge would constitute, by its size and cost, a solution that would be very difficult to reverse ;*
6. *Requests the State Party to undertake as soon as possible an alternative study for a crossing of the Garonne, keeping in mind the long-term conservation of the visual integrity of the property and the best possible expression of its outstanding universal value ; to execute an in-depth environmental and cultural impact study on the current drawbridge project by a qualified independent body in order to assess the integration of this project into the property while respecting its outstanding universal value, and to transmit the results to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for examination ;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to envisage other technical or geographical solutions for crossing the river, in particular a tunnel, and to carry out as soon as possible comparative impact studies on the Port of the Moon property and its visual integrity and to transmit the results to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for examination, and that no construction work be undertaken until the afore-mentioned studies have been provided for examination ;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to evaluate the degree of alteration to the outstanding universal value of the property due to the destruction of the Pertuis Suspension Bridge, and the impact of the drawbridge project on the outstanding universal value and visual integrity of the property ;*
9. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, before **1 February 2009**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including the results of the different studies requested above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

90. Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708)

2. Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.69; 29 COM 8B.1; 29 COM 7B.64; 31 COM 7B.96

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 19,000 for the preparation of a heritage and tourism master plan for Mtskheta.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

8 to 16 November 2003 and from 2 to 10 June 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a management mechanism;
- b) Insufficient coordination between the Georgian Church and the national authorities;
- c) Need to re-define core and buffer zones;
- d) Loss of authenticity in recent works carried out by the Church.

Current conservation issues

The Ministry of Culture, Monuments Protection and Sport of Georgia submitted a state of conservation report dated 25 January 2008, confirming, in one page, that no significant progress has been made since the last session of the World Heritage Committee.

A joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the Historic Monuments of Mtskheta and to the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Complex invited by the State Party, with some delay due to political factors, took place from 2 to 10 June 2008, met all relevant Georgian representatives, and discussed the following issues:

Legal framework

The new Georgian Law on Cultural Heritage was adopted in June 2007. Different protection zones were defined in this legal instrument. In accordance with this Cultural Heritage Law and the Urban Planning Law, the Protected Areas Plans and Historic-Cultural Plans constitute the base for all urban planning documentation, including the Land Use Plans and General Plans.

The mission evaluated the national protection zones of Mtskheta approved by the joint Order of the Minister of Culture and the Minister of Economic Development "On the definition of the Cultural Heritage Protection Zones in Mtskheta" of 27 October 2006. The areas approved at the national level by this Order do not correspond to the boundaries of the protection areas of Mtskheta or its monuments, as inscribed on the World Heritage List, and which constitute the legal reference within the framework of the *World Heritage Convention*. This situation illustrates that the above-mentioned Order was prepared without any link with the *World*

Heritage Convention, its *Operational Guidelines* and previous decisions of the World Heritage Committee.

At this time, the main threat to the property is the distribution or sale of lands situated within the protected area of the property, as part of a privatization process without any detailed legal regulations approved in conformity with the expectations of the World Heritage Committee. Numerous proposals submitted by the municipality were already approved by the Ministry of Economic Development without any knowledge of the nomination dossier submitted by Georgia during the inscription of property.

The mission recommended:

- a) To inventory all lands already distributed within the protected areas of Mtskheta, and to halt any construction permits and works within the existing protected areas of the World Heritage property as inscribed ;
- b) To immediately halt any land distribution or sale, as well as any construction within the protected area of Mtskheta as inscribed in 1994, the preparation and approval in conformity with the *World Heritage Convention*, its *Operational Guidelines*, the World Heritage Committee's decisions of the following documents:
 - "Special Statement on protection of World Heritage properties in Georgia" defining the World Heritage property's status, the World Heritage properties' strict protected areas and its buffer zones with all necessary restrictive regulations,
 - Boundary clarification document to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, and if relevant, the boundaries modification proposal in order to clarify exact boundaries of protected areas of the World Heritage property and its buffer zones,
 - Plan of the protected areas ("Historic-Cultural General Plan"), Land Use Plan ("Plan of Regulation") and Master Plan ("General Urban Plan") of Mtskheta.

The mission also recommended the establishment of a "Special State Board on World Heritage" in order to officially share the responsibilities between all relevant State institutions and national, local and religious authorities in ensuring an appropriate legal protection and management of the important and outstanding heritage of Georgia.

Management plan

No management plan exists for the property. The mission noted that the concept of the management plan is not known by the authorities; as such plan does not correspond to the existing documents or rules. The Cultural Heritage Programme prepared each year by the Ministry of Culture is a unique framework for any activity concerning the cultural properties in Georgia, including the World Heritage properties.

The mission recommended that the preparation of a management plan for the World Heritage properties in Georgia should be added, as priority, to the Cultural Heritage Programme.

Management system and institutional framework

The management, monitoring and survey of the property are under the supervision of the Cultural Heritage Department, Ministry of Culture. The Georgian World Heritage Committee, created in 2006, assumes the role of coordinator of World Heritage issues.

The Greater Mtskheta State Archaeological Museum-Reserve, under the Cultural Heritage Department, Ministry of Culture, acts as the local site manager. However, the mission noted that this institution does not fulfill its role as World Heritage site manager as the function has not been clearly defined by the authorities.

A special Commission on Cultural Heritage was also created by the Patriarch of the Georgian Church but its function is still unclear. The responsibility for cultural heritage,

management, protected areas, rules of maintenance and use of religious monuments is determined by the relevant State authorities, in accordance with the 2007 Law on Cultural Heritage, and with the 2002 Constitutional Agreement.

Physical conditions of the major components of the nominated property

a) Jvari Church

The mission underlined the serious problems at the Jvari Church. The general state of conservation of the monument is very critical due to the negative influence of natural conditions and climatic change. The conservation works of the Jvari Church should be started immediately involving international experts on stone conservation, as a follow up to the ICCROM training course organized in 2005.

The mission noted that new construction within the vicinity of the Jvari Church had been stopped, and recommended the removal of this inappropriate construction.

b) Svetitskhoveli Cathedral

The mission commented on structural problems at Svetitskhoveli Cathedral due to factors affecting the monument. The mission noted that no progress has been achieved in order to improve the global monitoring of the structures of the Cathedral. The mission recommended undertaking a global monitoring for the structural stability of the Cathedral and also undertaking special interventions for conservation of the important mural paintings of different periods in the interior of the Cathedral.

c) Samtavro Monastery

The authorities reported that stabilization works were completed between 2002 and 2003. The archaeological remains discovered during the reparation works were recovered by the new floor. The structure of the associated belfry outside of the church, which was in serious danger of collapse, was reinforced.

Within the direct vicinity of the church new monastic cells were recently built but did not affect the functional integrity of the property. However, taking into account the necessity to continue scientific investigation of the area, the lands around the walls should be reserved for relevant archaeological excavations and research studies.

Furthermore, the mission noted serious damage to the archaeological sites of the World Heritage property, which have been completely abandoned by the authorities. There are no conservation, protection and promotion activities in place and nothing has been suggested for the future. The mission confirmed that this part of the World Heritage property has completely lost its authenticity due to vandalism and absence of management.

In general, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS remain greatly concerned by the scope of the problems described even if the mission noted the progress accomplished by the State Party in attempting to prepare a legal and technical basis to address these problems.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.90

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.96**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes the substantive efforts of the State Party in defining and establishing the Cultural Heritage Programme, including legal assessments and relevant conservation, protection measures;

4. *Expresses its serious concern about the privatization processes of land situated in the vicinity of the World Heritage property, and strongly urges the State Party to immediately halt these processes before the boundary clarification and the preparation of a "Special Statement on protection of World Heritage properties in Georgia" defining the World Heritage property's status and its buffer zones are completed;*
5. *Recalls its request to the State Party to give highest priority to development of an integrated management plan for the property;*
6. *Invites the State Party to establish a Special State Commission on World Heritage in order to officially share the responsibilities between all relevant State institutions and national, local and religious authorities in ensuring an appropriate legal protection and management of this property;*
7. *Urges the State Party to immediately start the implementation of an integrated multistakeholder approach to the conservation of Jvari Church in coordination with ICCROM and relevant international experts on stone conservation;*
8. *Also expresses its serious concern about the state of conservation of the archaeological components of the World Heritage property, their progressive deterioration and the abandonment of conservation efforts by the State Party, noting that this loss has a major impact on the outstanding universal value, authenticity and integrity of the property and further urges the State Party to develop a special programme on protection of all archaeological components;*
9. *Encourages the State Party to undertake a global monitoring of structural stability of the Svetitskhoveli Cathedral and implement special interventions for conservation of the paintings;*
10. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a progress report including all above mentioned documents, as well as the boundaries clarification document, and if relevant, the boundaries modification proposal, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, **with a view to consider, in the absence of substantial progress, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

91. Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.87; 29 COM 7B.75; 31 COM 7B.96

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

8-16 November 2003 and 2-10 June 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) General need for interior and exterior conservation work on the monuments;
- b) Insufficient coordination between the Georgian Church and the national authorities;
- c) Lack of co-ordinated management system;
- d) Major reconstruction of the structure of Bagrati Cathedral.

Current conservation issues

The Ministry of Culture, Monuments Protection and Sport of Georgia submitted, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, at its 31th session (Christchurch, 2007), a state of conservation report dated 25 January 2008 confirming that no significant progress has been made since the World Heritage Committee's last decision.

A joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission carried out from 2 to 10 June 2008 to the Historic Monuments of Mtskheta and to the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery, met all relevant representatives and discussed the following issues:

Bagrati Cathedral

In January 2008, the President of Georgia and the Georgian Orthodox Church initiated the reconstruction project of the Bagrati Cathedral based on the intention to recreate the initial religious use and functions of the Cathedral, which was previously discussed at the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee (Suzhou, 2004). ICOMOS, in 2004, took a view that any reconstruction must be carried out in keeping with the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and its authenticity and therefore it would be more appropriate to retain the property as a ruin. The World Heritage Committee urged the State Party not to carry out any reconstruction work which may adversely affect the Outstanding Universal Value and its authenticity and strongly urged the State Party not to commence any constructions before consideration of the project by the World Heritage Committee. The mission informed the authorities of the provisions in the *Operational Guidelines* concerning authenticity, in particular that the reconstruction of historic buildings is justifiable only in exceptional circumstances, and only on the basis of complete and detailed documentation and to no extent on conjecture. The authorities confirmed that the final decision will only be made after an analysis of reconstruction possibilities for the Cathedral has been completed, and following a review of the project by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, and examination by the World Heritage Committee.

The preparatory activities, including, documentation, detailed examination of structures and stability of the walls, evaluation of the general state of conservation and examination of construction materials, as well as reuse of more than 400 authentic stone construction

elements inventoried inside and outside the historic building will be finalized by the end of 2008.

Following the evaluation of the state of conservation of this element of the World Heritage property, the mission noted the critical structural stability of the walls and recommended starting immediately, in parallel to any possible decision concerning the project, the preventive conservation works of the Bagrati Cathedral.

Gelati Monastery Complex

The mission evaluated the general state of conservation of the main components of the property.

- Virgin Mary Church:

The mission observed the damage of the roof, stone elements and accumulation of humidity in the north-eastern part of the Church and concluded that the exterior of the Cathedral is in need of urgent conservation/restoration work. The Ministry of Culture confirmed that a competition for an architectural conservation project had already been organized. The mission underlined the need for the authorities provide the project proposal for review by the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies.

The mission noted that no preventive actions have been undertaken by the Georgian conservation services concerning the mural paintings of great value. Only in the narthex, has diagnostic research on the wall paintings of the Virgin Mary Church been carried out by the Cultural and Art Fund of Georgia in 2004-2005. However no conservation action has been taken.

The mission strongly recommended that the authorities prepare, in coordination with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, a long-term programme for the systematic conservation of the mural paintings and mosaics with the involvement and collaboration of the international specialists in this domain.

- St George Church, St. Nicolas Church, Bell Tower

The architectural conservation project for these monuments is part of the above-mentioned competition organized by the Ministry of Culture. The mission expressed its concern about the increasing gravity of the physical situation of these monuments and strongly urged the authorities to undertake the necessary conservation works to ensure the long term survival of these monuments.

Management plan and boundary issues

In accordance with the 2007 Law on Cultural Heritage and with this Constitutional Agreement, the management of the religious cultural heritage properties still lies under the State Party's authority but is carried out in agreement with the Church. No management plan exists for the property. The mission recommended that the preparation of the World Heritage property management plan, in coordination with all relevant stakeholders, be added, as a priority, to the Cultural Heritage Programme.

In addition, the mission underlined the necessity to prepare an awareness-raising campaign for all World Heritage properties in Georgia, including installation of the plaques commemorating the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The authorities did not mention their 2007 proposals concerning a new statement of authenticity/integrity, as well as a new approach to the justification of the property, including the possible re-nomination under two additional criteria, (i) and (ii). The mission did not consider that a re-nomination of the property under new criteria would be justified. However, the State Party should provide a draft of Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The mission recommended to the authorities that the work programme designed to address the major problems identified with this property and the preparation of the donors conference

for all World Heritage properties in Georgia be included in the Georgian Cultural Heritage Programme.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.91

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.97**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Strongly urges the State Party to immediately start preventive conservation work on the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Complex, as well as to develop, in coordination with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, a long-term programme for the systematic conservation of the mural paintings and mosaics with the involvement and collaboration of international specialists in this domain;*
4. *Also recalling the earlier discussions among the Advisory Bodies, international experts and the World Heritage Committee, notes the State Party's intention to prepare a new reconstruction project for Bagrati Cathedral in order to recreate its initial religious use and functions, and underlines that in accordance with Paragraph 86 of the Operational Guidelines the reconstruction of historic buildings is justifiable only in exceptional circumstances;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide assurances that no reconstruction work shall be commenced until the State Party has provided complete and detailed documentation concerning this project for review by the World Heritage Committee;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to urgently prepare, approve and provide to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, the management plan of the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Complex, including the boundaries clarification document clearly indicating its buffer zones;*
7. *Encourages the State Party to organize awareness-raising campaign for all World Heritage properties in Georgia;*
8. *Invites the State Party to prepare relevant documentation in order to initiate an international donors conference designed to address the major problems identified for all World Heritage properties in Georgia;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a progress report, including the complete and detailed documentation concerning the new reconstruction project for Bagrati Cathedral, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

93. Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2002

Criteria

(ii) (iv) et (v)

Previous Committee Decisions

26 COM 23.9

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous missions

N/A

Current conservation issues

In August 2007, the State Party provided an impact study on a project for the crossing of the Upper Middle Rhine Valley taking into account the economic, cultural and landscape aspects and the outstanding universal value of the property. Initially, five possibilities were considered by the State Party: two low bridges across the river, one high bridge, a tunnel and an increase in the number of existing ferry crossings. Of the five initial possibilities considered by the impact study for the Rhine crossing, only two projects remain today under consideration: a bridge construction, the "Wellmich-Fellen low bridge", judged to be the least disruptive to the integrity of the property, and a tunnel that links the B274 road to the east with the L208 road to the west, between the localities of St Goar and St Goarshausen.

At the invitation of the German authorities, a World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS advisory mission took place on 10 February 2008 to examine the different proposals for the location of the Rhine crossing, whilst respecting the outstanding universal value of the property.

Wellmich-Fellen low bridge

The construction of a bridge at this location was considered by the responsible authorities as the best alternative as connection to the existing road networks was feasible. The dimensions of the bridge would in particular, need to take into account a number of constraints linked to river traffic and the treatment of access routes. The following points concerning the potential construction of a bridge in the World Heritage property should be considered:

- a) The visual integrity of the cultural landscape of the inscribed property needs to be considered from two viewpoints: firstly, in the context of the conservation of clearly identified historical and cultural significance over a long period of time, within a cultural landscape, and secondly in the framework of a European transport axis of outstanding universal value.

- b) Due to the existing morphology of the Rhine Valley, the perception of the landscape is formed in successive landscape sequences. Therefore, particular attention should be paid to the risk of disrupting the scale and harmony of the landscape through the construction of a bridge of sufficient scale as to allow the passage of large tourism vessels.

In ICOMOS' opinion, the wide visual integrity of the cultural landscape of the inscribed property as well as its clearly identified historical and cultural significance would be affected by the bridge construction, which would be difficult to reverse. In this case, the outstanding universal value of the property would be diminished by a disruption in the scale of the landscape, breaking the relationship of harmony between the historic buildings themselves and their environment.

The ICOMOS evaluation emphasizes the way in which the Rhine, over the centuries, created a natural landscape of great beauty that has strongly influenced artists of all kinds – poets, painters and composers. There are rich cultural associations, both historic and artistic, embedded in the present landscape. In ICOMOS' opinion, the size of the bridge would have a serious negative impact on this valley that has inspired romantic perceptions of the landscape and has become a model demonstrating the way in which human settlements, buildings and landscape can merge to produce a setting of great aesthetic value.

The tunnel between St. Goar and St. Goarshausen

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that the existing infrastructures would permit the connection of the tunnel entrances to the road network, and these connections are envisaged at a certain distance from the banks of the Rhine. However, due to the configuration of this area, the linking up of the tunnel to the A61 road (right side of the Rhine) appears to be problematic. The solution of a tunnel, although much more costly, would maintain the visual integrity of the property. Additional technical studies are, nevertheless, required to confirm this project and demonstrate its compatibility with the outstanding universal value of the property and its integrity.

Noise pollution

The mission also noted that the noise pollution linked to the railway lines along the Rhine Valley has increased in recent years, particularly with regard to commercial goods traffic. Peaks in sound levels above 100 decibels have been recorded. Only a rethinking of railway policy within the property would reduce the noise pollution. Discussions with the competent Federal authorities are ongoing to develop technical solutions to reduce the sound pollution, as well as a modification and redistribution of the flow of commercial goods traffic using alternative transport routes.

Draft Decision : 32 COM 7B.93

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Notes with satisfaction the State Party's action in involving the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS in their reflection with regard to the Rhine crossing project and in the preservation of the outstanding universal value of the property;*
3. *Requests the State Party to give priority to the solution of a tunnel and carry out an environmental impact study, as well as to prepare an additional transport plan to evaluate in a more detailed manner the feasibility of this construction and traffic management whilst respecting the outstanding universal value of the property;*

4. Also requests the State Party to consider the necessary exceptional financial requirements involved in the implementation of the tunnel construction, under acceptable conditions for the inhabitants and their local communities, should the environmental impact study confirm the feasibility of the tunnel;
5. Expresses its concern at the very high level of noise pollution linked to the increasingly heavy railway traffic in the Upper Middle Rhine Valley and further requests the State Party to examine without delay a reduction in the railway traffic of commercial goods as well as a mid-term regional railway plan together with a chart showing the overall sound levels within the inscribed property;
6. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, an updated report on progress in its reflections concerning the Rhine crossing and on the reduction of sound levels, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

97. Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia) (C 852)

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add.2*

106. Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545)

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

31 COM 7B.103

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

6 – 14 December 2007: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM

Main threats identified in previous reports

Erection of a monument in honour of Marshal G. Zhukov

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee discussed during its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) information received concerning the loss of historic fabric in the transformation of a structure called the "Middle Trading Rows", a five building ensemble (1891-1894) opposite the Kremlin's Spasskaya Tower and near St. Basil's Cathedral.

The Committee urged the State Party to halt all demolition works within the boundary of the World Heritage property of the Kremlin and Red Square in Moscow or its buffer zone until a detailed assessment of any threats to the outstanding universal value, authenticity and integrity of this property could be carried out.

The state of conservation report requested from the State Party by 1 February 2008 has not been received at the time of preparation of this report.

The joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission requested by the World Heritage Committee took place from 6 to 14 December 2007.

The mission noted that the state of conservation of all components of the property was very satisfactory, and also that it did not observe any negative developments in the conservation of the property.

The mission report includes a technical report prepared by the ICOMOS expert which provides a detailed and well illustrated examination of a number of structures within the Kremlin and Red Square precinct (Cathedral of the Annunciation, Cathedral of the Assumption, Bell Tower of Ivan the Great, Cathedral of the Archangel Micheal, Church of the Deposition of the Robe, Grand Palace, St Basil's Cathedral) and also an analysis of the project transforming the "Middle Trading Rows" complex. This section of the mission report concludes that the structures reviewed are basically in good condition and well maintained.

The current management plan considered by the State Party to be adequate had not been provided to the mission.

The mission also noted some concerns with the effectiveness and the level of overall institutional co-ordination of management measures in place. The mission recommended establishing a Special Coordination Board in order to reinforce the co-ordination between different stakeholders concerned and in particular the Moscow City authorities whose role would be crucial in establishing the buffer zone.

The mission highlighted the need for preparation of a Statement of outstanding universal value as a basis for orienting all management efforts, and for updating the nomination file with all relevant documentation and visual support, to better reflect the importance and value of this property.

The mission expressed concern for ongoing and accelerated urban development around the World Heritage property. While the mission noted that the interior parts (central courtyard) of the "Middle Trading Rows" complex had already been demolished some years ago without loss of the outstanding universal value of the property, and that the on-going restoration works of the outer part of the building complex did not constitute a danger to the property at this stage, it also noted a current proposal to establish a luxury hotel and commercial complex utilizing the central courtyard of the complex, and that the architectural design for the central courtyard development was not available for comments.

As a consequence the mission recommended that the State Party:

- Submit to the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, details concerning all ongoing projects, including visual impact studies for the projects of the "Middle Trading Rows" complex and the "Zaryadye" complex (former Hotel

“Russiya”), as well as other planned urban development projects within or nearby the property;

- Conduct, prior to the construction works within the “Middle Trading Rows” complex, necessary soil investigations under the Red Square, St. Basil Cathedral, Kremlin Walls and the “Middle Trading Rows”, including the underground water levels, in order to minimise any impact of the future constructions inside of “Middle Trading Rows” to components of the World Heritage property.

The mission concluded that the State Party should be careful in allowing any new construction within the property or in the surrounding area the property which could visually affect the property prior to the delineation of a buffer zone, the preparation of the visual impact study for existing construction projects and elaboration and approval of the adequate and effective protective juridical regulations of the buffer zone, as well as the establishment of the effective control mechanism and institutional framework between all stakeholders involved in the management and protection of the Kremlin and Red Square in Moscow.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.106

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.103**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Requests the State Party, in line with the recommendation of the reactive monitoring mission, to halt any new construction within the property or in the surrounding area the property which could visually affect it prior to:*
 - a) *The delineation and approval of a buffer zone;*
 - b) *The approval of adequate and effective protective juridical regulations within the buffer zone;*
 - c) *The establishment of an effective control mechanism and institutional framework between all stakeholders involved in the management and protection of the Kremlin and Red Square in Moscow, including the establishing a Special Coordination Board aiming at enhancing the protection of the property and its buffer zone;*
 - d) *The preparation of the visual impact study for existing construction projects;*
4. *Also requests that the State Party implement the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission, and in particular:*
 - a) *Submit to the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, details concerning all ongoing projects, including visual impact studies for the projects of the “Middle Trading Rows” complex and the “Zaryadye” complex (former Hotel “Russiya”), as well as other planned urban development projects within or nearby the World Heritage property,*
 - b) *Conduct, prior to the construction works within the “Middle Trading Rows” complex, necessary soil investigations under the Red Square, St. Basil Cathedral, Kremlin Walls and the “Middle Trading Rows”, including the underground water levels, in order to minimise any impact of the future constructions inside of “Middle Trading Rows” to components of the World Heritage property,*

5. Further requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with 3 copies of the Kremlin and Red Square in Moscow World Heritage property management plan ;
6. Reiterates its requests to the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;
7. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 **February 2009**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress reports on the requested measures noted above and described in the reactive monitoring mission report, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

108. Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1984; 2005

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

N/A

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS have been informed by several NGOs about the development of the high-speed (AVE) railway line Madrid–Zaragoza–Barcelona–French Frontier, which will involve the construction of a tunnel underneath the city of Barcelona.

By letter of 23 January 2008, the State Party provided comprehensive information on the state of project planning and technical assessments made and further informed that the final routing of the tunnel had not yet been determined.

Considerable public concern has been expressed over the appearance of cracks in buildings along the tunnel parts already constructed outside Barcelona and over the possibility of similar impacts on the city centre of Barcelona. The tunnel section considered to threaten the Church of the Sagrada Familia would cross Mallorca Street with the tunnel being approximately 12m in diameter and located at a depth of 30m and at a distance of 3–4 m from the Glory facade of the Church. To prevent potential damage from the tunnel construction and passage of the high-speed train, the tunnel construction team has proposed to build a reinforced concrete slurry wall 240m long and 42m deep composed of 1.5m piles separated by 2m. This wall will be 1.75m from the foundations of the church and 0.75m from the tunnel.

The Construction Committee of the Church of the Sagrada Familia has received a number of specialist reports, which have been studied by ICOMOS in conjunction with the documentation supplied by the State Party. ICOMOS is concerned that the construction of the tunnel and protective wall threaten the structural integrity of the church as a result, *inter alia*, of differential movements greater than those foreseen in the construction project for the church and of potential future geological movements. ICOMOS notes that when the Nativity towers were being built they settled a few centimetres because of their weight and the characteristics of their stone and lime mortar foundations, causing cracks in the facade and adjacent windows.

Furthermore, ICOMOS points out potential threats to the fragile structures of the church from the impact of the vibrations caused by the passage of trains. The high-speed passage of trains made up of 80t carriages will produce waves of vibration that will be transmitted to the ground both through the air and directly through the rails. The vibrations will propagate through the ground to the foundations and from these to the building structure. The pile wall as currently proposed is not considered to be a sufficient protective measure against this type of impact.

The concern of ICOMOS is based, among other reasons, on the lack of an evaluation of the dynamic impact that will be caused by the vibrations produced on the fragile structure and foundations of the church and on the pile wall. In addition, a study is lacking on how these vibrations may affect the durability of the church, both the vaults and the rest of the building structures.

ICOMOS further notes that, in addition to potential irreparable damage to the structure of the church, there is a risk of physical injuries to people from possible falling objects.

In response to objections made by the Construction Committee of the Church, a report from the Spanish Ministry of the Environment states that the use of an EPBS tunnelling machine, together with monitoring equipment, would ensure that the Church would not be affected adversely by the construction of the tunnel or the passage of high-speed trains once in operation.

Despite these assurances, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are not convinced that the Church would be 100% safe from adverse impacts, neither during the construction of the tunnel nor in its future use. In its opinion, the more prudent solution, and one more in keeping with the obligations of the State Party towards a World Heritage property, would be to re-route this section of tunnel at a greater distance from the monument and any other part of the World Heritage properties located in its vicinity.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.108

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,
2. Requests the State Party to halt the construction of the tunnel section in the vicinity of the Church of the Sagrada Familia and to consider changing the route of the proposed high-speed train tunnel so as to avoid any potential adverse impact on the structural stability of the Church;
3. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the measures taken to ensure the protection of the World Heritage property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;

110. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add.2*

112. Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.89; 30 COM 7B.74; 31 COM 7B.90

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Construction proposals in the immediate vicinity of the Tower of London and Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church World Heritage properties that could harm the setting, related vistas and integrity of the World Heritage properties;
- b) Lack of an in-depth visual impact study on possible impacts of development projects, as well as the lack of an approved management plan;
- c) Need for protection of the immediate surrounding of the Tower of London through an adequate and commonly agreed buffer zone; and statutory protection of the iconic view from the South Bank of the River Thames towards and beyond the Tower.

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted its report on 31 January 2008 and has provided comments on the actions undertaken and development proposals since the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007). It also submitted a draft Statement of outstanding universal value. This will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8B of the Agenda (Document WHC-08/32.COM/8B).

a) *Dynamic Visual Impact Study*

The State Party has reported that this study is still on-going. It is part of a wider study being undertaken by English Heritage called 'Seeing History in the View' which will set out a methodology for assessing the impact of development on views to and from World Heritage properties. No further details have been provided to the World Heritage Centre on this study and no timescale is given for completion. There is concern that the study being undertaken is generic rather than specific to the Tower of London. The World Heritage Committee made a specific request for a skyline study of the Tower, its setting, and views, in order to allow rapid assessment of the potential impact of proposed development.

b) *Buffer Zone*

The World Heritage Committee requested measures on protection of the immediate surrounding of the Tower through an adequate and commonly agreed buffer zone. The buffer zone is not mentioned in the State Party's report and no further information was provided at the time of the preparation of this document.

c) *Management plan*

In July 2007 the State Party had submitted the completed management plan for review by ICOMOS.

Historic Royal Palaces were responsible for the preparation of the plan. Implementation and monitoring of the management plan are the responsibility of Historic Royal Palaces, in consultation with the Tower of London World Heritage property consultative Committee.

The ambition of the Plan is to "*embrace the physical preservation of the Tower, protecting and enhancing the visual and environmental character of its local setting, providing a consideration of its wider setting and improving the understanding and enjoyment of the Tower as a cultural resource.*" As well as providing an agreed framework for long-term decision-making on the conservation and improvement of the Tower, the Plan provides a mechanism to consider the setting of the Tower.

In assessing challenges for the property, in ICOMOS' opinion, the management objectives face the challenges but do not always explicitly address the core of these issues.

The division of spatial planning responsibilities means that the setting of the Tower could be vulnerable to inconsistency in the definition and application of policy objectives between these authorities.

Issues like the status of the immediate surrounding (definition of possible buffer zone), additional reduction of statutory protective measures in London View Management Framework, the abandonment of the visual assessment tool elaborated by Historic Royal Palaces as a qualitative visual assessment methodology, are not explored.

The weak point in the management process is the definition of the zones around the World Heritage property in relation to the possible impact of local development on the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property. There is no defined statutory buffer zone. The management plan refers to external policies relevant to the preservation of the property, but the mechanisms for future negotiation between stakeholders and possible conflicts resolution are not explored. It is not clear enough to what extent the World Heritage management plan is the subject of a formal agreement and who endorses the plan.

d) *Statutory Protection of iconic view from the South Bank*

In its report, the State Party indicates that the London View Management framework was published in July 2007. This confirms statutory protection on one view to the Tower of London from a point on the south bank of the River, but in comparison to the draft presented to the mission, reduces the protected view angle from 20 to 15 degrees. This framework allows English Heritage and the Historic Royal Palaces to comment on proposals that might impact on this protected view.

e) *Update on legislation*

The State Party provided information on the draft "Heritage Protection Bill", previously mentioned as the "Heritage Protection White Paper". This will be put before Parliament in 2007-2008. In advance of this, three new measures are also being considered regarding procedures for development proposals, strengthening the protection of World Heritage properties and guidance on the status and use of buffer zones.

f) *Development proposals*

The State Party provided the following information on development proposals affecting the Tower which were mentioned at the time of the mission but has not provided information on other proposals which will affect the Tower (see below):

- *Shard of Glass*: Construction of this tall 66 story tower to the south of the Tower which was permitted in 2003 is likely to start in 2008 after demolition on the site which has already begun;

- *20 Fenchurch Street*: This 39 storey building to the west of the Tower, to which the Historic Royal Palaces and English Heritage objected, was approved as a result of a public inquiry in July 2007;

- *Potters Fields*: This proposed development is for 8 elliptical towers up to 19 storeys high, between Tower Bridge and the Greater London Headquarters (from where the protected view begins on the South Bank) was objected to by English Heritage but given permission in February 2006 by the Secretary of State who acknowledged that there would be impact on the World Heritage property but considered that it would fit well into the thriving city of London.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that progress has been made with the development of the management plan but express concern that it has not been made clear how conflicts between conservation and development in the setting of the Tower might be addressed, in the absence of further protection from a statutory buffer zone or a specific skyline study that could be used for rapid assessment of the impact of development proposals on the setting of the Tower. Up till now English Heritage and the heritage lobby have lost every inquiry into major projects that were supported by the Greater London Authority, and it is not clear how this will change in the future.

No measures have been put in place to change the current status of the setting of the Tower, apart from the one narrow, 15 degree, designated view from a point on the south bank of the river towards the Tower. This is having the effect of prompting further high-rise development immediately to each side of this view cone. For instance, to the north a group of buildings known as Trinity Square was submitted for planning last year and is being revised for re-submission. This includes glass towers that are outside the view cone but will be seen immediately to its left.

Another similar proposal is at Goodman's Fields, Tower Hamlets, where residential towers are planned. These are being modified so they do not appear from the view cone 'point', but from elsewhere will be seen between turrets of the White Tower. These are being objected to by English Heritage but supported by the Greater London Authority who sees them as exciting.

The 307 metre Bishopsgate Tower is currently being built to the north-west of the Tower and other tall buildings are being planned around it, such as the Foster scheme in Hackney and three more including the Bishopsgate Goods Yard.

Further proposals are expected after 8 April 2008 when new 'call-in' arrangements will be in place that will allow the Mayor, after a public inquiry, to make a final decision on major proposals rather than a Minister.

The lack of protection for the setting of the Tower apart from one narrow view cone is leading to development proposals coming forward that will in effect enclose this one view. The integrity and setting of the Tower are in danger of being severely compromised, in the absence of any real support from the letter of the law.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.112

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.ADD,*
2. *Recalling Decisions 30 COM 7B.74 and 31 COM 7B.90, adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the actions taken by the State Party in response to the World Heritage Committee's requests in developing a management plan, preparing guidance on methodology for assessing development in World Heritage views, and giving protection to the view of the Tower from the South Bank;*
4. *Also notes progress with implementing proposals associated with the "Heritage Protection White Paper" and its subsequent "Heritage Protection Bill";*
5. *Regrets that no buffer zone with protection has been put in place and that no specific skyline study of the Tower, its setting and views, has been carried out, to allow rapid in-depth assessments of the impact of development proposals in the immediate vicinity of the World Heritage property,*
6. *Also regrets that there appears to be lack of clarity on the management system set out in the management plan for addressing conflicts between conservation and development, particularly in the setting;*
7. *Further regrets that large development projects with tall buildings continue to be approved while the issue of the property and its setting has not yet been resolved;*

8. *Takes note that the State Party has begun to comply with the requests of the World Heritage Committee (Decision **31 COM 7B.90**) to protect the property, its setting and related vistas and defers consideration of the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger to its 33rd session in 2009;*
9. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a progress report on the above issues, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

121. City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 120)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1978

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

Previous Committee Decisions

N/A

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 371 500 for the consolidation and preservation of some of the historic ensembles of the city as well as management and risk preparedness activities.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

None

Current conservation issues

In March 2007 the Ecuadorian National Committee of ICOMOS informed the Director of the UNESCO Quito Office of its concern regarding two projects proposed for the historic centre of Quito. These were the “reconstruction” of the tower of the Jesuit Church *Iglesia Compañía de Jesús*, which collapsed following earthquake damage in the mid 19th century, to include the construction of a viewing area accessed by a modern elevator, and the “integral rehabilitation” and extension of the Legislative Palace *Palacio Legislativo y Centro Cívico* following its severe damage by fire some years ago. The ICOMOS Ecuador communication also called for a high-level review of the Special Plan of the Historic Centre of Quito of 2003, in order to ensure that the outstanding universal value of the property for which it was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978 would not be put at risk.

ICOMOS studied the detailed information provided by the State Party and by its National Committee. In its opinion, the project for the reconstruction of the tower of the Jesuit Church is unacceptable, since it significantly affects the authenticity of the monument and the historic ensemble and takes no account of eventual reversibility. It should therefore be reconsidered and revised in light of these comments before work is resumed.

In the opinion of ICOMOS, the Legislative Palace is an outstanding example of modern Latin American architecture. The rehabilitation project provides for the construction of two towers

on either side of the Palace which would have a profound adverse impact on the group of buildings. It recommends that the planned project should be abandoned in its present form.

ICOMOS supports the proposal of its National Committee that a high-level review of the Special Plan of the Historic Centre of Quito of 2003 should be carried out, in order to ensure that the outstanding universal value of the property for which it was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978 is not put at risk.

The World Heritage Centre received the 2 April 2008 an official letter from the National Institute for Cultural Heritage (INPC) indicating that the Municipality of Quito had decided to stop the works on the tower. An inspection report from the INPC dated 28 April 2008 and received by the WHC the 12 May 2008 included graphic information on the current state of the interruption of the works at the tower.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.121

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add;*
2. *Expresses its deep concern about the potential impact of the Compañía de Jesús tower on the outstanding universal value of the property;*
3. *Requests the State Party to make a clear and unequivocal commitment to cease the construction of the tower of the Jesuit Church so as to maintain the authenticity of the property;*
4. *Urges the State Party to suspend work on the rehabilitation project for the Palacio Legislativo y Centro Cívico and revise it so as to remove any potential adverse impact on the setting of an outstanding modern Latin American building;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to Quito to re-evaluate the above-mentioned interventions in the framework of the actualization of the 2003 Special Plan for the Centre of Quito;*
6. *Further requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop, prior to the arrival of the mission, a draft Statement of outstanding universal value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009;*
7. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, for consideration at the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee in 2009.*

122. Maya site of Copan (Honduras) (C 120)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.90; 30 COM 7B.95; 31 COM 7B.126

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 167,825 (Management Plan, nomination file, equipment, emergency measures for the protection and rehabilitation of the Maya Site of Copan, replacement of a protective canopy over the Hieroglyphic Stairway at the Maya site of Copan, seminar).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

Monitoring missions in 1999; 2003: ICOMOS-UNESCO Reactive Monitoring Mission; 2005: ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) The foreseen construction of an airport in the vicinity of the World Heritage property;
- b) Deterioration of construction materials due to natural decay phenomena;
- c) Risk of structural failure of archaeological buildings resulting from the excavated tunnels for archaeological purposes;
- d) Deterioration derived from uncontrolled visitation and potential to exceed carrying capacity at specific time periods.

Current conservation issues

The State Party's report for the property was received by the World Heritage Centre on 11 March 2008, in response to the decision adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007)

Plans are currently being explored for an alternate airport location, considering recommendations previously made. The situation should be closely monitored. A pre-feasibility study has been undertaken by the State Party to build the airport in *La Concepción*, 50 km far from the World Heritage property of Copan. At this site archaeological material has been found. No official assessment has been submitted by the National Institute of Anthropology and History (*Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia*) (IHAH), nor has an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) so far been carried out.

A letter was sent to the Government of Guatemala by the World Heritage Centre concerning the intention of the State Party to improve the conditions of the airport of *Los Tablones*, which is situated not far from the border of Guatemala and Honduras and that could be the closest airport to visit Copan. The World Heritage Centre has requested official information on emplacement, system of operations and plans of construction. No information has been received yet.

The PNTS (National Programme for Sustainable Tourism) funded by the Inter American Development Bank could provide funds for the creation of the *Rio Amarillo* Archaeological

Park, to elaborate a public use study. A management plan of the site of *Rio Amarillo* has been already elaborated by the United States Department of Interior through the National Park Service and the fieldwork at the site could start in 2008.

As for the archaeological site, the State Party plans to expand the protected area, which would be useful in the long term to mitigate impacts from uncontrolled buildings and further protect the integrity of the property. Works have been carried out in response to prior recommendations, but no additional documentation was provided for review of the adequacy of the proposed actions. Stabilization and consolidation works have continued at some areas (Tunnels and Nuñez Chinchilla group), but no indication was provided on further works for other portions of the site or what the final decision will be for the carved sculptures or reliefs. The management plan has yet to be finalised so there are no clear indications on what the future course of actions will be. It is critical that it is completed and implemented as soon as possible, particularly in regard to public use and conservation interventions to mitigate current factors affecting the fabric of the site.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.122

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.126**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch 2007),*
3. *Also recalling the recommendations of the previous monitoring missions of 1999, 2003 and 2005,*
4. *Notes the interest of the State Party in continuing to build an alternate airport to access the archaeological site and invites the State Party, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines to submit detailed information on the definitive location and plans for construction and operations, accompanied by the official Environmental Impact Assessment and archaeological/cultural impact study from the National Institute of Anthropology and History (IHAH);*
5. *Encourages the State Party to finalise the management plan and to provide three printed and electronic copies of the resulting document for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies; prior to its implementation;*
6. *Invites the State Party to also submit the management plan for the Rio Amarillo site to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to examine its potential articulation to the Copan management plan;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, for the examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

125. Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(i) (ii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.118; 29 COM 7B.94; 31 COM 7B.122

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 73,888

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2001: Reactive monitoring mission UNESCO World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Deterioration and destruction of the fabric of the property by environmental factors, lack of maintenance, as well as polluted water;
- b) Erosion;
- c) Absence of management policies included in management plans;
- d) Uncontrolled urban development;
- e) Tourism pressures (in particular at Portobelo).

Current conservation issues

Official information was received by the World Heritage Centre on April 29 2008. The report presents a summary of the history of the site, but no consideration of the state of conservation of the site has been included. No information concerning the direct or indirect impact of the new infrastructures of the Panamá Channel was submitted..

Previous state of conservation reports have indicated the pressing need to develop management plans, which include precise assessments of all issues currently affecting the properties inscribed, as well as a prescribed course of action to address them in the short, medium and long-term. These include, amongst others:

San Lorenzo :

- a) Poor state of the road leading to the Castle, with difficult access, particularly during the rainy season;
- b) Lack of parking facilities;
- c) Lack of restrooms, electricity or drinking water;
- d) Poor maintenance of the surrounding environment;
- e) Lack of signage, brochures or information;
- f) Lack of tourist facilities or visitor centre;
- g) Damage to the dock at the base of the fortress is evident;
- h) Lack of safe access to the courtyard of the Castle;

Portobelo :

- a) Illegal settlements in immediate vicinity of the fortifications;
- b) Lack of implementation of the conservation regulations on culture and environment by local authorities;
- c) Lack of housing alternatives for families, who have built their houses on the fortifications;
- d) Lack of tourist facilities, hotels or docks;
- e) The drainage system in the village does not work properly and the water supply is insufficient;
- f) Lack of treatment of residual water, increasing pollution in the urban and archeological areas as well as in the sea;
- g) Lack of system for collecting rain water;
- h) Lack of conservation and restoration interventions at the monuments;
- i) Lack of implementation of the territorial plan;

The 2007 report mentioned that the National Institute of Culture is working on the development of preservation and recovery works at the *Patronato de San Lorenzo*, through a technical office in Portobelo to increase the direct relationship between the different levels of government. The report sent by the State Party still describes this possibility. Unfortunately it is not clear if the *patronato* has already been created or if it is in the process of being consolidated. The rules for its operation were also included, but it is not clear if they were already approved or they are still under revision. A five-year activity list for the *patronato* was attached, but no specification of when the activities are going to start or how the interventions will be undertaken.

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.125

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.122**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),

3. *Regrets that the report sent by the State Party did not include actualized information, despite the preoccupying state of conservation of the property,*
4. *Reiterates its invitation to the State Party to submit a request for International Assistance to support in particular the development of a management plan for the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2009**, a comprehensive progress report, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.*

127. Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)

See Document *WHC-08/32.COM/7B.Add.2*