



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

# World Heritage

# 34 COM

Distribution Limited

**WHC-10/34.COM/7B**

Paris, 1 June 2010

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-fourth session  
Brasilia, Brazil  
25 July - 3 August 2010

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

## SUMMARY

This document contains information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. 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.

**Decision required:** 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/en/sessions/34COM/>

## Table of content

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	6
	ELABORATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS.....	7
	NEW, CONTINUING AND EMERGING ISSUES.....	8
	CLIMATE CHANGE AND WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES.....	9
	STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT .....	10
II.	REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST .....	13
	NATURAL PROPERTIES.....	13
	AFRICA .....	13
	1. Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407) .....	13
	2. Rainforests of Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257) .....	18
	3. Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199).....	18
	4. Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 39).....	23
	5. Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156).....	28
	6. Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia / Zimbabwe) (N 509).....	32
	7. Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas (Zimbabwe) (N 302) .....	36
	ARAB STATES.....	37
	8. Wadi Al-Hitan (Whale Valley) (Egypt) (N 1186) .....	37
	9. Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia) (N 8).....	37
	ASIA-PACIFIC.....	41
	10. Macquarie Island (Australia) (N 629 rev).....	41
	11. Sichuan Giant Panda Sanctuaries - Wolong, Mt Siguniang and Jiajin Mountains (China) (N 1213) .....	44
	12. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083).....	45
	13. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955) .....	45
	14. Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167) .....	49
	15. Gunung Mulu National Park (Malaysia) (N 1013).....	56
	16. Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120).....	58
	17. East Rennell (Solomon Islands) (N 854) .....	58
	18. Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590) .....	58
	EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA .....	62
	19. Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225) .....	62
	Year of inscription on the World Heritage List .....	62
	20. Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park (Canada / United States of America) (N 354rev).....	65
	21. Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands) (Italy) (N 908) .....	66
	22. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754) .....	66
	23. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765bis) .....	66
	24. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900) .....	66

25. Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719) .....	66
26. Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685bis) .....	66
27. Henderson Island (United Kingdom) (N 487) .....	71
28. Yellowstone National Park (United States of America) (N 28) .....	74
29. Everglades National Park (United States of America) (N 76).....	78
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....	84
30. Iguazu National Park (Argentina) (N 303) .....	84
31. Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N355).....	84
32. Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205 Bis) .....	84
33. Alejandro de Humboldt National Park (Cuba) (N 839 rev) .....	88
34. Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196) .....	90
35. Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve (Mexico) (N 1290).....	90
36. Manu National Park (Peru) (N 402) .....	90
37. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161).....	93
MIXED PROPERTIES .....	94
ASIA-PACIFIC .....	94
38. Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181) .....	94
Year of inscription on the World Heritage List .....	94
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA .....	99
39. Pyrénées – Mont Perdu (France / Spain) (C/N 773 bis).....	99
40. Mount Athos (Greece) (C/N 454).....	103
41. Ibiza, Biodiversity and Culture (C 417rev) .....	106
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....	110
42. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274) .....	110
CULTURAL PROPERTIES .....	111
AFRICA .....	111
43. Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323bis) .....	111
44. Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia) (C 18).....	111
45. Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 12) .....	114
Current conservation issues .....	115
46. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055).....	118
47. Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116rev) .....	118
48. Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev) .....	118
49. Aapravasi Ghat (Mauritius) (C 1227).....	123
50. Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599) .....	123
51. Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956 bis).....	123
52. Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099).....	126
53. Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) (C 1022) .....	126
54. Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173rev) .....	126

ARAB STATES.....	127
55. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87).....	127
56. Petra (Jordan) (C 326).....	129
57. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299).....	129
58. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190).....	129
59. Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 287).....	130
60. Ancient <i>Ksour</i> of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750).....	130
61. Historic City of Meknes (Morocco) (C 793).....	132
62. Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433).....	133
63. Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) (C 1073).....	135
64. Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20).....	135
ASIA-PACIFIC.....	139
65. Angkor (Cambodia) (C 668).....	139
66. Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia) (C 1224rev).....	139
67. Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241).....	139
68. Taj Mahal, Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri (India) (C 252; C 251; C 255).....	139
69. Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India) (C 1101).....	139
70. Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodhgaya (India) (C1056 rev).....	140
71. Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Iran, Islamic Republic of) (C 115).....	143
72. Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451).....	143
73. Parthian Fortresses of Nisa (Turkmenistan) (C 1242).....	143
74. Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan) (C 602rev).....	145
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA.....	148
75. Madriu - Perafita - Claror Valley (Andorra) (C 1160).....	148
76. World Heritage properties of Vienna.....	150
77. Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower (Azerbaijan) (C 958).....	150
78. Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh (Belarus) (C 1196).....	154
79. Historic Centre of Brugge (Belgium) (C 996).....	154
80. Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 rev).....	155
81. Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria) (C 217).....	157
82. Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616).....	157
83. Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay (France) (C 80bis).....	157
84. Provins, Town of Medieval Fairs (France) (C 873 rev).....	159
85. Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (France) (C 85).....	161
86. Bordeaux, Port of the Moon (France) (C 1256).....	164
87. Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066).....	168
88. Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710).....	172
89. Skellig Michael (Ireland) (C 757).....	172
90. City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy) (C 712bis).....	175

91.	Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994) .....	175
92.	Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (C 723) .....	179
93.	Historic Centre of Sighisoara (Romania) (C 902).....	179
94.	Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544).....	182
95.	Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540) .....	182
96.	Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545) .....	182
97.	Ensemble of the Ferrapontov Monastery (Russian Federation) (C 982) .....	182
98.	Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320bis) .....	183
99.	Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev) .....	183
100.	Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev) .....	186
101.	Old Town of Avila with its Extra-Muros Churches (Spain) (C 348bis).....	188
102.	Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356) .....	188
103.	Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral, Kiev Pechersk Lavra and Related Monastic Buildings (Ukraine) (C 527 bis) .....	195
104.	L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C 865).....	198
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....		201
105.	Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia) (C 567 rev) .....	201
106.	Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445).....	205
107.	Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia) (C 285) .....	208
108.	Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526) .....	208
109.	City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2) .....	213
110.	National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180) .....	217
111.	Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414) .....	217
112.	Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135).....	217
113.	Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis) .....	217
114.	Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016) .....	217
115.	City of Cuzco (Peru) (C 273) .....	221
116.	Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500bis) .....	221

## I. INTRODUCTION

This document deals with reactive monitoring as it is defined in Paragraph 169 of the *Operational Guidelines*: "The reporting by the World Heritage Centre, other sectors of UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties that are under threat". Reactive monitoring is foreseen in the procedures for the inclusion of properties in the List of World Heritage in Danger (Paragraphs 177-191 of the *Operational Guidelines*) and for the removal of properties from the World Heritage List (Paragraphs 192-198 of the *Operational Guidelines*).

The properties to be reported on have been selected, among all those inscribed on the World Heritage List, in consultation between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. In making the selection, the following have been considered:

- Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger (Cf. Documents *WHC-10/34.COM/7A* and *WHC-10/34.COM/7A.Add*);
- Properties for which state-of-conservation reports and/or reactive monitoring missions were requested by the World Heritage Committee at previous sessions;
- Properties which have come under serious threat since the last session of the World Heritage Committee and which require urgent actions;
- Properties where, upon inscription, follow-up was requested by the World Heritage Committee.

As since the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007), the draft decisions prepared by the World Heritage Centre, jointly with the Advisory Bodies, reflect an attempt, wherever possible, to establish a two yearly reporting cycle for most of the World Heritage properties under consideration. This would reduce the number of state of conservation reports to be examined by the World Heritage Committee (which this year number 147 in total, including 31 on the List of World Heritage in Danger), providing States Parties, among other things, a more realistic timeframe to report on progress achieved on the Decisions by the World Heritage Committee. Exceptions to this approach have been made when special circumstances demanded an annual review.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have also studied the possibility of setting-up a regional review of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties on a regular basis (taking into account the Periodic Reporting process). This would allow the identification and consideration of properties which have never been subjected to the reporting process, or which have not been considered for many years, and the possible "phasing-out" of others, as appropriate.

The World Heritage Centre (often in collaboration with UNESCO Field offices and other Sectors) and the Advisory Bodies review throughout the year a considerable amount of information on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. At their bi-annual meetings (September and January) critical cases are reviewed and a decision is taken as to whether a report should be provided to the World Heritage Committee. In many cases a report is not required, as issues can be reviewed with the State Party concerned, or through expert advice provided on a specific project, following the submission of material in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. In some cases States Parties request that experts visit the properties to review a specific issue through an advisory mission.

It is important that States Parties are provided with adequate and timely advice in the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. To ensure that the conservation of World Heritage properties for future generations is a core activity under the 1972 *Convention* and plays a key role in its implementation, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are at the disposal of States Parties, and their local authorities and site managers, to assist in protection and conservation processes through all means at their disposal, including written advice, advisory missions and international cooperation projects.

Finally, it is important to clarify the nature of the different types of missions referred to in the state of conservation reports. Whereas all missions conducted to World Heritage properties and mentioned in the reports should be considered as “official” UNESCO missions, they can be grouped in various categories as follows:

- Reactive monitoring missions requested by the World Heritage Committee, which are carried out jointly by World Heritage Centre or UNESCO staff and representatives of the Advisory Bodies;
- Missions conducted within the framework of the Reinforced monitoring mechanism on selected properties;
- Monitoring or advisory missions carried out by UNESCO staff, consultants or experts from the Advisory Bodies in the framework of projects or requested by States Parties;
- Visits to World Heritage properties by UNESCO staff on the occasion of workshops or other events.

## **ELABORATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS**

Once the list of properties subject to a state of conservation report for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its next session has been decided, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies start compiling all information available: state of conservation report submitted by the State Party, information received by NGOs, individuals, press articles, replies by the State Party, mission reports, comments on these by the State Party, etc...

The major source of information is the state of conservation report submitted by the concerned States Parties, before the statutory deadline of **1 February** of any given year, following a request by the World Heritage Committee (Paragraph 169 of the *Operational Guidelines*) or a request for information on specific issues by the World Heritage Centre (in the case the property was not subject to a report to the World Heritage Committee previously). This report is the opportunity for a State Party to bring all relevant information to the attention of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, in reply to specific requests by the Committee. States Parties can also (and are encouraged to do so) submit detailed information on development projects to inform the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also receive information from other sources than the State Party (NGOs, press articles, individuals, etc.). In such case, they communicate with the State Party to ascertain the information and get clarification on the specific issue.

The World Heritage Committee also, in some cases, requests a reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property and the status of the threats. Such missions are usually conducted by representatives of both the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Following completion of the fact finding mission, the mission members prepare jointly a report, which is sent to the State Party for comment and correction of eventual factual errors, hence, improving the accuracy of the final state of conservation report.

The preparation of the first drafts of the state of conservation reports should normally be carried out by the Advisory Bodies. However, when the World Heritage Centre has a strong technical engagement with a particular property, or has recently been on mission, it often takes the lead on drafting. The World Heritage Centre also revises all the reports to integrate some elements and ensure consistency in the drafting.

The first draft is then circulated several times between the relevant Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre until the report is agreed upon and reflects a joint position. It is then integrated into the main document on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties (Documents *WHC-10/34.COM/7A*, *WHC-10/34.COM/7A.Add*, *WHC-10/34.COM/7B* and *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add*), for examination by the World Heritage Committee.

Therefore, in order to ensure accuracy of the state of conservation reports, States Parties have already several “entry points”:

- the State Party’s report on the state of conservation to be submitted by 1 February to the World Heritage Centre,
- the State Party’s reply to World Heritage Centre’s letter(s) regarding specific information received through other sources,
- the information submitted voluntarily by the State Party in application of Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*,
- the information provided by the State Party during a reactive monitoring mission,
- the reply by the State Party to the reactive monitoring mission report.

## **NEW, CONTINUING AND EMERGING ISSUES**

### **Trends**

Both at 32nd and 33rd sessions respectively (Quebec City, 2008; Seville 2009), the World Heritage Committee discussed general issues related to the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. The analytical summary of the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties is presented in Working Document WHC-10/34.COM/7C.

At the meeting with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to prepare this document the following issues emerged during discussions:

### **Buffer zones**

Buffer zones are a means of enhancing protection of World Heritage properties. The results of the international expert meeting on World Heritage and Buffer Zones (Davos, Switzerland, 2008) were presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Decision **32 COM 7.1**) and the proceedings (World Heritage Papers 25 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/series/25/>) were disseminated. The recommendations of the expert meeting are also related to and partially covered by the revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* proposed in working document WHC-10/34.COM/13.

### **Reconstruction**

The *Operational Guidelines* in paragraph 86 are very clear about reconstruction: “In relation to authenticity, the reconstruction of archaeological remains or historic buildings or districts is justifiable only in exceptional circumstances. Reconstruction is acceptable only on the basis of complete and detailed documentation and to no extent on conjecture”. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note a number of new and emerging cases on the



destruction of the historic fabric and the reconstruction of buildings. Awareness raising among stakeholders and local authorities is strongly encouraged.

### **Agricultural encroachment, human / wildlife conflict and indigenous peoples' rights issues**

These issues were already brought forward by IUCN in Working Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B and it was suggested to work more systematic on these to enable the World Heritage Committee, World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to respond more positively and consistently. Preliminary consultations on agricultural issues are undertaken with FAO; whereas on indigenous peoples' rights it is proposed to develop a more coherent and UNESCO wide approach.

### **Infrastructure developments and tall buildings**

The ongoing work on Historic Urban Landscapes (HUL) is covered in working documents WHC-10/34.COM/7.1A and WHC-10/34.COM/7.1B, which will provide further guidance to States Parties in regard to developing integrated planning mechanisms to deal with these issues. Major infrastructure developments (dams, bridges etc.) continue to be an issue and require a more systematic approach with States Parties and local authorities to address any potential impacts on World Heritage properties through international standards environmental and visual impact assessments.

### **Windfarms**

Further discussions between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies took place as large scale wind farm projects came up for a number of sites, including properties presented in this document. The Advisory Bodies proposed that a thorough study including a review of case studies at World Heritage properties and buffer zones, best practice and policy development could be carried out with a budget of USD 30,000 through extrabudgetary funding. Potential donors are encouraged to contact the World Heritage Centre.

### **Disasters**

In addition to the apocalyptic disaster of 12 January 2010 in Haiti, which caused some 230,000 casualties and immense human suffering among the population, a number of smaller but equally catastrophic events have taken place in the last few months, which affected World Heritage properties. These include earthquakes in Valparaiso (Chile); landslides and floods in Machu Picchu (Peru), Madeira (Portugal) and Toruń and Auschwitz Birkenau (Poland); structural collapse of part of a Mosque at Meknes (Morocco); fire at the Tombs of Buganda Kings in Kasubi (Uganda); a stampede at the Djingareyber Mosque of Timbuktu (Mali).

## **CLIMATE CHANGE AND WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES**

Following the adoption by the World Heritage Committee, at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006) of a Strategy on Climate Change (Document *WHC-06/30.COM/7.1*) and by the General Assembly of States Parties to the *Convention*, at its 16th session (UNESCO, 2007) of a Policy document (Document *WHC-07/16.GA/10*), the World Heritage Centre has played a pivotal role in securing extra-budgetary financing for two site-based projects focusing on climate change mitigation and adaptation measures. The Swiss Development Cooperation agreed to finance a climate change risk management and adaptation project in Manu

National Park (Peru), implemented through the UNESCO Office in Lima. In Indonesia, the German Ministry of the Environment is supporting a project entitled "Adaptive and Carbon financed forest management in the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra", implemented through the Science Sector in the UNESCO Jakarta Office. In addition to these projects, the World Heritage Centre has assembled seed funding to produce climate change vulnerability assessments for managers and to implement a site-based pilot project for REDD+ recognized activities.

Furthermore, the publication "Climate Change and Arctic Sustainable Development: Scientific, Social, Cultural and Educational Challenges", bringing together the knowledge, concerns and visions of leading Arctic experts in the natural, cultural and social sciences, and of prominent indigenous leaders from across the circumpolar North has been released in both English and French. It is based on the results of a major conference held in Monaco in March 2009 with the participation of World Heritage experts and staff of the World Heritage Centre. This publication is available at the following web page: [http://publishing.unesco.org/details.aspx?&Code\\_Livre=4722&change=E](http://publishing.unesco.org/details.aspx?&Code_Livre=4722&change=E)

In addition an updated version of brochure on UNESCO's strategy for action on climate change was published since the last session of the World Heritage Committee. The English version is available at the following Web address: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0016/001627/162715E.pdf>

## **STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT**

Decision **27 COM 7B.106.3** requested

"...that the reports are categorized as follows:

- a) Reports with recommended decisions which, in the judgment of the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, require discussion by the World Heritage Committee,
- b) Reports which, in the judgment of the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, can be noted without discussion,"

During the coordination meeting between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies (UNESCO Headquarters, 13-15 January 2010), the selection process for the properties to be discussed by the World Heritage Committee has been refined taking into account the procedures and statutory deadlines as set out in the *Operational Guidelines*, the different monitoring tools at the disposal of the Committee and the ever growing number of properties to report on at World Heritage Committee sessions within Agenda item 7B (128 in 2008, 147 in 2009, 116 in 2010).

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have agreed that the following properties would be brought to the Committee's attention for discussion:

- **if the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger is proposed,**
- **if the property is subject to the Reinforced monitoring mechanism,**
- **if significant new information regarding the property has been received after the document was issued, requiring a revision of the draft Decision,**
- **if no consensus has been reached between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies regarding the state of conservation of the property and the way forward, and**

- **if the State Party has not submitted, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, its report on the state of conservation of the property.**

World Heritage Committee members can still decide to discuss in detail the state of conservation reports which are submitted for adoption without discussion, providing a written request is made to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee prior to 9 July 2010.

To facilitate the work of the World Heritage Committee, a standard format has been used for all state of conservation reports. This format has been adapted taking into account Decision **29 COM 7C** as well as Decision **27 COM 7B.106** para 4:

“Invites the World Heritage Centre to present all information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in the following manner:

- a) the report on each property should start on a new page,
- b) the identification number of the property allocated at the time of its nomination should be used in the document,
- c) an index of all properties should also be included,
- d) the decisions should have a standard layout, draft recommendation, and should be concise and operational;”

Therefore, the standard format includes:

- a) Name of the property (State Party) (ID number);
- b) Year of inscription on the World Heritage List;
- c) Inscription criteria;
- d) Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger ;
- e) Previous Committee Decisions;
- f) International Assistance;
- g) UNESCO Extra budgetary Funds ;
- h) Previous monitoring missions ;
- i) Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports ;
- j) Illustrative material;
- k) Current conservation issues;
- l) Draft Decision.

As indicated above, the most important source of information is the state of conservation report submitted by the concerned States Parties, which according to the *Operational guidelines* need to be submitted before the statutory deadline of **1 February**. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies point out that the respect of this deadline is important to allow for a professional assessment of the reports by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre and avoid delays in the preparation of working documents for the World Heritage Committee. Delayed reports inevitably will lead to more properties being included in the Addendum documents.

Therefore, in spite of the major efforts made this year to include even reports which were delayed in documents WHC-10/34.COM/7A and WHC-10/34.COM/7B, and considering the further delays due to late missions or late receipt of complementary information, an important number of reports (75) are included in the Addendum documents (7A.ADD and 7B.ADD).

In this document, the state of conservation reports of World Heritage properties will be presented in English alphabetical order by region, as follows: Africa, Arab States, Asia-Pacific, Europe and North America, and finally Latin America and the Caribbean. For practical and environmental reasons, as in previous years, each report will not start on a new

page (116 reports are presented in this document). However, each region will start on a new page.

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

### NATURAL PROPERTIES

#### AFRICA

##### 1. Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407)

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  
**30 COM 7B.4; 31 COM 7B.5; 33 COM 7B.1**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 81,700 for Technical assistance and training activities.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 60,000 from the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust to UNESCO. The Dja Faunal Reserve benefited from part of the USD 193,275 in 2008 and a part of USD 118 725 in 2009, allocated within the framework of the Central Africa World Heritage Forest Initiative (CAWHFI) to the South-eastern Cameroon region.

Previous monitoring missions  
March 1998: UNESCO monitoring mission; June 2006: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission; December 2009: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of implementation and full approval of management plan;
- b) Industrial mining activities proposed adjacent to the property;
- c) Industrial farming proposed in the buffer zone;
- d) Threats from commercial hunting; deforestation around the property.

Illustrative material.  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/407>

#### Current conservation issues

On 21 January 2010, the State Party transmitted a state of conservation report of the property containing the following information to the World Heritage Centre: progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2006 joint mission, progress in the implementation of the activities of the development plan for the property, a copy of the Decree N° 2007/10929 of 9 July 2007 concerning the establishment of the Dja Wildlife Reserve, and a copy of Decision 0330D/MINFOF/SG/DFAP of 29 April 2008 concerning the organization of the management of the Reserve. The report formulates several suggestions concerning mining activities by the GEOVIC Company and in particular with regard to the environmental impact study and management of the property. These State Party' suggestions are as follows:

- Conduct a new environmental impact study that takes into consideration the biodiversity plan based on the terms of reference updated and amended by all the stakeholders for the conservation of the Dja Biosphere Reserve;
- Develop and sign a convention for collaboration between the MINFOF and the GEOVIC concerning the timber management resulting from clear-cutting;
- Establish an item in the budget of the MINFOF reserved for the conservation of the World Heritage site;
- Mobilise financial resources to enable concertation at all levels as foreseen by the development plan for the Biosphere Reserve;
- Regularise the provisions of the organizational charts of the Conservation Services for Protected Areas and development plan;
- Through the Conservation Service of the Dja Biosphere Reserve, and in cooperation with the UNESCO national representative, Cameroon should develop appropriate projects to submit to UNESCO for funding, particularly in the framework of protection, capacity building and ecodevelopment;
- Involve local organizations in all the processes for biodiversity conservation in the Reserve and combat against poaching;
- Notify UNESCO of any modification undertaken with regard to the zoning of the property.

Furthermore, the implementation of recommendations of the 2006 monitoring mission highlighted the following insufficiencies:

- At the institutional level, the Dja management unit is not functional and effective, and still not financially autonomous for an efficient management of the property;
- Concerning the combat against poaching: the measures undertaken are not sufficient to control this major pressure;
- With regard to threats linked to agriculture and forestry, no recommendation has been implemented;
- As regards mining or industrial farming: practically no recommendation has been implemented.

The main threats flagged by the State Party in this summary are: the starting up of activities by the GEOVIC mining company and the associated pollution risks, poaching, the exploitation of two timber sales, namely 10 02 192 and 10 02 193, granted in the eastern border of the property, that constitute a threat due to possible incursions in the property by contractors. These different threats will continue until such times as the management system of the property is improved.

A joint UNESCO/IUCN monitoring mission on the state of conservation of the Dja Wildlife Reserve was carried out from 28 November to 5 December 2009. The objective of the mission was to evaluate the impact of current pressures on the property, as well as the mining project of the GEOVIC Company, in the periphery of the property. This monitoring mission enabled the evaluation of progress accomplished in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2006 mission carried out by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN. These recommendations concerned institutional organization, the anti-poaching combat system, agriculture, forestry and mining on the borders of the property.

- a) *Imminent commencement of mining activities by the GEOVIC Company on the periphery of the property*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that real threats weigh on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property because of the imminent commencement of mining activities by the GEOVIC Company. Indeed, the mining company for cobalt and other minerals (GEOVIC Cameroon PLC) has obtained authorization to mine in an area of more than 150,000 ha, some forty kilometres east of the Reserve, since 2003. Currently, it has bases at Lomié and Kongo (total deforestation of 50 ha in progress). This implantation of the GEOVIC shall be accompanied progressively by a demographic explosion at the periphery of the property (nearly 700 jobs directly created, more than 2,000 persons expected) which could significantly increase commercial poaching to satisfy the high demand for bushmeat. Moreover, this mining operation could result in a heavy pollution of the Dja River that surrounds almost three-quarters of the property. In addition to having a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, this pollution could be a health hazard to local populations, and more particularly the Baka Pygmies.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that a review of the Environmental Impact Study of the GEOVIC is indispensable as the one conducted in 2006 is no longer valid, even although it is currently being updated and revised by an impact study on the biodiversity. Thus, GEOVIC must provide a final technical feasibility study to learn the employed processes, the circulation routes for the minerals, the level of movement foreseen by the personnel, the investment plans and their chronology. An Environmental and Social Management Plan must also be proposed by GEOVIC to define how to reduce to a minimum the negative impacts of this mining project. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also consider that the Outstanding Universal Value of the Dja Wildlife Reserve could be threatened in the very short-term if the impacts of the GEOVIC mining project are not controlled, and consider it urgent to halt the current work of GEOVIC, until the missing information on the evolution of the cobalt mining project is communicated to the World Heritage Centre.

b) *Increase of traditional and commercial poaching*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the increase in poaching in the property, that concerns almost all the wildlife species (with a high proportion of small ungulates, primates and elephants), that has been confirmed by all the partners, including the local Dja NGO networks (ROLD). Patrol reports indicate a clear diminution of wildlife in the central and southern parts of the Reserve. Different sources indicate a significant increase in the illegal trade of ivory. Traditional hunting that could have been considered as negligible over the past decades, could now become « critical » if the secular balance between adjacent populations and natural resources of the Reserve is upset. However, the local population has faith in its means of action (firearms), develops, and there is the increase in the reasons to hunt (to meet external demand). Commercial poaching depends largely on traditional hunting in the field. Increasing external demand for forest or wildlife products, without any relation to the supply capacity of the environment, is creating an imbalance locally.

The mission considers that a national information campaign should be initiated as only a change in behaviour at the national level shall ensure the long-term safeguarding of the wildlife of Dja. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN encourage the State Party to undertake all the preventive measures to mitigate the increase in poaching in view of the foreseeable increase of the population at Lomié, linked to the implantation of the GEOVIC Company.

c) *Development of forestry exploitation and encroachment of agriculture in the periphery of the property*

Forestry exploitation is located along the border of the Reserve, notably in the eastern part. The mission noted that some licensees have no hesitation in prospecting in Dja taking advantage of the absence of formalised borders, the lack of control and the different ways of circumventing the laws. The mission also noted agricultural encroachment in places where the borders of the property are imprecise, notably on the northern border of the Reserve. This pressure is amplified by the hesitations of the administration to demarcate the possible

extension areas for agriculture, and its tendency to back down in the face of the advance of the fields and clearings. Several commercial plantations are developing in the western periphery of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider it important that forestry exploitation and commercial plantations are the subject of environmental impact studies and that monitoring indicators and control methods be developed for all the activities on the periphery of the property.

d) *Management of the property*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the Dja Wildlife Reserve is greatly lacking as regards the management, planning, surveillance, ecological monitoring that does not target the principal values of the property. Indeed, the current management plan is hardly operational and has no set of action plans. Surveillance is not effective because of logistics inadapted to a forest zone where movement is very difficult (vehicles to the detriment of hiking equipment). The cooperative frameworks officially established for a co-management of the Reserve have never functioned and the local NGOs are not involved in the management of the property.

The mission concluded that although the Dja Wildlife Reserve still retains the Outstanding Universal Value, its quantitative wealth in biodiversity has been eroded with an important decrease in the number of wildlife since its inscription on the World Heritage List. The critical threat to certain large wildlife species due to poaching could question, in the short-term, the justification for criterion (x). The pressure placed on certain non-ligneous resources and the rarity of certain species of mammals having an important role in the maintenance of the natural ecological processes, could also call into question criterion (ix). Moreover, the launching of the cobalt mining project in the periphery of the property, the direct and indirect negative impacts of which do not appear to have been fully considered, constitutes an important threat to the property's integrity.

However, the mission considered that the tendency of degradation of the Outstanding Universal Value could still be reversed if the Environmental and Social Management Plan enabling the mitigation of direct and indirect negative impacts of the mining project, and an emergency plan to strengthen management, are developed and implemented in the short term. These elements are contained in the draft decision.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN support the conclusion of the mission that considers that in the absence of a response, it is certain that the property would soon present criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.1**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **31COM 7B.5** and **33 COM 7B.1**, adopted respectively at its 31st (Christchurch, 2007) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions,*
3. *Expresses its deep concern as regards the conclusions of the World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission that considers that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is threatened by a progressive erosion of its biodiversity due to increased*



poaching, as well as by the negative impact of the commencement of mining activities of the GEOVIC Company, the development of forestry exploitation, and the encroachment of agriculture around the property;

4. Considers that in the absence of an urgent and decisive response in the face of these threats, it is certain that the property could shortly respond to criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in accordance with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines;
5. Requests the State Party to review the Environmental and Social Impact Study (ESIS) based on the final technical feasibility study prepared by the GEOVIC Company, and to submit an Environmental and Social Management Plan to mitigate the direct and indirect negative impacts of the mining project;
6. Strongly urges the State Party to suspend the implantation work for the GEOVIC mining activity until the conclusion of the new ESIS and also requests the State Party to control the validation of these documents by the different stakeholders and to inform the World Heritage Centre by **1 December 2010**;
7. Further requests the State Party to develop and implement an emergency plan before the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee, based on the management plan with the following objectives:
  - a) Improve the operational organization of the Reserve and strengthen the supervisory and surveillance personnel,
  - b) Focus the management of the property on the Outstanding Universal Value and establish a systematic monitoring mechanism on the pressures and threats,
  - c) Strengthen the controlling power of the ecoguards and limit the traditional use of natural resources by the local populations,
  - d) Strengthen the level of protection in the Reserve by transforming it, if possible, into a national park and taking into account its uses by the indigenous populations,
  - e) Reenergize the consultation frameworks with the local NGOs and other concerned stakeholders,
  - f) Clearly re-establish the boundaries of the property based on controllable axes such as the Dja River, or the recognized circulation routes,
  - g) Propose a suitable budget for the implementation of these priorities,
  - h) Define a monitoring-evaluation framework that includes pertinent indicators on wildlife and ensure the collection of historic and updated data;
8. Requests furthermore the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission to the property in 2011 to evaluate the implementation of the recommendations of the 2009 mission and the progression of the threats, notably the mining and industrial agriculture projects;
9. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, and on the steps taken for the implementation of the recommendations of the 2009 World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, **with a view, in the absence of substantial progress, to considering the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

## 2. Rainforests of Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257)

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late complementary information)

## 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

**31 COM 7B.3; 32 COM 7B.3; 33 COM 7B.8**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission, November 2007 ; World Heritage Centre/ IUCN monitoring mission, November 2008.

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/199>

### Current conservation issues

On 25 February 2010, the State Party submitted a detailed report on the state of conservation of Selous Game Reserve (SGR), which provides information on the different recommendations included in Decision **33 COM 7B.8**. The report provides an update on the status of funding for the property, mineral and hydrocarbon prospecting, potential and proposed dam developments, anti-poaching measures, hunting, and tourism management and development, but does not acknowledge the reported increases in poaching. The report

also notes that a new Wildlife Act n° 5 has come into force in 2009 and refers to some of the new provisions in the report.

a) *Increases in poaching*

The State Party report recalls that regular wildlife censuses have been conducted in the Selous Mikumi Ecosystem in previous years and that available data show that populations are stable. It notes that a dry season wildlife census was conducted in August 2009 by Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute and that the report will be provided as soon as it is available. However a publicly available report submitted by the Panel of Experts to the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) on the status of elephants and ivory poaching in Tanzania provides some figures of this survey. The report notes a decline of the total elephant population in the country, attributed largely to the downward trend in the Selous-Mikumi ecosystem. A dramatic loss of approximately 31,500 elephants is reported from the ecosystem between 2006-2009 (from 74900 to 43500). The CITES Panel of Experts expresses its concern over this decline and concludes that based on the proportion of elephant mortality attributed to illegal killing (a reliable poaching threat indicator) which jumped from 18% in 2004 to 63% in 2009, the illegal killing of elephants is not only significant, but has also been increasing.

This confirms the conclusion of the 2008 World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission, which highlighted reports indicating that poaching pressure was on the increase, in particular elephant poaching and noted the need for the State Party to react decisively to indications of increasing poaching pressure in order to avoid a future negative impact on the elephant populations. While the recent Tanzanian elephant census report notes that the 44% decline of Selous' elephant population between 2006-2009 could be due to elephant migration to Niassa Game Reserve in Mozambique, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the minor levels of in-migration observed in particular in the southern part of Niassa cannot explain the dramatic decline of Selous' elephant population. According to information received, the increase observed in Niassa Reserve seems more related to development pressures to the south of the Reserve.

The State Party notes that enhancement of SGR's capacity to carry out anti-poaching activities is foreseen in the implementation of the new Wildlife Act No 5 of 2009, and that it intends to prepare a proposal to request technical and financial support from the IUCN Species Survival Commission to assist with the new aerial survey in 2010.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are extremely concerned about the dramatic decrease in the elephant population which seems to be due to an increase in poaching and a result of an apparent breakdown of anti-poaching activities in the property, which is in part probably due to insufficient funding. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that without decisive and immediate action on the part of the State Party to halt poaching, poaching levels in SGR, which contains one of Africa's largest elephant populations, might further increase. The World Heritage Centre considers that the State Party should urgently enhance SGR's capacity to carry out anti-poaching activities.

b) *Management of the property*

The State Party reports that under the new Wildlife Act the Wildlife Division will be transformed into a new autonomous Wildlife Authority and that the accrued revenue for all game reserves will be reinstated, including SGR, which will significantly increase the availability of financial resources to manage the property. It is not clear from the report when this will be implemented. While SGR currently has 365 Game Scouts, the State Party highlights that it will take considerable resources and time to attain the 2000 Game Scouts it estimates necessary to effectively patrol and manage the 50,000 sq. km of the property. The State Party notes that it will seek financial and technical support from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to: conduct an independent evaluation of the implementation of the General Management Plan; and convene a workshop to discuss the implementation of

the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 reactive monitoring missions as requested by Decision **33 COM 7B.8**.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the restoration of accrued revenue for the property, as well as the creation of the new autonomous Wildlife Authority. These are significant steps towards reinstating effective management following the interruption of the Revenue Retention Scheme since 2004. They consider that the new revenue accrual scheme should be designed along the same lines as the original Revenue Retention Scheme, and that at least 50% of the revenues accrued from tourism and hunting are retained by SGR management. World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome also the intention of the State Party to undertake an independent evaluation of the management plan and convene a workshop on implementing the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 monitoring missions.

c) *Mineral and hydrocarbon prospecting and mining*

The State Party acknowledges the incompatibility of mineral exploration, mining, oil exploration and exploitation with inscription on the World Heritage List. However, the revised Wildlife Act now allows exploration and extraction of uranium, oil and gas in game reserves, including the property, as long as the prospector undertakes an Environmental Impact Assessment. The report confirms that uranium mining potential is being assessed within and around the property and that a prospecting license has been issued to MANTRA Resources. However, no uranium mining activity is currently being undertaken. Moreover, no oil exploration is taking place within the property. The State Party notes that it has not as yet issued any permits to allow uranium mining or oil exploration within the property and confirms that it will comply with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* before executing any such permits.

World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain seriously concerned with the on-going uranium exploration and in particular the existing proposal for hydrocarbon prospecting within SGR. They reiterate the clear policy position of the World Heritage Committee that mineral exploration, mining and oil exploration are incompatible with World Heritage status. Moreover, they are concerned that these activities could now be legally possible within the Property as a result of the new Wildlife Act of 2009. They note that the new Wildlife Act has weakened the legal provisions for protection that were in place at the time of inscription of the property, and they consider that the current legal protection is not sufficient for a World Heritage property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the conclusion of the 2008 mission that the impacts of oil exploration would impact large areas in the property and recall that oil exploration in the 1980's also coincided with a sharp increase in poaching and a dramatic decline in wildlife populations, in particular elephants.

d) *Potential and proposed dam developments – Kidunda and Stiegler's Gorge dams*

The State Party confirmed the information gathered by the 2008 monitoring mission that the proposed Kidunda dam, which is intended to meet increasing water demand in Dar-es-Salaam, is 12km outside the property boundary, and that the dam's capacity has been reduced. The current design would result in 4 to 5 km<sup>2</sup> of SGR being inundated. The State Party report notes that a Steering Committee is being created to review the project, including experts from the Wildlife Department and SGR and that a second EIA is foreseen in February 2010.

With respect to plans for a hydroelectric dam in Stiegler's Gorge within the property, the State Party notes that in spite of an earlier feasibility study in 1970 which considered that it would be uneconomical and therefore should not go ahead, the Ministry of Energy has included it in the National Power System Master Plan (PSPM) 2009-2033 as an important infrastructure project for meeting long term power demand in Tanzania. Feasibility studies in the Rufiji River Basin are currently being prepared.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the revised plans for the Kikunda dam could also have significant negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of SGR as it will affect Gonabis, which is an important area for many of Selous' large mammals. They also reiterate the conclusion of the 2008 mission that a dam in Stiegler's Gorge would have serious impacts on the values and integrity of the property. The State Party is urged to ensure that the on-going or planned impact assessments will evaluate the impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value and details in line with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* are submitted to World Heritage Centre before a final decision on the dam projects is taken.

e) *Hunting*

The State Party reports on the 2007 and 2008 mission recommendations to regulate hunting. The State Party considers that a transparent system is in place through the Reviewed Wildlife Act No. 5 of 2009 and Tourist Hunting Regulations of 2002; transparency is currently exercised in the quota setting; and SGR is in the process of developing an integrated database which will allow the linkage of information and reports within the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that while the new wildlife act sets out a clear procedure for the attribution of hunting blocks, the system still lacks transparency. Hunting blocks are allocated by the Minister based on the advice of the Hunting Block Allocation Advisory Committee, but there are no clear criteria to guide the allocation. The Wildlife Act also does not prescribe a methodology for setting the hunting quota. The State Party report, while noting that wildlife census data are taken into consideration in the process of setting the quota, did not explain how this scientific information is used. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the commitment of the State Party to develop an integrated database linking monitoring systems, and reiterate the recommendation of the Committee to use this as a basis for wildlife management.

f) *Tourism management and development*

The State Party notes that SGR does not have a detailed Tourism Plan with a clear vision for both consumptive and non-consumptive tourism and that a proposal is currently being prepared to request technical support from the World Heritage Centre to assist in developing a Tourism Plan. The State Party further notes that it is developing camps in the northern area of the property (10 currently exist with another 10 under construction), and that it intends to expand photographic tourism south of the northern sector.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the number of lodges in the northern area of Selous is now much higher than specified for in the Management Plan. They are concerned that Selous may be developing mass tourism infrastructure prior to formulating a clear and sustainable vision for both consumptive and non-consumptive tourism. A Tourism Plan should be prepared as quickly as possible with the assistance of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN in order to avoid any potential impacts of increased tourism on the property's values and integrity.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are also concerned by the significant increase in threats to the values and integrity of SGR and consider that a coordinated approach is necessary to address these, in collaboration with local and international NGOs and other stakeholders. They are specially concerned by the dramatic results of the elephant survey and the indications of a strong increase in poaching and express the hope that the creation of the autonomous Wildlife Authority and the announced restoration of the revenue retention mechanism will create the necessary momentum to address this issue seriously.

The World Heritage Committee should encourage the State Party to take full advantage of the proposed workshop to consider the 2007 and 2008 mission recommendations, and use this as an opportunity to support the elaboration of an anti-poaching programme. It is also clear that the new Wildlife Act is weakening the legal protection of the property and that

under the new provision uranium, oil and gas exploration and exploitation activities are permitted. The State Party should make a specific exception on this provision for SGR as a World Heritage property and reiterates the Decision by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) that any decision to go forward with oil exploration inside the property would constitute a clear case for inscribing SGR on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.3**

*The World Heritage Committee;*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.8**, adopted at its 33rd session (Sevilla, 2009),*
3. *Expresses its serious concern about the results of the 2009 elephant survey, which shows a decline of the elephant population in the Selous-Mikumi Ecosystem by 44% between 2006 and 2009 and an increase in the proportion of illegally killed elephants;*
4. *Urges the State Party to take immediate and decisive action to halt the upsurge in poaching of elephants as well as other wildlife, which risks seriously degrading the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
5. *Also expresses its utmost concern about the weakening of the legal protection of the property by the 2009 Wildlife Act, which allows for the prospection and mining of oil, gas and uranium inside Game Reserves and reiterates that any decision to go forward with oil exploration inside the property would constitute a clear case for inscribing Selous Game Reserve on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
6. *Also urges the State Party to enact specific legislation to prohibit the prospection and mining of oil, gas and uranium inside the Selous Game Reserve on the basis of its status as a World Heritage property;*
7. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre of all planned activities within and in the vicinity of the property which could impact its Outstanding Universal Value, including dam and mining projects, and provide an Environmental Impact assessment before taking a decision on these projects;*
8. *Welcomes the State Party's decision to create an autonomous Wildlife Authority and to reinstate revenue accrual which should over time significantly increase the property's human and financial resources;*
9. *Further urges the State Party to continue to implement the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 monitoring missions, as detailed in its Decision **33 COM 7B.8**;*
10. *Also welcomes the intention of the State Party to convene a workshop on implementing the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 monitoring missions, and requests the State Party to use this opportunity to ensure the implementation of a full and effective set of actions, including support the elaboration of an anti-poaching programme, in collaboration with local and international NGOs and other stakeholders;*

11. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including information on progress in addressing poaching and in implementing the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 monitoring missions, as well as information on the current status of the impact assessments for the Kidunda and Stiegler's Gorge dam projects and on the legal protection status of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

#### **4. Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 39)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

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

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

1984-1989

Previous Committee Decisions

**30 COM 7B.2 ; 31 COM 7B.2; 33 COM 7B.2**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 10,000 provided for a scientific study of vehicle congestion in the Ngorongoro crater in 2001, USD 19,294 provided for the preparation of a nomination file for the extension of the Ngorongoro World Heritage property in 2004, and USD 29,920 for Implementing Management Effectiveness Evaluations into two World Heritage Sites (along with the Kilimanjaro National Park) in 2009

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

April 1986: IUCN mission; April-May 2007: UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission; December 2008: UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Increased human pastoral population;
- b) Immigration; Poaching;
- c) Spread of invasive species;
- d) Tourism pressure;
- e) Encroachment and cultivation

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/39>

Current conservation issues

It is important to note that the State Party has submitted a re-nomination of this natural property under cultural criteria for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session. The re-nomination has been evaluated by ICOMOS with support from IUCN in 2009. The technical evaluation should be considered in parallel with this state of conservation report, as it partly overlaps in terms of integrity, governance and management issues.

On 25 February 2010, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. The report notes the following progress in the implementation of the 2007 and 2008 monitoring mission recommendations:

*a) Continue and complete by June 2008 the process of voluntary relocation of immigrant populations,*

The report notes that efforts to raise awareness about the voluntary relocation of immigrants continue and that some people have now registered for this relocation. Social services at the relocation site of Jema are reported to be in a final stage and efforts are continuing in cooperation with the Arusha regional authority to identify more areas outside NCA suitable for the relocation programme. The report does not provide any details on the number of people that have accepted the relocation or if and when this programme is scheduled to be completed.

*b) Carry out and complete by June 2008 a census and carrying capacity study, based on the needs of the Maasai population and an assessment of the ecological impacts of the populations*

The report recalls that a carrying capacity study has already been carried out, as mentioned in previous reports, and that the results of this study show that NCA can only accommodate 25000 people with cattle. The 2007 population census showed that 64000 people currently live in NCA. In annex to the State Party report, a summary of the existing carrying capacity study is included, documenting various scenarios which were included in this study.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the 2008 mission was informed about this existing carrying capacity study, but also noted that its results were contested by the Maasai community, who were not at all involved in this study. The mission therefore supported the recommendation of the 2007 mission to carry out a new scientific carrying capacity study, based on the needs of the Maasai population and the assessment of the ecological impacts.

The State Party also reports that agriculture in Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA) was banned in August 2009. However, it does not provide information on the enforcement of the ban, and it is unclear what alternatives there are for residents involved in agriculture.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the 2008 mission also concluded that while agriculture was legally prohibited within NCA, it was widespread and tolerated and no strategy was in place to manage it. The mission also expressed its concern about the impacts of agriculture on the integrity of the property and the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that a ban, if enforced, will have a positive impact on the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. However, it is clear that many of the resident communities, including the Maasai are now dependent on agriculture for their livelihoods as many have given up their traditional nomadic lifestyle. Therefore, the question of agriculture cannot be dissociated from the question of the livelihood of the concerned populations, the carrying capacity of the area and the management of human occupation. It is noteworthy that even the scenario of the carrying capacity leading to the number of 25000 residents takes into account limited agricultural activities.

*c) Implement the recommendations of the Environmental Impact Assessment on traffic congestion in the crater*

The State Party report recalls that in an attempt to diversify tourism attractions, and thereby reduce traffic congestion in the crater, several nature trails have been designed, and roads to access them have been improved. Construction of visitor information centres at the main gate and near the Laetoli Footprint site is also reported. Most of these activities had already been reported upon at the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee. Other recommendations, such as the creation of a booking system and shortened tours in order to achieve the target of 100 vehicles per day in the crater, remain to be developed.



The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that while diversification of tourism may lead to a reduction in traffic, it is not clear whether the State Party's actions on this issue have effectively reduced traffic. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the remaining recommendations to address visitor pressure in the crater, in particular the introduction of half day tours, the introduction of a booking system and the enforcement of the limit of 100 vehicles per day in the crater still remain to be implemented. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the management of tourism traffic continues to require urgent action.

*d) Close and rehabilitate all existing gravel pits in the property*

The 2008 mission acknowledged that it might be necessary to maintain some gravel pits but recommended immediate closure of the gravel pit near Sopa Lodge on the rim of the crater due to its visual impacts. The State Party report does not provide any information on this issue.

*e) Freeze any new lodge development in the property, in particular on the crater rim, and f) Develop a proactive tourism strategy to guide future activities in relation to tourism within the conservation area;*

The 2008 mission noted that while no new lodges had been approved on the crater rim, other lodges and tourism facilities were being developed without an overall tourism strategy. It considered that an overall tourism strategy should be developed, which should not seek to increase visitation but rather focus on managing existing visitor streams. The State Party report does not provide any information on the on-going lodge developments.

The report notes that NCA is beginning to develop an overall tourism strategy that would focus on tourism quality rather than quantity. In addition, an improvement of tourist facilities is reported so as to ensure visitor satisfaction. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the challenge remains to facilitate a satisfying visitor experience and maintain this major source of revenue without compromising the integrity and values of the NCA and creating conflicts with local residents.

*g) Ensure that existing lodges are best practice models in relation to environmental protection*

While during the 2008 mission, the State Party announced that environmental audits would be completed for all lodges soon, the current report does not provide information on this issue. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the 2008 mission had recommended to finalize and implement by the end of 2009 the code of conduct for drivers, vehicles and guides and that all environmental audits be completed by the same date.

*h) Continue existing programmes for control of invasive species, in particular to eradicate *Azolla filiculoides**

While the State Party does not report on this issue, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received information that a number of invasive plant species, such as *Argemone mexicana* and *Datura stramonium*, continue to be of concern and require monitoring and management responses.

*i) Complete as quickly as possible the programme to relocate NCAA and lodge staff as well as other major infrastructure outside the property*

The State Party reports that efforts are continuing: 24 families were relocated and housing facilities for a further 36 families are reported to be underway. However, the relocation is far from being completed as only a small number of the 360 families have been relocated. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the slow pace of the relocation of staff, which at the time of the 2008 monitoring mission was expected to be completed by 2012.

*j) Explore alternatives to limit or remove cattle grazing in the crater*

The State Party recalls that in line with the General Management Plan grazing areas have been set aside within the property in collaboration with the Pastoral Council, whereas grazing in core areas including Ngorongoro crater is banned. Water dams outside the crater intended to ensure water availability in the dry season and alternative salt sources have been provided to motivate pastoralists not to take their cattle inside the crater. No information is provided on the impacts of these measures.

*k) Explore and implement a range of innovative financing mechanisms*

The State Party reports that revenues generated by tourism are substantial and increasing. No information is provided on the recommendations of the 2008 mission to ensure that tourism generated revenues are allocated in a manner that benefits all concerned stakeholders. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that, given its world class reputation, the property has exceptional potential to become a model for sustainable financing of heavily visited protected areas.

*l) Develop a high level technical forum between NCAA, TANAPA and the Wildlife Department to ensure better management of the Ngorongoro-Serengeti ecosystem*

The establishment of a "Serengeti Ecosystem Form" (SEF) as a follow-up to this recommendation was reported in 2008. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that this positive development should be consolidated and sustained to ensure the integration of the property into the larger landscape and to better understand and manage the interactions and linkages with the surrounding land, including the various protected areas, such as Serengeti National Park and World Heritage property. There is increasing human pressure outside the boundaries of the property. IUCN has received reports concerning proposed permanent lodges in areas known to be important wildlife corridors. They consider the consolidation of SEF necessary to address increasingly complex and large scale developments in the broader region. The Serengeti-Ngorongoro biosphere reserve is suggested as an umbrella for such broader landscape schemes.

*m) Ensure active participation of the resident communities in decision making processes and develop benefit sharing mechanisms to encourage a sense of ownership of, and responsibility for, the conservation and sustainable use of the property's natural resources;*

The State Party report recalls the involvement of the resident communities through the Pastoral Council, the Chairman of which also sits on the NCAA board. The report further enumerates a list of projects NCAA is funding to benefit the communities. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that in spite of these efforts, the 2008 mission observed the growing tension between NCAA and the resident communities. The mission therefore, recommended that NCAA initiate a dialogue with the communities on their participation in decision making, the development of benefit sharing mechanisms as well as their responsibility for the implementation of the objectives of the General Management Plan with regard to land use within the property. The report provides no indication on whether such a process has started.

The State Party also has submitted a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value as requested by the Committee in 2009. Depending on the decision on the parallel re-nomination of Ngorongoro under cultural criteria, this will be further developed by the State Party in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and, if applicable, ICOMOS.

In conclusion, it is clear that there has been limited progress as regards the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 monitoring missions. There are no signs that the well-documented trend of increasing threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and mounting tensions between local residents and the authorities has been halted. In spite of some progress made, not only do many of the 2007 recommendations remain to be implemented, but there continue to be developments in marked contradiction to these recommendations.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also received reports and complaints that in response to the Decisions of the World Heritage Committee, the State Party would plan to forcefully evict resident populations from the property. The World Heritage Centre contacted the State Party on this issue, which denied that any forced eviction had taken place or were planned.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that while the growing impacts of the resident populations on the values and integrity of the property are of concern, the General Management Plan has the dual objectives of maintaining a balance between nature conservation and peoples' needs, as detailed in the property's policy programme. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the challenges to meet these dual objectives are greater than ever before.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN acknowledge that the issue of human population impacts are complex and conflictive and that they can only be addressed through dialogue with the local communities and will require a long term approach. They note that any relocation also raises important issues, including prior, free and informed consent, the exact interaction between human use and natural values in a dynamic ecosystem, the appropriateness of alternative land and facilities offered, land tenure security, as well as possible competition and conflict with other resource users in the new areas.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the mechanisms for credible and effective participation in management and for negotiating conflicts should be improved and encourage the State Party to develop a more inclusive, effective and transparent management framework that allows for meaningful stakeholder participation. Future management frameworks will also have to consider the World Heritage Committee decision on the re-nomination of the property under cultural criteria and its potential implications for management. It may also be noted that if forms of tourism that threaten to compromise the integrity, protection and management of the property continue to be promoted, this will rapidly degrade the property's values. Therefore, it is critical that the State Party develop an overall sustainable tourism strategy, based on high environmental and social standards, as requested by the World Heritage Committee.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the impacts of human population pressure and tourism need to be addressed urgently. If current degradation patterns are not stopped, the OUV of the property will be jeopardized and the World Heritage Committee may have to consider the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**Draft Decision:      34.COM 7B.4**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.9**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Expresses its utmost concern about increasing pressures on the Ngorongoro ecosystem, particularly from tourism and growing human use, and the limited progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 reactive monitoring missions;*

4. *Considers* that if current degradation patterns are not stopped, the Outstanding Universal Value of the property could be jeopardized and inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger may be considered;
5. *Strongly urges* the State Party to implement all recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 monitoring mission to address these threats;
6. *Reiterates* the importance to change the current governance framework so as to facilitate more meaningful stakeholder involvement in land-use planning and the development of more transparent and effective benefit-sharing mechanisms and a realistic overall tourism strategy;
7. *Requests* the State Party to invite the joint UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission which will be visiting Serengeti National Park, and update the mission on the implementation of the 2007 and 2008 mission recommendations;
8. *Also requests* the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the 2007 and 2008 monitoring mission recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

## 5. Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1981

### Criteria

(vii) (x)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**30 COM 7B.7; 31 COM 7B.10; 33 COM 7B.10**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 42,000 in 1990 under Technical cooperation.

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- b) Potential impacts of a hydro-electric project in Kenya;
- c) Poaching;
- d) Reduced and degraded water resources;
- e) Potential impact of optical cables' installation.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/156>

### Current conservation issues

On 15 February 2010, the State Party submitted a detailed report on the state of conservation of Serengeti National Park. The report provides the following information on the issues raised by the Committee in its Decision **33 COM 7B.10**.

#### a) *Water Resource Management*

The State Party reports that significant progress has been made towards formulating transboundary policies on the sustainable use of the Mara River. Three key documents have recently been prepared and will form a strong basis to draft such policies in the near future including: i) an Environmental Flows Assessment (EFA) of the Mara River commissioned by WWF, which sets thresholds for maximum levels of abstraction for both Tanzania and Kenya; ii) a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the Mara River Basin; and iii) a Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) for the area. Both the EFA and SEA have been adopted by the Lake Victoria Basin Commission of the East African Community, while the BAP has been provisionally adopted.

With respect to the request by the World Heritage Committee to carry out and submit the Environmental Impact Assessment studies for the abstraction of water from Bologonja Springs for the Bilila Lodge, the State Party notes that this plan was abandoned and that instead three deep boreholes, in line with the policy in place within the Tanzania National Parks, were drilled after detailed hydrological surveys were undertaken which concluded that the aquifers in the Lodge area had sufficient capacity. The State Party considers that as a result of these recent developments, the Environmental Impact Assessment of expanded use of the Bologonja Springs is unnecessary. However, due to the scarcity of water resources in the property, the State Party is seeking technical and financial assistance for water resources studies within the property, and will submit a request for assistance to the World Heritage Committee.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress achieved by the State Party, in collaboration with the Kenyan Government and WWF's East Africa Programme, towards formulating clear water resource management policies for the Mara River. It is crucial that sustainable water management policies are put in place as quickly as possible by building on the existing Environmental Flows Assessment and the other key documents noted above. IUCN recalls that the main causes of decreased flow of the Mara River include deforestation in Kenya, high river sediment load from erosion, and over-extraction of water. These impacts, combined with the likely effects of climate change, could potentially lead to prolonged droughts and, in the worst case scenario, stop the Mara River's water flow and compromise the Serengeti's iconic migration.

#### b) *Potential impact of optical cables' installation*

The report confirms that the optical cables, which were originally planned to traverse the property, have been rerouted outside its boundaries along existing major telecommunication infrastructure.

#### c) *Potential extension of the property to include Speke Gulf*

The State Party notes that adding the c. 96 km<sup>2</sup> Speke Gulf area to the property is considered of utmost importance due to its function as an alternative water source for the property's animals during times of drought. A position paper has been prepared and submitted to the Board of Trustees of Tanzania National Parks (the managing authority for the property). The State Party notes that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN will be contacted for assistance on this issue, who strongly support this proposed extension as it is important for maintaining the value and integrity of the property over the long-term.

Other conservation issues:

d) *Plans to build a North Road through the property*

In early November 2009, the World Heritage Centre was informed about plans to build a road to the northern part of the property. On November 12, a letter was sent to the State Party, expressing its concerns about the project and recalling the need to submit an EIA to the World Heritage Centre before a decision on implementing the project is taken. A reply was received dated 11 February 2010 and additional information on this issue was also submitted in the State Party report. Both clarify that the proposed North Road would be part of the 452 Km Natta-Mugumu-Tabora 'B'-Kleins-Loliondo-Mto wa Mbu tarmac road, and traverse the northern section of Serengeti National Park for 53 Km. The road is a nationally prioritised project and is part of the Government's 10 year Transport Sector Improvement Programme (2002-2012), which the State Party considers justified as the construction will enable the economic development of the Lake Zone circuit. The report highlights that the 53 km stretch within the Serengeti would be a gravel and not a tarmac road. To date, only a preliminary feasibility study and a preliminary EIA have been undertaken, which concluded that the road is feasible and that its negative environmental impacts can be mitigated. The report notes that a 15 member multi-disciplinary committee, including representatives of the Tanzania National Parks, has been created to advise the Government on the project. The State Party notes that the final detailed EIA report will be provided to the World Heritage Centre as soon as it becomes available.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are seriously concerned by this project, which will dissect the northern wilderness area of the Serengeti, a critical habitat for some of the most endangered species present in the property, such as the Black Rhinoceros and the Wild Hunting Dog. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that, if built, the North Road could critically impact the property's Outstanding Universal Value and justify its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. They recall that the North Road proposal was originally submitted to the World Bank twenty years ago. It underwent an EIA in 1996 which concluded that "A trunk road open to commercial traffic through Serengeti National Park should not be implemented due to its substantial negative environmental impacts." The EIA further noted that the North Road would "...prejudice the survival of several rare and endemic species of plants and animals and may cause mortality of migratory species."

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the negative environmental impacts of the North Road would include: i) restriction on animal movements and migration routes; ii) direct wildlife mortality; iii) habitat fragmentation and modification; iv) increased impact from human activities, including poaching; v) hydrological impacts and soil erosion; and vi) introduction of exotic species. Moreover, if the road were built, the high number of resulting vehicle-wildlife collisions would lead to consideration of fencing as a mitigation measure, which would create a barrier to the migration of wildebeest and other animals seeking the Mara River, their only water source in the dry season. IUCN notes that road construction is recorded as leading to major impacts and losses of migratory routes in other Protected Areas. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that feasible and less environmentally damaging alternatives to the North Road exist, such as the South Road proposal.

e) *Visitor management*

The State Party notes that visitor numbers and distribution within the property remain a major management challenge, and that the exact visitor carrying capacity for the Serengeti has been difficult to determine without a comprehensive study. The State Party further notes that it will seek external assistance from other State Parties, as well as the IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, to build internal capacity. A comprehensive review of the Tourism Management Programme is underway to address emerging tourism challenges and to better foster sustainable tourism management. This revised programme will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, as soon as it is approved.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the State Party's initiative in seeking assistance but recommend that the revised Program be submitted prior to approval so that they may better advise the State Party. They also recall that any plans for further visitor facility developments should be shared with the World Heritage Centre prior to granting planning permission to these.

f) *Increasing poaching pressure*

IUCN is concerned by reports suggesting a significant increase in rhinoceros and elephant poaching within Serengeti National Park. Furthermore, IUCN has also received reports that bushmeat poaching, including snaring associated with the movement of wildebeest migration, is also on the rise. This increase in poaching pressure was not reported by the State Party. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the State Party ensures transparent recording of elephant poaching incidents and carcass ratios in elephant censuses to help track any increase in poaching and allow for intervention measures and recommend undertaking a study to better understand offtake.

g) *Invasive species*

IUCN recalls that it has received reports on invasive species, including *Agremone mexicana* and *Datura stramonium* and that while they have not significantly impacted the values of the property to date, early action should be taken to remove these species and avoid risk of further spread and increased removal cost.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.5**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.10**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Acknowledges the progress achieved by the State Party, in collaboration with the Kenyan Government and WWF's East Africa Programme, towards formulating sustainable water resource management policies for the Mara River Basin, and requests the State Party to ensure that these policies are rapidly put in place;
4. Welcomes the State Party's intention to expanding the property to include Speke Gulf, which is a crucial alternative water resource during times of drought;
5. Expresses its utmost concern about the proposed North Road which will dissect the northern wilderness area of the Serengeti over 53 km, considers that this proposed alignment could result in irreversible damage to the property's Outstanding Universal Value and would constitute a clear case for inscribing Serengeti National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and notes that feasible and less environmentally damaging alternatives to the North Road exist, including the South Road proposal;
6. Also notes with concern the reports of a significant increase in rhinoceros and elephant poaching within the property, and also requests the State Party to review its anti-poaching strategies and law enforcement activities in order to effectively counter this threat to the values of the property;
7. Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess its state of conservation, including

*potential threats such as the North Road proposal, as well as reports on a significant increase in poaching;*

8. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including on the status of the North Road proposal, sustainable water management policies for the Mara River, and the status of poaching, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

## **6. Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia / Zimbabwe) (N 509)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1989

Criteria  
(vii) (viii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
**30 COM 7B.8; 31 COM 7B.4; 32 COM 7B.4**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 78,000 in 2001 and 2002 under technical cooperation and training, USD 16,500 in 2001 under training, and USD 30,000 in January 2007 under technical cooperation.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
November 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Unplanned tourism development;
- b) Uncontrolled urban development driven by population increase;
- c) Invasive species;
- d) Pollution (water, air and visual);
- e) Reduced water flows over the falls due to drought and/or upstream hydropower production.

Illustration material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/509>

### Current conservation issues

On 23 February 2010, the States Parties submitted a detailed joint report on the State of Conservation of the property as requested in Decision **32 COM 7B.4**. The report addresses the implementation and financing of the joint management plan for the property, and the threats related to urban development, tourism numbers, and invasive species. The report also includes a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property, and the following information on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2006 monitoring missions:

- a) *Establishment of a Joint Ministerial Committee and implementation and financing of the joint management plan*



The States Parties report that a Joint Ministerial Committee, a Joint Technical Committee and a Joint Site Management Committee are in place following the signing of the Joint Integrated Management Plan (JIMP) in November 2007. However, they also note that in the subsequent period the Committees have not met regularly, as planned, due to high institutional turnover and “*changes in political appointments and economic meltdown.*” Despite these limitations a total of five meetings of the different Committees have been held, and minutes provided show a good level of attendance and full agendas on key issues. The State Parties indicate that following improvement in the economic situation and staff recruitment, it is envisaged that the Committees will meet as planned in 2010/ 11. The State Parties also report on the implementation of the management plan, in particular the control of invasive species, the implementation of joint anti-poaching activities, tourism pressure, urban development, noise and water pollution and water abstraction. Some of these issues are discussed below. No information is provided about the critical issue of funding for the implementation of the management plan.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the importance of the operation of the JIMP for this transboundary site, and welcome the progress achieved. However, unless there is established and stable management capacity in the two management authorities, and a regular programme of meetings, then a meaningful programme of joint management will remain elusive. The State Party report contains limited specific information regarding either adequacy of budgets, staffing and resource levels to be able to judge the degree to which the property is effectively managed.

b) *Moratorium on the construction and development of tourism infrastructure, facilities or services within the property*

The States Parties report that there has been pressure to develop within the property, especially on the river banks. Both States Parties have maintained buffer zones (150m on the Zimbabwean side and 50m on the Zambian side). The report states that there have been no uncontrolled developments since 2007 and that developments which took place have been within the parameters of the JIMP. An audit and a number of development plans are in place to control and guide development at the property and in the surrounding area. An attempt to resuscitate the Combination Master Plan in Zimbabwe was made in 2008, but the funding available for its implementation is reported to have been eroded by hyperinflation. There are no reported plans to develop housing in the CHOGM Park.

IUCN received additional information indicating continued visual intrusion of telephone towers and hotel developments on the Zambian side of the Falls. Two telephone towers can be seen from all vantage points on the Zimbabwean side of the property, and hotel roofs and other developments on the Zambian shore also create impacts and could be better camouflaged.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the attention being paid by both States Parties to the issue of uncontrolled development, but consider that the ongoing pressures and challenges to the planning systems around the property remain an important area of concern. Continued efforts to both maintain strong development control policies, and implement a joint programme of assessment and improvement to maintain the visual quality of the property is essential, in the context of the JIMP and the supporting management arrangements.

The World Heritage Centre also received a copy of a letter sent to the Ministry of Tourism by Hiflyer Zambia, a company wanting to operate a balloon at the Falls, proposing to revive the project at an alternative site close to the property. A copy of a letter sent by the National Heritage Conservation Committee (NHCC) was also received, advising the Minister that this project should be considered inappropriate if it is to be implemented anywhere near the property, in line with Decision **31 COM 7B.4** of the World Heritage Committee and the recommendations of the 2006 mission. A further copy of a letter was received from the company dated 26 March, claiming for damages and penalties. The World Heritage Centre

and IUCN reiterate the recommendation of the 2006 mission that any tethered balloon projects close to the property adversely impact its visual integrity, because when raised the balloon is likely to appear within the viewing corridor of the Falls.

- c) *Development of indicators which can be assessed during the monitoring of the state of conservation of the property and better address management and protection concerns.*

No information is provided on the implementation of this recommendation.

As mentioned above, the report provides an update on a number of management issues:

- d) *Tourism pressures*

The States Parties report touches very briefly on the estimated carrying capacity of the property (up to 6000 visitors per day), and consider that the property is not exceeding this capacity on an annual basis. Twenty boats and nine helicopters are said to be operating in the property since 2007. The States Parties report that the flights over the property conform to joint rules established in 1996. The States Parties also report that the completion of the Chamabondo helipad in 2010 will lead to a significant reduction in noise pollution by removing the take off site to a location 13km from the property. An entry sign displaying the World Heritage emblem has been established in Zimbabwe and is being reviewed in Zambia.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the effective management of tourism and on site visitors in this iconic World Heritage property is of the utmost importance. Whilst an annual estimate of carrying capacity is one possible gauge of the issue, the requirements to assure a high quality, safe and satisfying visitor experience require considerable planning beyond simply considering the numbers of visitors coming to the property. It is clear from the minutes of the joint meetings that a number of issues remain under consideration.

- e) *Invasive species*

The States Parties report that the threat from invasive alien species to the integrity of the property continues to be serious. Species such as *Lantana camara* are displacing the native vegetation within the property and its buffer zones and also threaten the stability and visual appearance of the gorge walls, as well as impacting on nesting sites of the rare Taita Falcon. The two States Parties have been trialling different methods of control including mechanical, chemical and biological techniques. They report around 20% of the infested area has been cleared mechanically and that this technique is showing positive results, while the efficacy of different techniques is still being investigated as part of ongoing work.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress in addressing the issue of invasive species but are concerned about the continued funding of the work. To date, most activities have been undertaken on a project basis, which is not a sustainable means of addressing the long term nature of this threat. The larger project is a Zambian UNEP-GEF project which will come to an end in July 2010, but is anticipated to stop before then due to the lack of project funding. There is a need for both States Parties to commit to funding ongoing monitoring, clearing and replanting of native vegetation, otherwise, with the exception of the possible hope of an eventual solution through bio-control, the progress made in the last five years is likely to rapidly be lost. In addition, management of invasive species needs to be expanded to consider a number of other species that are not currently the subject of targeted efforts. IUCN notes that most of the active partners in these projects are IUCN member organizations, and would be pleased to engage with the State Party of Zambia representatives on possible approaches to ensure that current efforts are maintained. Clearly, the significant visitor revenues to the property could be considered as one source of funding. Given the impact of the invasive species on key aspects of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the action required in this area is of a high priority.

- f) *Other conservation issues of concern*

The States Parties also report on action to counteract poaching, including joint operations, combined security meetings, ranger training courses and the provision of fencing to control access. Increased joint anti-poaching operations are planned. The report also notes water pollution and abstraction issues, and how these are mitigated. The Livingstone main sewerage ponds in Mosi-oa-Tunya National Park (Zambia) are noted to be in need of rehabilitation, and are leaking. Otherwise, the regulation of both sewage treatment and boat toilets are in place. In relation to abstraction, the report notes water sharing arrangements and the systems to vary water use from the Victoria Falls power station according to river levels.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the importance of continued action to maintain the water and pollution management systems that are in place.

In conclusion, World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the substantive progress made by the States Parties in their management of the property in challenging financial times. They commend the degree of transnational cooperation which has been maintained despite the difficulties of resourcing these efforts. However, significant challenges remain to secure effective and durable transboundary management of the property, in particular the control on urban and tourism infrastructure development, the control of invasive species and visitor management. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the recommendation of the 2006 mission that indicators be developed to monitor the state of conservation of the property and better address management and protection concerns. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend in this respect to use the management effectiveness evaluation methodology, which was developed and tested in a number of natural World Heritage properties. Continued and greater international support to establishing the effective management of the property would be highly beneficial.

**Draft Decision:        34 COM 7B.6**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.4**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Welcomes the substantive progress achieved by the two State Parties in strengthening the transboundary management of the property and requests to further strengthen these efforts to ensure a stable management capacity in the two management authorities, establish a fully functional programme of joint meetings of the transboundary management bodies, and ensure adequate resources for the implementation of the Joint Integrated Management Plan ;*
4. *Urges the two States Parties to develop indicators to monitor the state of conservation of the property and better address management and protection concerns, as recommended by the 2006 joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission and encourages using the management effectiveness evaluation methodology which was developed by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN;*
5. *Requests the two States Parties to ensure that on-going efforts to control invasive species within the property, including the continuation of manual clearance of affected areas and continued investigations of chemical and biological controls are continued and to confirm, through communications to the World Heritage Centre by **31 December 2010**, that ongoing funding is in place to ensure this;*

6. *Reiterates* the conclusion of the 2006 mission that any tethered balloon projects close to the property will adversely impact its visual integrity, because when raised the balloon is likely to appear within the viewing corridor of the falls;
7. *Also requests* the two States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a jointly prepared report on the state of conservation of the property, including the implementation of the recommendations of the 2006 monitoring mission and status and actions received in relation to the above mentioned factors, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

#### **7. Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas (Zimbabwe) (N 302)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

## ARAB STATES

### 8. Wadi Al-Hitan (Whale Valley) (Egypt) (N 1186)

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

### 9. 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  
**30 COM 7A.12; 31 COM 7B.13; 32 COM 7B.7**

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustration material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/8>

#### Current conservation issues

On 16 February 2010 the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of Ichkeul National Park, providing detailed information on the implementation of several of the remaining recommendations of the 2006 reactive monitoring mission, as well as an update on the property's management structure, the implementation of the management plan, water resource management, scientific monitoring, eco-tourism and community outreach activities. However, the report does not consider two of the 2006 mission's recommendations relating to water management, including an assessment of the effects of the construction of three additional planned dams on the property and whether, during dry winters, water resources can/ are made available from Sidi Dam.

a) *Management structure and implementation of the five-year participatory management plan*

The State Party reports significant progress towards the establishment of an adequate management structure for the property with sufficient decision-making power and financial autonomy. As a first step, a Scientific Management Committee for Ichkeul National Park was established in 2007. Currently, the State Party is preparing a decree seeking to modify national park regulations. This decree would, if approved, consolidate the property's management structure, as well as that of Tunisia's other national parks, by specifying the park manager's position and necessary qualifications, requiring the establishment of a Scientific Management Committee, allowing co-management in cooperation with the private sector, and setting an entrance fee to supplement autonomous financing. Concerning the five-year participatory management plan for the property, the State Party provides details on the outcomes of all activities undertaken since January 2008 in an annex to the state of conservation report, many of which have significantly contributed to the further restoration of the property's values.

b) *Water management*

The State Party recalls that water resources are an essential element of the management of the property. The hydrological model created in 1996 to predict hydrological conditions and water needs has recently been updated and continues to facilitate water resource management. The report also notes that significant progress has been made towards centralising all data for the property within a Microsoft Access database, which will gradually be populated with scientific data collected over the last fifteen years.

The State Party reports that in accordance with the Tunisian Government's recognition of the property as a net water user, significant volumes of water have been released to Ichkeul since 2002/ 2003. The average yearly water volume reaching the property is 140Mm<sup>3</sup>, with a minimum of 6 Mm<sup>3</sup> provided during the winter of 2007/ 2008, and 94 Mm<sup>3</sup> during 2008/ 2009. Manipulation of the Tinja sluice, which is the key mechanism controlling inputs of freshwater into Ichkeul's aquatic ecosystem, has been crucial to managing water levels within the property during periods of drought. The State Party further reports that a project concerning integrated management of water resources in the Ichkeul watershed began in 2009 as part of a wider regional Wetlands International programme to engage civil society in the preservation of Mediterranean wetlands through participatory management and dialogue between various water users.

c) *Scientific monitoring*

The State Party reports the results of scientific monitoring over the last two years, which confirm the restoration of the property's ecosystem to a level comparable with the state of conservation at the time of inscription. This is despite the low water levels in 2007/ 2008, which were inferior to one-fifth the annual average water levels, and the late arrival of water resources in 2009/ 2010. The State Party notes that the number of overwintering birds and waterfowl is comparable to records at the time of inscription.

d) *Restoration of the Joumine River and other key conservation activities*

The State Party reports that the restoration of the Joumine River, a recommendation of the 2006 mission, was completed in the summer of 2008. This restoration enabled water to flow back into the Joumine marsh and resulted in significant regeneration of *Scirpus* rushes, which are an important for overwintering birds.

The State Party also reports on other key management activities between 2007 and 2010 which have contributed to restoring and preserving the property's lake, marshlands and associated fauna and flora including: i) installation of a metal barrier in the integral protection zone and the marshes covered by the management plan, which has allowed the recovery of *Scirpus* rushes; ii) creation of artificial grasslands covering 122ha in order to allow cattle

grazing, which has been prescribed in the integral protection zone of the property; iii) closure of the El Hawya cave to protect its bat population.

e) *Eco-tourism, Agenda 21 and community outreach*

The State Party reports that a number of activities have been undertaken over the last two years to improve the property's tourism infrastructure. A number of community livelihood projects have been implemented to support the local population. The State Party further notes that community outreach activities targeted at both the local population and the wider public has been undertaken, including school visits to the property, television advertisements, and knowledge transfer from Ichkeul National Park staff, to Tunisia's other national parks. The State Party also indicates that the Agenda 21 process for the town of Tinja was halted in 2008 in order to harmonise its activities with a recently initiated rural-urban integrated development programme, but notes that this process is currently being renewed.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN commend the State Party's significant achievements in restoring the values and integrity of the property, and welcome the recent restoration of the Joumine River, which has greatly contributed to its ecological recovery. While the great majority of the Committee's recommendations have been or are being realised, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party has yet to provide information concerning the three additional dams proposed for the Melah, Doumis and Tine streams and recall that in 2006 the Tunisian water management authorities agreed that these future dams would provide water resources to the property, rather than to agricultural irrigation. The State Party is encouraged to provide an update on the status of these three proposed dams to the World Heritage Centre in the course of 2010 as well as an Environmental Impact Assessment.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee encourage the State Party to continue its efforts to consolidate the Ichkeul National Park's autonomous management structure, and to increase the role of the Ichkeul Scientific Management Committee, which is essential to the long-term sustainable management of the property's recently regained values and integrity. While the establishment of such management structures can be slow, it is clear that there is political will on the part of the State Party to better organise and manage not only Ichkeul National Park, but all of its Protected Areas.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.9**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.7** adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Commends the State Party for its significant achievements in restoring the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property and welcomes the recent restoration of the Joumine River, which has greatly contributed to the property's ecological recovery;*
4. *Notes the progress made by the State Party towards consolidating the property's autonomous management structure, which is essential to the long-term sustainable management of its recently regained values and integrity, and encourages the State Party to continue with these efforts and to increase the role and activities of the Ichkeul Scientific Management Committee;*

5. *Also encourages the State Party to rapidly repair the lake breach that occurred in April 2009, and to restore the Agenda 21 process;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit any Environmental Impact Assessments for the additional dams proposed for the Melah, Doumis and Tine streams to the World Heritage Centre in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and to ensure that these dams provide an adequate water supply to the property.*



## ASIA-PACIFIC

### 10. Macquarie Island (Australia) (N 629 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1997

Criteria  
(vii) (viii)

Previous Committee Decisions  
**31 COM 7B.14; 32 COM 7B.9**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
Invasive Species

Illustration material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/629>

#### Current conservation issues

On 28 January 2010, a report detailing the state of conservation of Macquarie Island was submitted by the State Party. The report provides an overview of the implementation of the pest eradication plan, of rabbit numbers on the island, of pre and post eradication monitoring plans, of the impacts on seabirds of long-line fishing trials and of the status of the island as a Man and Biosphere Reserve.

#### *a) Progress in the implementation of the pest eradication plan and status of the rabbit population*

The State Party reports that the implementation of the Macquarie Island Pest Eradication Plan has begun and that poison baiting will commence in May 2010, followed by pest hunting with trained dogs. To date, all necessary environmental approvals for the plan have been received, key field eradication staff have been selected and hired, thirteen of the seventeen pest hunting dogs have reached interim certification, and bait, helicopter and shipping suppliers have been selected. The State Party notes that rabbit numbers peaked in 2005 at an estimated 148,200, and that in 2008 there were an estimated 79,700 rabbits on the island. The pest eradication and associated monitoring programmes are expected to run through November 2014, and that preliminary information as to the outcome will be provided in February 2013.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the Australian and Tasmanian Governments should be commended on implementing the ambitious eradication plan for the invasive rabbits and rodents that are adversely impacting Macquarie Island's Outstanding Universal Value and integrity. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider it crucial that the eradication proceed to schedule, and that it is demonstrated to be successful in completely eliminating all pests, leading to a full recovery of the island's endemic vegetation and aiding the recovery of its threatened seabirds.

b) *Pre and post eradication monitoring*

The State Party notes that monitoring and biosecurity plans have been developed. The Monitoring Plan will run until completion of the project in November 2014 and will monitor the performance of baiting and ground hunting operations, rabbit presence, the impacts of helicopters on king penguin colonies, as well as the broader outcomes of the project on the ecology of Macquarie Island. The State Party highlights that wandering albatross nests will be carefully monitored, and that any bait within reach of chicks will be removed. The State Party further notes that 28 rabbit exclusion plots have been established to protect samples of undisturbed plants and provide a seed source from which vegetation on the island can be re-established. The Biosecurity Plan will enable monitoring of new alien plant and animal species, particularly at the main visitor landing sites, and should prevent the introduction or reintroduction of alien species.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the preparation of monitoring and biosecurity plans. However, IUCN notes that while the financial resources to monitor the implementation of the eradication plan are secured (output monitoring), it has received reports that funding has yet to be agreed for adequate post-eradication monitoring of ecological aspects such as vegetation recovery (outcome monitoring), which is key to demonstrating the effectiveness of the pest eradication activities. IUCN further notes that the monitoring program could also give specific consideration to the geological and geomorphologic values which were the primary reasons inscription on the World Heritage List. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider it important that the State Party rapidly secure the financial resources needed for adequate post-eradication outcome monitoring.

c) *Impact on the island's seabirds of long-line fishing trials*

The State Party reports that several strictly managed long-line fishing trials around Macquarie Island have been operating for the past three seasons (2007-2010). These trials operate under comprehensive rules to protect seabirds, including a requirement to cease long-line fishing for the season if the seabird bycatch limit is exceeded. The State Party highlights that no seabird mortality resulting from long-line fishing has been observed during the trial period. The mitigation measures adopted by the trials are those required by the *Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels* (of which Australia is a signatory). These mitigation measure include: i) night setting of fishing lines when seabirds are less active; ii) exclusive use of integrated-weight long-lines to ensure that baited hooks sink more quickly and birds are less likely to be caught; iii) 100% observer coverage; iv) blue dyed bait that is less visible to seabirds; v) paired plastic streamer lines to scare birds away from baited hooks; and vi) retention of all fish waste to eliminate seabird deaths at the stern of the vessel during waste discard. The State Party notes that a request to approve long-line fishing as an authorised fishing method in the region will be submitted in November 2010 as part of a strategic assessment of the Macquarie Island toothfish fishery.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the positive results of the trials to date and consider that a strictly controlled level of responsible long-line fishing may be compatible with the values and integrity of Macquarie Island given the following conditions: i) long-line fishing mitigation measures continue to be strictly and effectively applied and enforced in line with the *Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels*; ii) the implementation and effectiveness of these measures is continually monitored and revised; and ii) if pre-established seabird by-catch levels are exceeded, all long-line fisheries operating in the region cease for the duration of the season, pending a review of the mitigation conditions. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note that the strategic assessment of the Macquarie Island toothfish fishery, which will evaluate the likely impacts of long-line fishing for the region, should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre prior to approving long-line fisheries consents, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

d) *Other conservation issues of concern – the impact of legal and illegal long-line fishing on Macquarie Island seabirds outside Australian waters*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the Macquarie Island seabirds, and particularly albatrosses, are threatened by legal and illegal long-line fishing when foraging and feeding outside Australian waters. Therefore, it is critical that Macquarie breeding seabirds are protected outside Australian waters. All State Parties involved in long-line fishing operations that may adversely affect Macquarie's seabirds should explore options to abate seabird death resulting from their long-line fishing operations, particularly in known foraging areas. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that all States Parties with such long-line fishing operations should be strongly encouraged to consider adhering to the *Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels*, which would require them to take specific mitigation measures to reduce the number of albatrosses and petrels killed by long-line fishing.

e) *The status of Macquarie Island as a Man and Biosphere Reserve*

The State Party acknowledges that Macquarie Island is not a functional biosphere given that it lacks human residents and will seek its withdrawal from the World Network of Biosphere Reserves. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN take note of the State Party's initiative in withdrawing Macquarie Island from the World Network of Biosphere Reserves.

f) *Other conservation issues of concern – dieback and possible extinction of the endemic Macquarie cushion plant*

The State Party reports that dieback of the endemic Macquarie cushion plant (*Azorella macquariensis*) has emerged as a serious concern in 2009, with up to 90% of cushions affected in some locations. The Macquarie cushion is an important component of the island's feldmark vegetation, which is located on stony soils above 500m. A number of measures have been implemented by the State Party to identify the cause of the dieback and prevent its spread including testing for pathogens and enhanced quarantine measures for tourists. As insurance measures, a small amount of seed was collected in autumn 2009 and sent to the Royal Tasmanian Botanic Gardens and to the Millennium Seedbank project, the collection of living plants at the Royal Tasmanian Botanic Gardens was supplemented, and an attempt is currently being made to establish an ex-situ population on the island near the ranger station. The State Party further notes that the Macquarie cushion has been listed as endangered under State legislation and that an application is pending to list the species as threatened under Commonwealth legislation.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned by the unexplained dieback of the endemic Macquarie cushion plant. IUCN notes that given the current rate of dieback, the species could become extinct within a few years. As Macquarie cushion is the main structural component of the feldmark, its loss would cause severe modification to the island's ecosystem and is likely to lead to major erosion problems and decline of associated species. IUCN notes that there is no indication of any dieback being recorded in other cushion plants worldwide and considers that: i) the cause of the dieback should be determined and addressed; ii) a larger ex situ conservation holding of seeds and living plants should be created by supplementing the collection of seed for long-term storage; and iii) assessments of remaining healthy cushion plants should be made in the summer of 2010.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.10**

The World Heritage Committee;

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.9**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Commends the Australian and Tasmanian Governments on the implementation of the plan to eradicate the invasive rabbits and rodents that adversely impact the property's values and integrity, and considers it crucial that the eradication proceed to schedule and is demonstrated to be successful in completely eliminating all pests, leading to a full recovery of the island's endemic vegetation and aiding the recovery of its threatened seabirds;
4. Recommends that the State Party rapidly secure the financial resources required for adequate post-eradication outcome monitoring;
5. Also recommends that the State Party urgently determine and address the cause of dieback of the Macquarie cushion plant, create larger ex situ conservation holdings of seeds and living plants, and assess the remaining healthy cushion plants in the summer of 2010;
6. Requests the State Party to ensure the application of strict mitigation measures required by the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels if limited and responsible long-line fishing is to continue around the property, and also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre the strategic assessment of the Macquarie Island toothfish fishery as soon as it becomes available;
7. Expresses its concern that Macquarie Island seabirds, particularly albatross, continue to be threatened by legal and illegal long-line fishing when feeding outside Australian waters, and strongly urges all States Parties involved in long-line fishing operations that may adversely affect Macquarie's seabirds to seek to reduce the adverse effects of their fishing operations, and to adhere to the mitigation measures required by the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, including information on the progress made with the eradication plan, the conservation status of the Macquarie cushion plant, the impact on seabirds of continued long-line fishing trials in the island's waters, and the impact of legal and illegal long-line fisheries on Macquarie seabirds feeding outside Australian waters, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

**11. Sichuan Giant Panda Sanctuaries - Wolong, Mt Siguniang and Jiayin Mountains (China) (N 1213)**

See Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

## 12. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083)

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

## 13. 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

30 COM 7B.14; 31 COM 7B.18; 32COM 7B.15

### 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

2008: UNESCO/IUCN Joint Reactive Monitoring Mission

### Factors affecting the property 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.

### Illustration material :

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/955>

### Current conservation issues

On 22 February 2010, a report was submitted by the State Party on the state of conservation of the property. The report provides an overview of the three priority threats affecting the property including: i) ongoing road construction and forest die-back in the Lake Habema region; ii) functioning of the management agency; and iii) management of illegal logging and poaching in the southern lowlands region. The report furthermore acknowledges that whilst most of the Lorentz National Park retains its Outstanding Universal Value and integrity, little progress has been made in addressing the threats that are seriously degrading key areas of the property, which is one of the last great wilderness areas in the world. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the lack of progress in addressing these threats is due in large part to severe constraints to effective operation of park management including funding,

limited monitoring and surveillance equipment, and limited staff capacity and technical expertise.

a) *Road construction in the Lake Habema region*

The State Party reports that the road between Wamena and Yuguru has damaged the integrity of the property, that construction work is ongoing, and that 62 km have been built (out of a total of 170 km planned). The World Heritage Committee's 2008 request to cease all road construction and rehabilitate existing sections was addressed by a series of letters to the Regent of Jayawijaya, which noted that any road construction should be sustainable and suggested that an air strip may be the best transport option for the area. While the Lorentz National Park authority continues to dialogue with the Local Government to minimise the impacts of the road, to date the Local Government has only committed to building a monitoring post at the entrance and exit of the property and installing gabions to limit erosion in landslide-prone areas. The report further notes that the *Strategic Plan for Lake Habema* may include provisions for additional roads and lanes in the alpine region to support planned tourism infrastructure. While the Park authorities have discussed the design of these roads with the Local Government, the State Party notes that there has been no technical assessment of the planned roads in the montane-alpine area to date. The report further notes that the Park authorities are coordinating with the Forest Service, local indigenous communities, and the police to address increased illegal logging resulting from the road development.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are gravely concerned by the ongoing unauthorised road development in the Lake Habema glaciated landscape, and the proposed major road construction programme in the alpine and montane regions of the property. The lack of progress in stopping road construction (raised by the World Heritage Committee each year since 2004) has led to ever-increasing negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property from habitat degradation, illegal timber cutting, forest fires, landslides and the additional threats of forest die-back, and invasive species.

They strongly recommend that the State Party take direct action to stop all road construction activities within the property, that an independent Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the Lake Habema road is commissioned to evaluate alternative transport options such as an air strip (as requested at the Committee's 28th session), and that substantial rehabilitation of existing road sections is rapidly undertaken to prevent further impacts on the property's fragile high-value natural heritage features. Furthermore, a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the *Strategic Plan for Lake Habema*, which may include provisions for additional roads, should be rapidly undertaken to identify the least environmentally damaging transport options for the alpine region of the property, including alternatives to road building. IUCN recalls that all projects that may affect the values and integrity of a World Heritage property should be subject to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and all plans and programmes should undergo Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

b) *Forest die-back in the Lake Habema region*

The State Party notes that the forest die-back disease is being addressed through cooperation with a range of stakeholders including NGOs, educational institutions and research institutes. However, there is no report on progress or concrete actions to identify and control the die-back disease threatening the *Nothofagus* forests.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are seriously concerned by the disease driven forest die-back in the high altitude Gondwanan *Nothofagus* forest adjacent to the Lake Habema road. To date, there have been no pathogenic investigations of the *Phytophthora* disease as a possible cause of forest die-back. The evidence from the 2008 joint reactive monitoring mission indicates that the die-back associated with roads was continuing to spread, killing the relict *Nothofagus* forest. This threat, combined with illegal logging ensuing from the road development, may cumulatively cause serious and irreversible damage to the high altitude

Gondwanan Nothofagus forest. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the cause of the forest dieback be rapidly ascertained and addressed.

c) *Functioning of the Management agency*

The State Party reports that the *Lorentz National Park Strategic Plan 2007-2012* has been implemented through an annual work plan and budget, and that the Park's budget in 2009 was 4 billion IDR, or roughly USD 440,000. The *Draft Management Plan 2010-2030*, which will address zoning and is expected to accommodate existing interests within the park, is being prepared in collaboration with WWF Papua Sahul, as well as representatives of the nine nearby districts and other stakeholders. It is expected that this Draft Plan will be completed in conjunction with the *Papua Province Spatial Plan*. The State Party notes that the property's limited budget and capacity have hindered its effective management and reports some capacity building of existing staff, as well as the addition of one additional staff per year. The State Party highlights that surveying and mapping of the alpine region and other areas is necessary to support effective management.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN commend the State Party for implementing the Lorentz National Park Strategic Plan 2007-2012. However, while some progress has been made in strengthening field-level management, it is still insufficient to address the many threats affecting the property. The State Party has identified severe constraints to effective operation of Park management including funding, limited monitoring and surveillance equipment, and limited staff capacity and technical expertise, which deserve the attention of the international community. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the management budget in 2007 was USD 710,000 (7 billion IDR), that in 2008 it increased to USD 1,000,000 (9.5 billion IDR to cover salaries for 44 personnel with the aim to increase this to 60 staff), but that it decreased by over 50% in 2009 to 440,000 USD (4 billion IDR), which is insufficient to manage the property. Unless there is rapid and significant improvement in the field management performance of the park authority, important areas of Outstanding Universal Value will be further degraded or lost.

Because of the acknowledged constraints to the effective operation of park management, IUCN recommends that Lorentz National Park revise its management approach and consider the following collaborative and participatory management options: i) creating multiple management units in the form of small local outposts managed by indigenous staff; ii) securing greater participation and engagement of traditional land owners; iii) increasing the number of trained indigenous staff and creating a network of indigenous-based management; iv) emphasizing local community development; and v) securing greater input from alpine environment specialist, including the WCPA Mountain Task Force. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the State Party convene an international workshop in 2010 to explore all options for the effective management of Lorentz National Park, with the participation of international donors, international and local NGOs, local communities, PT Freeport, IUCN, and the World Heritage Centre.

d) *Management of the Southern Lowlands Region - illegal logging and poaching threats*

The State Party reports that effective management in the southern portion of the property has been impossible due to lack of personnel and capacity. The Park authorities have continued to cooperate with PT Freeport in order to monitor the impacts of tailings disposal from the Grasberg mine. Freeport has built a major dike and gabions to slow the flow of tailings and prevent further sedimentation in the marine portion of the property, which extends up to 10km offshore. The report further notes that lowland areas of the park are affected by illegal logging and poaching taking place along the river network that provide access to the southern lowlands. Illegal activities in this area of the property need to be closely monitored in the future, as does the impact of tailings disposal. However, a comprehensive monitoring programme covering illegal logging, poaching and the impact of tailings disposal cannot be undertaken by the Park administration given its limited capacity.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the 2008 reactive monitoring mission found no evidence of mine tailings affecting the marine section of the property, and that the monitoring programme maintained by Freeport for periodically advising the Government agencies, including the Ministry of Forestry, represents a sound basis for the State Party to continue to monitor mining impacts in the property. However, it is necessary to expand the current monitoring to the marine part of the Lorentz property. IUCN considers that a comprehensive monitoring programme that also covers illegal logging, poaching and monitoring discharge of effluent from mine tailings should be undertaken.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that given the immediacy of the road construction issue – one illegal road under construction at present and many more planned – resolution of this serious threat to the alpine/montane section of the property is a matter of urgency. Similarly, the cause of forest die-back associated with roads needs to be rapidly determined and addressed. They note that a variety of additional issues are also of conservation concern, which include illegal fishing and trawling, the seaward boundary of the marine section remains unmarked, and invasive species (particularly water hyacinth).

Unless a much greater level of protection and management control is exercised in the immediate future, important vulnerable parts of the property could lose their integrity, values could be seriously degraded or lost in the near future, and the current drift towards the whole property becoming threatened will continue. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the World Heritage Committee should encourage the international community to assist the State Party in resolving the severe constraints to effective operation of the Park management including funding, limited monitoring and surveillance equipment, and limited staff capacity and technical expertise.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.13**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32COM 7B.15**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Welcomes that the Draft Management Plan for 2010-2013 is being prepared in collaboration with WWF Papua Sahul;*
4. *Notes with grave concern that the priority recommendation of the 2008 reactive monitoring mission, i.e. ceasing road construction and addressing forest die-back, have not been implemented, and that extensive threats to the property in the Lake Habema and southern lowland regions have resulted in these areas of the property becoming seriously degraded;*
5. *Urges the State Party to fully implement the recommendations of the 2008 mission and to prioritise those which are most urgent, in particular:*
  - a) *Cease all road construction in the Lake Habema region and rehabilitate recently constructed roads and mitigate their impacts, and*
  - b) *Identify and control the die-back disease threatening the Nothofagus forests in the Lake Habema region;*
6. *Also urges the State Party to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Strategic Plan for Lake Habema, which includes provisions for additional roads,*



*in order to identify the least environmentally damaging transport options for the alpine region of the property, including alternatives to road building;*

7. *Requests the State Party to convene an international workshop in 2010 to explore all options for the effective management of Lorentz National Park, with the participation of international donors, international and local NGOs, local communities, PT Freeport, IUCN, and the World Heritage Centre, and encourages the State Party to submit a request for International Assistance to support the workshop;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission in 2010 to assess the impacts of road construction, forest dieback, illegal logging, poaching and illegal fishing on the property's values and integrity;*
9. *Calls upon the international community to support the State Party in resolving the severe constraints to the effective operation of the Park management including funding, limited monitoring and surveillance equipment, and limited staff capacity and technical expertise;*
10. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a report, by **1 February 2011**, on the state of conservation of the property, and progress on the implementation of recommendations of the 2008 monitoring mission, in particular 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 35th session in 2011.*

#### **14. Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(viii) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 7B.16; 32 COM 7B.14; 33 COM 7B.15**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 66,600 in July 2005 for Emergency Assistance on rehabilitation of management facilities of the Gunung Leuser National Park, which is a part of the property

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 1,800,000 for the 3-year UNF/UNFIP Project (2005-2007) - Partnership for the Conservation of Sumatra Natural Heritage.

Previous monitoring missions

2006: UNESCO / IUCN reactive monitoring mission; 2007: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission; February 2009: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Agricultural encroachment;
- b) Illegal logging;
- c) Poaching;

- d) Road construction;
- e) Institutional and governance weaknesses.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1167>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2010 the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (TRHS), a serial property comprised of Kerinci Seblat National Park (KSNP), Gunung Leuser National Park (GLNP), and Bukit Barisan Selatan National Park (BBSNP). The report provides an update on the implementation of the Emergency Action Plan during 2009, as well as an overview of actions carried out to address key threats to the property including: a) road construction; b) illegal logging; c) agricultural encroachment; poaching; and d) park management, institutional and governance weaknesses.

The report acknowledges that the property is seriously threatened by extensive agricultural encroachment, illegal logging and road construction plans, which are linked with expansion of the rural population, poverty as well as the general state of governance and management effectiveness of the property and its surroundings. It suggests that progress is being made in addressing these threats, but provides little qualification of this claim and no data on total areas encroached or logged, the status of wildlife populations, or the extent of poaching. The main threats affecting each of the three National Parks comprising the property are discussed in detail below.

*a) Implementation of the Emergency Action Plan for all three components of the serial property*

The State Party notes that between 2007 and 2009 parts of the Emergency Action Plan (EAP) were implemented in all three national parks comprising the property. A recent 2009 management coordination workshop, held with government agencies and other stakeholders, concluded that the EAP should be extended for at least five years. The State Party reports that a workshop to further develop the EAP is planned during the second quarter of 2010.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the progress made in implementing the Emergency Action Plan and welcome its extension for another five years, including its further development through a workshop in 2010. All relevant ministries should be involved in this workshop (including agriculture, interior affairs, forestry, mining, people's welfare, public works), as well as other stakeholders at both national and local levels (province and district authorities, NGOs, local communities and the private sector). Since the EAP reflects governmental commitments, it is very important that the many EAP activities which are not within the parks' mandate, and are beyond their legal competence, should be implemented through a cross-sectoral approach with close coordination between the national and local levels, as well as governmental and non-governmental sectors. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the need to develop and implement an ecosystem-based restoration plan of the degraded forests in the property and neighbouring landscape as part of the EAP.

*b) Kerinci Seblat National Park (KSNP)*

The State Party reports on the following threats to the values and integrity of KSNP:

Road construction: KSNP management has halted some road construction within the park and has initiated legal action regarding a number of planned roads. The State Party reports that the Local Government is currently discussing plans for extensive road construction within the property. IUCN has received reports that the potentially illegal

Renah Pemetik road within the Park has had serious impacts on KSNP's integrity in terms of increased forest loss and poaching.

Illegal logging: Illegal logging has decreased in KSNP as a result of anti-logging activities implemented in 2009, including 36 routine patrols and the deployment of independent community-based Forest Protection System units in 18 villages (Pam Swakarsa). Moreover, an Integrated Forest Protection Team was created in part of KSNP to combat illegal logging, as well as encroachment and illegal poaching.

Agricultural encroachment: Both pre-emptive activities to stop agricultural encroachment and repressive action were carried out in a few areas of the park. Legal action has been taken against a number of encroachers and park management has developed agreements with some encroachers to stop their activities within the park. With respect to palm oil plantation encroachment, the State Party notes that it is in the process of investigating several incidents. IUCN has received reports that monitoring by park staff, NGOs and satellite imagery clearly reveals that encroachment is continuing around and within the national park, with more than 60% of the buffer zone now lost. In some areas there is a clear correlation between encroachment and reports of planned roads. With respect to palm oil plantations, IUCN notes that a subsidiary of PT Incasi Raya, PT SJAL, has been confirmed to have cleared more than 500ha of KSNP for an oil palm estate. IUCN further notes that there is currently no legal definition of the park's buffer zone, which is urgently required as a legal basis for land use planning, resource extraction and road construction.

Poaching: Park management has increased surveying and monitoring to twice a month, in collaboration with the Rhino Protection Unit, and legal action has been brought against several poachers. IUCN has received reports from various sources that no fewer than five, and probably more than eight, Sumatran tigers were poached in 2009 from KSNP and forests surrounding the park. Poaching of songbirds continues and has led to a serious decline over the last 10 years of many species' populations.

Mining: The Park Manager increased integrated patrols to combat illegal sand mining activities. IUCN has received reports that open cast coal mining and open cast iron ore mining in and around KSNP are under discussion, and that gold and copper mining exploration is ongoing in several areas of the KSNP.

While the World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the actions undertaken by the State Party, as well as local and international NGOs, it is clear that the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of KSNP are increasingly threatened. They note that KSNP's ability to undertake routine field activities and implement the Emergency Action Plan in 2009 was seriously impeded by the presumed theft of the park's operation funds, and note the actions taken by the incoming Park Director to resolve this and other administrative issues.

The main threats to KSNP relate to road construction and encroachment. In particular, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN are gravely concerned by plans for extensive road developments in and around the park which would lead to additional encroachment, illegal logging and poaching and represent a serious long-term threat to the property's values and integrity. The State Party should clearly restate and further clarify in law that no roads shall be built through any of the parks comprising the property, and order the closure of existing illegal roads through KSNP. Any plans for road construction in the areas surrounding the property should be subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in order to identify the least environmentally damaging transport options for the region, including improving existing transport links. Furthermore, the uncertain legal status of the Renah Pemetik road through KSNP should be ascertained and appropriate action taken if the road is determined to be illegal. Moreover, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note reports of mining exploration, continued hunting and sale of songbirds, poaching of Sumatran tigers,

and about reports that 50 of KSNP's 90 rangers will now be based in Jambi that is over 300km away from the park.

c) *Gunung Leuser National Park (GSLNP)*

The State Party reports on the following threats to the values and integrity of GSLNP:

Illegal logging: Illegal logging in Aceh Province has reportedly decreased as a result of the Governor's logging moratorium (Decree No. 5 / 2007). The Aceh Local Government has supported the conservation of GSLNP and plans to recruit 1000 forest security personnel to conduct forest patrols. The State Party further notes that illegal logging in North Sumatra Province has also decreased as a result of anti-logging activities and legal prosecution of loggers. IUCN notes that while the State Party reports on anti-logging activities, the budget lines presented in the reports indicates that no funding was spent on this activity in 2009.

Agricultural encroachment: The report notes that a number of activities have been undertaken to address encroachment, including creation of an Encroachment Task Force. Encroachment resolution in ex-refugee areas is underway. IUCN has received reports from various sources noting significant and ongoing encroachment. While the size of GSLNP is reported as 862,975 ha, IUCN notes that the official size is 1,094,692 ha.

While the World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome that the park authorities and partners have continued to undertake conservation action in GSLNP, the State Party's report that threats have decreased is not quantified and is therefore difficult to substantiate. Like KSNP and BBSNP, many of the threats to GSLNP are external and fall outside the jurisdiction of the property; thus solving these issues requires inter-agency working to address law enforcement, land-use management, and the relocation of displaced peoples. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that the management responsibility for roughly 80% of GSLNP located in Aceh Province is currently unclear and recommend that the State Party rapidly clarify this.

d) *Bukit Barisan Selatan National Park (BBSNP)*

The State Party reports on the following threats to BBSNP:

Road construction: No new or planned roads are reported within the park and the State Party highlights the need to implement measures to overcome habitat connectivity issues arising from the Way Heni - Sukaraja road crossing BBSNP. The report further notes that monitoring of existing roads in 2009 was regularly undertaken and that an Agreement on managing existing roads within the park has been approved by the Ministry of Public Works, the Local Government and the Directorate General of Forest Conservation

Illegal logging: Illegal logging has reportedly been addressed through a number of activities including increasing routine forest patrols by rangers to 20 days per month, integrated patrols, increasing patrols within communities, and by collaborating with law enforcement on legal prosecution of illegal loggers.

Agricultural encroachment: To address encroachment problems, the park authority has undertaken a number of additional activities including increased patrols, community development programmes in villages close to encroachment areas, and law enforcement activities. The State Party also notes that in BBSNP conflict between human and large mammals, including elephants and tigers, is a persistent problem.

Concessions: IUCN has received reports that almost one third of BBSNP has been granted as a concession to the Arthur Graha Group, is concerned by the unclear purpose, extent and terms of this concession, and urges the State Party to clarify its conditions and submit its terms to the World Heritage Centre.

While the Southern part of BBSNP park retains a high degree of integrity, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that large areas in the North-Eastern part have suffered from encroachment and were considered by the 2009 IUCN/ UNESCO reactive monitoring mission to no longer have Outstanding Universal Value. The 2009 mission notes that as this situation already partly existed at the time of inscription, these areas should not have been inscribed and that they should now be excised from the property; an issue which is not addressed by the State Party report. The Way Heni - Sukaraja road crossing BBSNP is adversely affecting wildlife, particularly rhinos, and the ecological connectivity between the Northern and Southern parts of the park. The Agreement on managing this and other roads is welcome, and its terms should be forwarded to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for review.

*e) Park management, institutional and governance weaknesses across the three components of the property*

As noted above, a coordination workshop was held in 2009, with government agencies and other stakeholders to address key management issues, and concluded that the EAP should be extended for at least five years, an inter-park communication and coordination mechanism should be developed, a community development programme carried out, and that an incentive mechanism for districts supporting conservation activities should be put in place. With respect to the property's budget for 2009, the State Party notes that: i) KSNP's budget was roughly USD 1,790,000 (17.9 billion IDR), an increase of 21% from 2008; ii) BBSNP's budget was USD 1,610,000 (16.1 billion IDR), an increase of 15% compared to 2008; and GLNP's budget was USD 1,930,000 (19.3 billion IDR), an increase of 6% compared to 2008. The State Party further notes that institutional capacity building has been undertaken in BBSNP through the development of a 'resort management unit', which undertakes the daily activities of the park, and that in GLNP, various training exercises were also undertaken. The report highlights that the limited number of forest rangers in the field encourages the park authority to collaborate with various national and local NGOs.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that some progress has been made by the State Party in improving the management of the property and urge the State Party to rapidly implement all the coordination workshop's conclusions. They recommend that an effective and prioritised monitoring system be developed and deployed to assess the status and trends of key factors affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, including encroachment, deforestation, poaching, wildlife trade, invasive species, and any anticipated climate change impacts in all components of the property. This system should, as a priority, map in detail and monitor the encroachments in and around the property and assess their changes and impacts since the inscription of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party does not report on: i) the need to halt the establishment of new provinces, districts and sub-districts in the property, which add to the complexity of its management and increase threats from development; ii) the need to provide law enforcement agencies with adequate resources for expanding their law enforcement activities with respect to encroachment and poaching; and iii) the need to legally establish an appropriate buffer zone to secure the conservation of the property.

*f) Opportunity to effectively address the multiple threats affecting TRHS through REDD and the Forest Investment Programme*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that Indonesia is currently one of the key focal countries engaged with the REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) processes. There are several pilot activities already underway with the support of both bilateral donors and the private sector. Furthermore, Indonesia has just been selected as one of five target countries to receive support from the Forest Investment Programme (FIP), a World Bank led initiative designed to support transformational change with respect to addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation while helping to balance the tradeoffs between economic development and safeguarding forest ecosystems.

Given that several of the REDD+ initiatives now operational in Indonesia are designed to address the specific threats affecting the TRHS, IUCN considers that the demonstrable and critical pressure on this exceptional site could be effectively addressed through, for example, incorporating ameliorative action in TRHS with the emerging programme of work of the Forest Investment Programme, which has the potential to deliver not only environmental gains (forest conservation and rehabilitation), but also social and sustainable economic benefits.

IUCN notes that the long term advantage of aligning TRHS conservation with Indonesia's REDD strategy includes sustained and predictable finance that can be used to support alternative local development strategies and reward local institutions and communities for safeguarding this exceptional site. IUCN encourages the State Party to make provision within their engagement with REDD and FIP on conservation of TRHS' forest ecosystem and could assist the State Party in designing and implementing an effective programme, given its extensive experience in developing distributional mechanisms for environmental payments and multi-stakeholder processes.

*g) Conclusion of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN regarding Danger Listing*

The property continues to face heavy pressure from illegal activities, including encroachment and extensive road construction plans within KSNP, which are a major threat to its Outstanding Universal Value and integrity and represent both an ascertained and potential danger in relation to the provisions of paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*, as confirmed by three monitoring missions since 2004. They recall their recommendation to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in parallel to inscribing the property on the World Heritage List. This proposal was not accepted, and was followed by continued discussions on Danger Listing. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee inscribe TRHS on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and encourage the State Party to fully support this inscription as its purpose is to strengthen international cooperation efforts and promote rapid conservation action in order to safeguard this endangered property.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.14**

*The World Heritage Committee;*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.15**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes with utmost concern that the property continues to face intense pressure from illegal activities, including road construction, encroachment, logging, poaching and mining prospecting, which are a major threat to its Outstanding Universal Value and integrity, and represent both an ascertained and potential danger in relation to the provisions of Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines, as confirmed by three monitoring missions since 2004;*
4. *Also notes that since the time of inscription, the World Heritage Committee have been advised to place the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger as a result of continuing and aggravated threats to its values and integrity;*

5. **Decides to inscribe the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;**
6. **Requests the State Party to implement the following corrective measures:**
  - a) *Immediately halt all road construction plans within Kerinci Seblat National Park (KSNP), clarify in law that no roads shall be built through the parks comprising the property, close all existing illegal roads, and develop appropriate regulations and infrastructure on existing legal public roads to reduce the negative impacts of traffic on wildlife and to ensure ecological connectivity,*
  - b) *Establish a clear institutional coordination mechanism to ensure that the large number of Emergency Action Plan (EAP) activities that are not within the park's mandate, and which are beyond its legal competence, including many of the activities intended to address encroachment, illegal logging and poaching, are successfully implemented through a cross-sectoral approach, and with the participation of all stakeholders,*
  - c) *Develop and implement an effective and prioritised monitoring system to assess the status and trends of key factors affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, including encroachment, illegal logging, poaching, wildlife trade, invasive species, and any anticipated climate change impacts in all components of the property,*
  - d) *Provide law enforcement agencies with adequate resources to expand their law enforcement activities with regards to illegal activities affecting the property, including encroachment, logging, poaching, and the wildlife trade,*
  - e) *Halt the establishment of new provinces, districts and sub-districts in the property in order to reduce both the administrative complexity of the property's management and the multiple development threats,*
  - f) *Establish through law an appropriate buffer zone to secure the conservation of the property,*
  - g) *Develop and implement an ecosystem-based restoration plan of the degraded forests in the property and neighbouring landscapes,*
7. **Also requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, to develop a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and to provide a draft proposal for 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;**
8. **Strongly encourages the State Party to consider alternative approaches to addressing the multiple threats affecting the property by making explicit provision within their REDD national strategy, and specifically the Forest Investment Programme (FIP), for prioritising the conservation of TRHS' forest ecosystem, and notes IUCN's willingness to assist the State Party in designing an effective programme for the property;**
9. **Reiterates its position that mining is incompatible with World Heritage status, in line with the International policy statement of the International Council of Minerals and Metals (ICMM) of not undertaking these activities in World Heritage properties, and urges the State Party to ensure that the Department of Mining formally consults the management authorities of all of the different Protected Areas that form the components of the property (KSNP, GLNP, and BBSNP) in the event of mining exploration in areas within or adjacent to the World Heritage property;**
10. **Invites the State Party to submit an International Assistance request to provide support for the Emergency Action Plan workshop planned for 2010;**

11. *Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property prior to its 36th session in 2012 in order to evaluate progress towards implementing the above corrective measures, and to determine whether revision of these measures is necessary;*
12. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the above corrective measures and the recommendations of the 2009 World Heritage Centre/IUCN Centre mission, including data on encroached and logged land, wildlife populations and the extent of poaching, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

## 15. Gunung Mulu National Park (Malaysia) (N 1013)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2000

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
**26 COM 21B.15; 33 COM 7B.16**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
a) Dam development  
b) Indigenous community marginalisation

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1013>

### Current conservation issues

On 28 January 2010, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides information on the two issues raised in World Heritage Committee Decision **33 COM 7B.16** regarding land rights issues, the involvement of communities in the management of the property, and proposals for development of dams.

#### a) *Land rights and the involvement of communities*

The State Party acknowledges that there have been land-claims by a group of local people, but notes that the land under dispute is outside the boundary of the property, and is owned by a private company. The State Party's report gives an explanation of the legal basis for



land claims and compensation and considers that the claims are tenuous. It notes that the impact of these disputes on the management of the property is not significant.

In relation to the involvement of indigenous communities, the State Party notes that there are community rights pertaining to hunting, fishing and the collection of Non-Timber Forest Products that were accorded at the time of the original creation of the National Park. They report that 84% of the 94 staff of the property are drawn from local communities (mainly the indigenous Berawan and Penan communities). The same communities make up 72% of the guides operating in the Park. In addition, leaders of local communities are members of the Special Park Committee that allows participation in the decision taking regarding the protection and management of the property. A joint management committee, headed by the Sarawak State Secretary and involving various stakeholders monitors the park management body and its budget.

The State Party also outlines further direct and indirect measures that offer community benefits, including the contributions of tourism income to local people, such as through service provision and handicraft products, and the provision of shared amenities such as treated water at no cost. In addition the State Party notes its awareness raising activities with communities. The State Party provides details on the specific names of guides, and the Terms of Reference and membership of the Special Park Committee in support of the above points.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received reports of some land disputes in the area, but consider that these appear relatively minor in relation to the overall management of the property. There appear to be appropriate processes in place to deal with these matters, and a good level of dialogue between the site management authorities, community leaders and political representatives. There is direct evidence of involvement of local people in the management of the property, and of the benefits they derive from it. The State Party report contains a good level of detail to substantiate the information provided, which is also supported by other sources of information received by IUCN on the conservation of the property.

b) *Plans for development of dams*

The State Party report confirms that a total of five potential hydropower sites were identified in the Sungai Tutoh in the 1980s through a technical study of hydropower potential in the area. The study predates inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, but the sites identified include locations that adjoin the World Heritage property. The State Party report states categorically that it has “*no plan to develop a hydro power project in the area*”. It notes that it would not implement any hydro projects if they are found to jeopardize the status of the property on the World Heritage List, and also note that they are fully aware of the reporting requirements regarding major projects, as noted, inter alia, in Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the answer provided by the State Party on this matter is clear and fully satisfactory. Development of hydro projects adjoining or affecting the World Heritage property would clearly be of significant concern with respect to potential impacts on its Outstanding Universal Value. However, the State Party provides clear reassurance that the hydropower plans considered in the past are currently not being considered for implementation.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.15**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,

2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.16**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Welcomes the report of the State Party regarding the means by which local communities are being involved in the management of the property, through both governance arrangements and within the staffing of the property; as well as the State Party's confirmation that it has no plans to implement dam projects that could affect the property;
4. Also welcomes the reassurance of the State Party regarding the resolution of remaining land claims in the area, and notes that these relate to land outside the boundary of the property, and that they do not appear to be adversely impacting on the effective management of the property;
5. Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed of any significant development regarding the above issues, and of any other matters relevant to the continued effective management of the property, including through the Periodic Report for the Asia and the Pacific Region.

#### **16. Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

#### **17. East Rennell (Solomon Islands) (N 854)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

#### **18. Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2005

Criteria  
(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
**29 COM 8B.11; 31 COM 7B.22; 32COM 7B.17**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Road expansion
- b) Forest fragmentation and need for ecological corridors.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/590>

Current conservation issues

On 10 February 2010, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex. The report provides information on progress towards designing and building effective wildlife corridors to mitigate the impacts of the proposed expansion of Highway 304 from two to four lanes, as well as an overview of tourism management provisions within the property's Management Plan for 2007-2016.

a) *The expansion of Highway 304 and the design of effective wildlife corridors*

The State Party acknowledges that Highway 304, which traverses the property from north to south and was built prior to its inscription on the World Heritage List, has fragmented the forest complex and affected its values and integrity. In order to mitigate the proposed widening of the highway from two to four lanes, the State Party proposes to put in place a 'mixed model' of wildlife corridors, including both elevated roads and wildlife overpasses connecting Khao Yai National Park and Thap Lan National Park. This proposal is based on a wildlife study undertaken as part of the wider Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the highway enlargement. The study confirmed the impacts of the existing road on wildlife (including collisions), determined that wildlife is using the areas on both sides of the road (including large carnivores like gaur), and records several wildlife trails crossing the 28th and 29th km of the highway. The 'mixed model' was determined to be the most appropriate and effective type of wildlife corridor through a weighted analysis of several factors including environmental (40%), engineering (30%), economic (20%), and social (10%). Other corridor options considered include: i) a tunnel through the mountain; ii) exclusively elevated roads; iii) a cut-and-fill tunnel; and iv) exclusively wildlife overpasses. The final EIA will be reviewed by the Department of Highways, the National Committee on the Environment and the National Committee on the *World Heritage Convention*, after which the project will be considered for approval by the Cabinet.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the State Party's acknowledgment that the existing highway affects the values and integrity of the property, which coincides with reports received by IUCN from NGOs concerning the high-levels of road kill associated with the road. They recall that at the time of inscription, the World Heritage Committee (Decision **29 COM 8B.11**) requested the State Party to carry out a study for the establishment of ecologically effective wildlife corridors across the existing highway to functionally link the western and eastern sectors of the complex. While the State Party should be commended for undertaking the necessary Environmental Impact Assessment studies for the proposed highway expansion, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain concerned that this expansion has the potential to create additional problems for the integrity of the ecosystems and species of this property, including through increased levels of road kill, as also noted by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **31 COM 8B.11**. They therefore question whether less environmentally damaging alternatives to the proposed expansion of Highway 304 exist,

and request the State Party to submit the EIA for this proposal, including a list of the alternatives considered, to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible.

Concerning the current expansion proposal, IUCN considers that elevated roads combined with wildlife overpasses, which the State Party identifies as the best wildlife corridor option, are unlikely to truly succeed in linking wildlife populations in the east and west of the property. A major tunnel underpass, potentially at several locations, may be more effective at facilitating wildlife movement. IUCN suggests that the State Party re-consider its assessment of the best wildlife corridor approach by reducing the importance accorded to economic factors. IUCN has also received reports that some donors may be interested in funding a more ambitious wildlife corridor infrastructure project.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that implementation of effective wildlife corridors is essential to maintaining the integrity of the property over the long-term, whether or not the existing road is expanded, and may also help minimise increased pressure to wildlife from changing land use in neighbouring forests outside the property. However, it is critical that the State Party first identify and implement the best wildlife corridor proposal on a purely ecological basis. Once the corridors are put in place, it will be necessary to demonstrate their effectiveness in allowing wildlife movement and reducing wildlife mortality from road kills. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN therefore urge the State Party to ensure that sufficient financial resources are available to undertake detailed pre- and post construction monitoring of wildlife corridors, and to adjust the management of the highway based on monitoring results, as required.

b) *Managing increased tourism*

The State Party reports that the Management Plan for 2007-2016 includes consideration of sustainable tourism, eco-tourism, carrying-capacity, tourism management, and community participation. The report further notes that the *Tourism, Recreation and Interpretation Plan* is part of the 10 year Management Plan and provides for 8 activities including ecotourism and promoting gateway cities to manage tourism sites within the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party provides little detail on how the *Tourism, Recreation and Interpretation Plan* will ensure sustainable management of increased tourism pressure. They recommend that the State Party request assistance in designing an effective tourism management plan for the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN would be pleased to provide advice to the State Party in this regard. IUCN recalls that the State Party's 2007 status report noted that tourist visits had doubled from 700,000 in 2001 to 1.4 million in 2006, and that such high visitor levels could affect the integrity of the property and should be managed through appropriate visitor use planning, based on the carrying-capacity of the property.

c) *Other conservation issues of concern*

IUCN has received reports that agricultural encroachment is occurring within the property on the north side of Thap Lan National Park and recommends that the State Party take action to investigate this issue, and to ensure that such encroachment is not allowed within the property. IUCN further recommends the State Party closely monitor the level of encroachment in all protected areas within the sites, in conjunction with activities to measure and monitor Thailand's forest resources, and also to consider the opportunities to integrate forest conservation within international programmes, including Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (REDD)..

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.18**

The World Heritage Committee;

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.17**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Reiterates its concern that the Highway 304 expansion project has the potential to create additional problems for the integrity of the ecosystems and species of this property, including through increased levels of road kill;
4. Commends the State Party for undertaking the necessary Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) studies to identify and design effective wildlife corridors to mitigate the impacts of the proposed highway expansion project, but considers that there are less environmentally damaging alternatives to the proposed highway expansion than the options being proposed by the State Party, which should be pursued;
5. Notes that the implementation of effective wildlife corridors is essential to maintaining the integrity of the property over the long-term, independent of the expansion of the highway, and that it is critical that the State Party first identify and implement the best wildlife corridor proposal on a purely ecological basis.
6. Also considers that elevated roads combined with wildlife overpasses are unlikely to truly succeed in linking wildlife populations in the east and west of the property and that a major tunnel underpass may be more effective in facilitating wildlife movement, and requests the State Party re-consider its assessment of wildlife corridor options by reducing the importance accorded to economic factors in its analysis;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit a copy of the highway expansion Environmental Impact Assessment to the World Heritage Centre as soon as it becomes available, including a list of alternatives considered and a clear summary of how the enlargement is likely to affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
8. Encourages the State Party to request assistance, if necessary, in order to design an effective tourism management plan for the property;
9. Also notes reports that agricultural encroachment is occurring on the north side of Thap Lan National Park, and recommends that the State Party consider the opportunities to integrate forest conservation within international programmes, including Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (REDD);
10. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a report, by **1 February 2012**, on the state of conservation of the property, including progress on wildlife corridors and management of tourism pressure, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

## EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

### 19. Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1983

Criteria  
(vii) (viii) (ix)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
**31 COM 7B.27; 32 COM 8B.15; 33 COM 7B.21**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 15,000 for Preparatory Assistance (2004)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
2002, 2004: Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Developments in the Bansko ski zone
- b) Lack of effective management mechanisms
- c) Boundary issues
- d) Illegal logging

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/225>

#### Current conservation issues

On 21 January 2010 the World Heritage Centre received a report on the state of conservation of the property by the State Party. The last decision of the World Heritage Committee (**33 COM 7B.21**) and several previous reports and Committee decisions have strongly voiced concerns about integrity and management and pointed out the need to address threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in particular the impacts caused by expanding ski tourism. The Committee previously noted the possibility of inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

At its 29th session (Durban, 2005) the Committee invited the State Party "to bring forward a nomination" based on new boundaries which would better protect the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property. A corresponding proposal was submitted for consideration of the Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) but then withdrawn by the State Party, despite a favourable recommendation by IUCN. The State Party submitted the nomination again for consideration by the Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). This report should therefore be considered in conjunction with the proposed extension of this property to be examined under agenda item 8. The parts of the report that refer to the resubmitted extension are not discussed below, as they have been further considered in relation to the nominated extension of the property.

### *a) Impacts of ski development*

The State Party restates the background to the development of the Bansko ski zone that the extensions of ski zones were a necessary response to growing demand and that provisions for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) and spatial planning referred to as "Territorial Arrangement Plan" (TAP) were met. In the case of Bansko, a legal concession for "construction and exploitation" was granted to private Yulen Company in 2001. The construction is reported as having been finished in 2007 with no construction currently taking place. The State Party considers that no works have been authorised that were not foreseen in the TAP.

The State Party report also notes that pressure to further expand ski resorts is addressed in the management plan approved in 2004 which prohibits the construction of ski facilities other than the ones licensed and approved under the above mentioned TAP. All development proposals are reported to be subject to Environmental Impact Assessments and Strategic Environmental Assessments. As Pirin National Park is part of the European Natura 2000 site network, this is also a requirement under the Habitats Directive of the European Union. The State Party report also explicitly accepts that the continued ski development is a critical threat to the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property, as stated in the last Committee decision. Additional conservation issues are noted by the State Party which had previously not attracted major attention include waste water management and soil erosion related to ski development above the town of Bansko.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the development of ski facilities and the extension of tourism zones, in particular Bansko and Dobrinishte tourism zones within and adjacent to the property are the key concern regarding its State of Conservation. The development goes back to the beginning of the construction of Bansko Ski Resort in 1986 as detailed in various reports by IUCN and the World Heritage Centre. According to the most recent Committee decision on Pirin National Park the development has "repeatedly and significantly impacted" on the Outstanding Universal Value to an extent that the property "may be considered for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger".

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that it is important to differentiate between the impacts of the existing ski infrastructure and potential future developments. There are clear indications for a strong demand for further tourism development, such as the massive growth of the town of Bansko and investment proposals, such as the one commented on by the State Party in a letter to the World Heritage Centre of January 2009 in response to concerns expressed by non-governmental organizations.

As there are credible reports about past violations of TAP and EIA provisions, the existence of such plans and assessments does not necessarily equal protection on the ground. There is also a current infringement procedure by the Directorate-General for the Environment of the European Commission which should be taken into account in future monitoring.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that existing ski development continues to be the utmost concern that will require permanent monitoring, including as regards the impacts of off-piste, night and helicopter skiing, all of which are being advertised and practised in Bansko Resort according to marketing materials. Future sports or other events in the ski resorts literally on the boundary of Pirin National Park may also generate impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value and the integrity of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that strong and effective protection and management to ensure no further ski development affects the property, is of the utmost importance, and that without this the Outstanding Universal Value of this property, whether extended or not, is certain to be irreversibly lost. IUCN also has noted in its evaluation of the

extension of this property that a new management plan is under development for the period after the current plan expires in 2013. The process to develop the new management plan for the period post 2013 is planned to commence in 2010. In the past, the influence of the responsible authorities on the development of the Bansko ski resort appears to have been limited, given the repeated unauthorized modifications and violations of approved requirements within the existing property. In order to retain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, it will be essential for the State Party to ensure that the new management to be developed for the period post 2013 will not permit further ski development or construction of other facilities within the property (including its possible extension) and its buffer zone, nor extension of the tourism zone into the property.

*b) Effective management of the property*

According to the report by the State Party, the capacities to manage and protect the property are sufficient. After several years of substantial budget cuts, in particular as regards operational management activities, the funding level in 2009 has been reinstated to the levels at 2004. This situation is reported as appropriate to manage the acknowledged major threats associated with development proposals. Aside from skiing development, other threats, such as illegal logging and poaching, are described as less significant and manageable with the current capacities and resources. Traditional resource use such as grazing and collection of non-timber forest products are regulated in the management plan.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recognise the maintenance of management resources for the property, alongside the currently proposed extension. While the state of conservation report by the State Party states a positive trend and visible results of restoration efforts, the findings of a recent IUCN technical evaluation mission clearly indicate that results are still not fully achieved. The restoration technique of sowing grass on eroded slopes is mentioned but not described in detail. It would be important to find out whether native species are used for this purpose, which is preferable from a conservation perspective. Potential concerns not referred to in the State Party report include the impacts of horse-back riding and cycling and the use of snow mobiles and quad bikes, as also observed during the IUCN technical evaluation.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the existence of additional conservation issues, in particular soil erosion in ski areas, waste water management, illegal logging, poaching and to a lesser extent grazing and harvesting of non-timber forest products do not appear to pose a major threat at this point in time but should be monitored and reported on in the future. The management plan seems appropriate to address many of the concerns provided the State Party ensures its effective enforcement.

The conclusions of this report presented hereafter are fully compatible with the findings of the IUCN technical evaluation of the proposed extension of the property. Therefore the conclusions and the draft decisions derived from them purposefully overlap with the draft decisions proposed in relation to the nomination for extension.

In line with the 2009 Committee decision, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN re-emphasize that inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger, stemming from possible future developments within the property but also from outside the boundaries in case of continued impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property remains a real consideration; and in the absence of agreement on the proposed extension considers that the property as currently listed no longer can be seen to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value, on either current standards, or in relation to its condition at the time of inscription on the World Heritage List. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the need for a governmental commitment at the highest levels, and beyond the Bulgarian Ministry for Environment and Water, as the development pressure that threaten the property from both



within and outside its borders can only be dealt with by working across various sectors, and with all relevant ministries and local authorities committed to the conservation of Pirin National Park and avoiding any further damage to it.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.19**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B;
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.21**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Recalling that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been repeatedly and significantly impacted by the development of ski facilities and ski runs, to the extent that the property may be considered for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and decides that any further development of ski facilities or ski runs, or associated infrastructure, within the property and its buffer zone would result in the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;
4. Notes that this decision is related to the proposed extension of the property, to also be considered by the Committee at its 34th session in 2010 under agenda item 8;
5. Urges the State Party to ensure that the new management plan to be developed for the period post-2013 will not permit further ski development or construction of other facilities within the property and its buffer zone, nor extension of the tourism zone into the property;
6. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission to the property in 2011 to assess the state of conservation of the property, and any agreed extension to it, with particular reference to its effective protection from inappropriate development and human use within and beyond its boundaries and to review a draft of the new management plan to ensure that it will provide for the continued protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, with particular reference to effective protection from inappropriate development and human use within and beyond its boundaries, and the effective protection and management of the property, including the maintenance of adequate staff and financial resources, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

**20. Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park (Canada / United States of America) (N 354rev)**

See Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add (States Parties' report on the state of conservation received late)

**21. Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands) (Italy) (N 908)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

**22. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

**23. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765bis)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

**24. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission and Complementary information received late)

**25. Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

**26. Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685bis)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1994; 2005

Criteria  
(vii)(ix)(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.29; 29 COM 7B.25; 29 COM 8B.16

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1998: UNESCO Reactive monitoring mission; 1999, 2001, 2004: joint World Heritage Centre, IUCN and Ramsar Convention missions (Doñana 2005 expert meetings on Hydrological Restoration of Wetlands).

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Toxic pollution after mining accident in 1998;
- b) Agriculture impacts;
- c) Extension of the National Park

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/685>

Current conservation issues

In 2009, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received reports from NGOs concerning the development of several oil refinery projects near the property, namely the expansion of the La Rábida refinery and the construction of a pipeline for the Balboa refinery in Extremadura, as well as information on two minor oil spills linked to La Rábida refinery, which occurred on 30 July and 15 September 2009 and reached the property's coastline.

On 2 February 2010, a report on the state of conservation of Doñana National Park was submitted by the State Party. The report provides an overview of the status of the above oil refinery and pipeline projects, as well as information on the risk of accidental oil spills resulting from increased maritime traffic to and from the Straits of Gibraltar. The report also provides a detailed summary of the implementation of the Doñana 2005 Restoration Project.

*a) Expansion of the La Rábida Refinery*

The La Rábida refinery is located outside the property's boundaries and was built in the late sixties, before Doñana National Park was inscribed on the World Heritage List. The State Party notes that the expansion project aiming to increase the refinery's middle distillate production capacity has undergone an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which was approved by the Spanish Secretary of State for Climate Change in March 2009. The report further notes that the Directorate-General for Biodiversity, responsible for the Natura 2000 network in Spain, does not include the property on the list of sites likely to be directly affected by the La Rábida refinery.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that while the expansion of La Rábida is unlikely to have direct impacts on Doñana's values and integrity, it may have significant indirect and cumulative impacts on the property due to the augmented risk of accidental oil spills resulting from increased maritime traffic to and from the Straits of Gibraltar, as discussed in point c) below. They request the State Party to provide a copy of the EIA for La Rábida to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible, highlighting the likely impacts of the proposed expansion on the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

*b) Construction of a pipeline for the Balboa refinery in Extremadura*

The State Party's report notes that the pipeline project for the Balboa refinery is currently undergoing EIA and that the Government of Spain does not plan to start or authorise any new works or buildings in the vicinity of the property that might affect its Outstanding Universal Value. The Balboa pipeline EIA is in its final phase and additional information is

being collected to resolve a number of issues, including the likely effect of the pipeline on the regions' aquifers. The portion of the Balboa pipeline that could potentially affect the property, in the State Party's view, is the section traversing the province of Huelva to the crude-oil and oil product storage terminal in the port of Palos de la Frontera. The initial 'project report' for this development, which preceded the EIA and was issued by the developer (Refinería Balboa-Grupo Alfonso Gallardo), notes seven possible alternative routes for this crude-oil pipeline. The State Party report indicates that, according to the developer's 'project report', the property could be affected by some of the proposed routing options. The final alternative pipeline routes will be analysed in more detail during the preparation of the EIA in order to identify the least environmentally damaging option.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the intent of the Government of Spain not to plan or authorise any new construction works or buildings related to the pipeline in the World Heritage area. However, they consider that the Balboa pipeline may have both direct and indirect impacts on the property's values and integrity, and request the State Party to submit a copy of the Balboa pipeline EIA to the World Heritage Centre as soon as it becomes available, including information on the potential impacts on the property.

c) *Risk of accidental oil spills resulting from increased maritime traffic to and from the Straits of Gibraltar*

The State Party notes the likelihood of intensified maritime traffic to and from the Straits of Gibraltar due to the proposed oil refinery projects, and acknowledges that this may augment the risk of accidents and oil spills. The report states that there are comprehensive safety procedures in place to prevent situations of serious risk, catastrophe or public calamity. It notes that the *2008 Special Coastal Pollution Emergency Plan for Andalusia* led to the development of the *Doñana Natural Area Self-Protection Plan*, which is almost complete and will include the coast of the World Heritage property. Moreover, the State Party reports that a maritime traffic EIA will be undertaken to assess the risks of accidental oil spills.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN agree with the State Party's assessment that augmented maritime traffic may increase the risk of accidents and spills, and request the State Party to submit a copy of the maritime traffic EIA and the *Doñana Natural Area Self-Protection Plan* to the World Heritage Centre as soon as these become available. They note that despite the existence of the *2008 Special Coastal Pollution Emergency Plan*, the oil spill on 30 July 2009, linked to the La Rábida refinery resulted in some hydrocarbons reaching the Doñana coastline, due to the prevailing maritime currents in the area. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the recent minor oil spills in 2009 are indications of the potential for a more serious oil spill to occur which could affect the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property. They further note that the Government of Portugal has expressed concern about the potential impacts of these developments on the Portuguese marine environment. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend to encourage the State Party to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of current and possible impacts of oil refineries in the region, considering the Outstanding Universal Value of Doñana as a factor, in order to consider alternatives to increased maritime traffic and increased risk of accidental oil spills in this sensitive area.

d) *Implementation of the Doñana 2005 Restoration Project*

The Doñana 2005 Restoration Project, which aims to significantly improve the conservation status of the Park, was launched in response to the April 1998 spill at the Aznalcollar mining reservoir that caused serious pollution of over 4,000 ha of the Agrio and Guadiamar rivers upstream of the property. The State Party reports that the implementation of the Restoration Project to date has reduced the amount of sediments being transported to Doñana National Park marshes and favoured colonisation by amphibians, reptiles and certain fish species. Of the project's eight actions to ensure hydro-ecological restoration of the basins and watercourses feeding the property's marshlands, the State Party reports that five are

complete and in operation, while two are drafted and awaiting approval. An additional three cross-cutting actions, monitoring, research and dissemination, are ongoing. The report notes that the partial results of the hydro-ecological monitoring carried out in recent years suggest that the project's five completed actions are succeeding in restoring the property's marshlands. These actions have enabled the recovery of natural values in the basin watersheds including: i) restoration of wetlands, which has reduced the amount of sediments being transported to Doñana National Park marshes and favoured colonisation by amphibians, reptiles and certain fish species; ii) restoration of the Gallega marsh and the Caracoles estate, which has enabled the recovery of the natural profile and flood levels; and iii) the communication of the Gallega marsh with the Hinojos marsh, which has enabled the recovery of hydrological processes that will permit longer flooding periods in the Doñana National Park marshes.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress that has been achieved in restoring the property's marshlands through the Doñana 2005 Restoration Project. They regret that no report on the project was made available earlier as requested by the Committee. Furthermore, significant additional work is needed to fully restore the structure and function of Doñana's marshland ecosystem. IUCN notes that two of the incomplete actions, actions 5 and 6 (which aim to restore water inflow into the property's marshland from the Guadiamar river), are critical to restoring the property and should be rapidly implemented. Moreover, several of the actions reported by the State Party as complete are in fact partially complete. These include the restoration of the El Partido stream, action 3, which is partially complete as the riverbank has not yet been restored. They strongly encourage the State Party to provide adequate resources to complete the restoration programme foreseen, maintain long-term monitoring arrangements, and to consider updating the Doñana 2005 Restoration Project to include the restoration of additional areas bordering the property including the Cantaritas fields (east of the property), as well the fields of Cochinato, Los Garridos and Huerta Tejada (north of the property). These marshland areas, once restored, would form important ecological corridors, which could also help mitigate the likely effects of climate change on the property and maintain its values over the long term.

*e) Other conservation issues of concern*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that there has been significant progress in the conservation of the Iberian lynx, Europe's most threatened cat species. However, while the captive breeding programme has been extremely successful, as noted by the State Party, IUCN has received reports that wild lynxes are experiencing high mortality rates due to road kill, which has caused 24 of the 57 lynx deaths in Doñana in the last 10 years. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the State Party consider addressing road-kill mortality of Iberian lynx by reviewing relevant road plans, and planning and implementing strategic wildlife corridors.

IUCN has received reports from NGOs concerning a number of additional conservation issues of concern. These include over abstraction and pollution of the aquifer underlying Doñana (there are estimated to be 1000 illegal boreholes in the area), and proliferation of illegal strawberry fields outside the property's boundaries. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that these issues are potentially serious threats to the values of the property and encourage the State Party to evaluate the current regional use of the aquifer, develop a plan to ensure that water flow to the property's marshland is maintained, and to consider reclaiming illegal fields and those in sensitive locations bordering the property in order to restore ecological corridors. IUCN has also received information concerning existing and planned coastal wind farms near Doñana, which could affect the property's Imperial Eagle population. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN request the State Party to submit any preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment studies for wind farms near the property to the World Heritage Centre as soon as these become available.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned by the many conservation issues affecting the property, which could cumulatively lead to a progressive loss of its Outstanding Universal Value. The many development issues affecting the areas surrounding the property indicate a need to ensure that land uses around Doñana take into account its values. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the State Party undertake a review of planning documents for areas adjacent to the property, in consultation with the Doñana National Park, in order to ensure that future developments do not compromise the property's values.

IUCN notes that climate change remains an unpredictable factor that is likely to adversely affect the property and should be continuously considered in the implementation and development of the hydro-ecological restoration of the marshlands. IUCN notes that a recent WWF report '*Environmental flows in the marshland of Doñana National Park*' (2009) demonstrates that freshwater inflow into the property's marshlands has been reduced by 80%, and that this is reflected in the concomitant reduction of marshland plant communities over 60-80% of the property since 1990, which in turn has seriously affected populations of key bird species including Great Bittern (*Botaurus stellaris*), Marbled Duck (*Marmaronetta angustirostris*), and Crested Coot, (*Fulica cristata*). IUCN considers that the most effective climate change mitigation and adaptation strategy for the property is to restore freshwater inflow to historical levels, to create a network of ecological corridors adjacent to the property by reclaiming illegal agricultural fields and those located in sensitive areas (e.g. along waterways), and to ensure that land uses around Doñana take into account its Outstanding Universal Value.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.26**

*The World Heritage Committee;*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 7B.25** adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005);*
3. *Calls upon the State Party to complete and sustain the results of the "Doñana 2005" restoration project, and to maintain and improve the management of the property, and encourages both the establishment of an ongoing system of management effectiveness assessment to assist this process, and an assessment and revision of all adjacent land use plans by the relevant local authorities to ensure that they consider the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and do not permit developments which could impact upon it;*
4. *Notes with concern the high risk of accidental oil spills resulting from the increase in maritime traffic to and from the Straits of Gibraltar due to the proposed expansion of the La Rábida oil refinery and the proposed Balboa pipeline, which may potentially affect the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit a copy of the La Rábida oil refinery expansion Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), the Balboa pipelines EIA, the maritime traffic EIA, the coastal wind farm EIA and the Doñana Natural Area Self-Protection Plan to the World Heritage Centre as soon as these become available;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess its state of conservation;*

7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a report, by **1 February 2011**, on the status of the La Rábida and Balboa oil refinery projects and all other developments that may affect the values of the property, the continued implementation of the restoration scheme, results of monitoring and management effectiveness assessments, and the regulation and impacts of land-uses adjacent to the property on its state of conservation, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

## **27. Henderson Island (United Kingdom) (N 487)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

Criteria

(vii) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7B.26; 31 COM 7B.34; 32 COM 7B.27**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Invasive species

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/487>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2010, a report detailing the state of conservation of Henderson Island was submitted by the State Party. The report provides an overview of the implementation of the invasive rat eradication scheme, the planned ranger appointment, and also briefly describes the status of additional conservation issues of concern, including sustainable use of timber, turtle nesting beaches, ex-situ conservation and translocation, endemic fauna and flora, invasive species, and cetaceans.

a) *Rat eradication*

The State Party reports that the last remaining conservation obstacles to a programme of rat eradication by poisoned bait, i.e. Henderson crane mortality and bait consumption by land crabs (*Gecarcinidae*), have been solved. A 2009 eradication field trial funded by the United Kingdom Government found that: i) Henderson crabs could be captured and held in captivity for at least four weeks, therefore avoiding exposure to the poisoned bait; and ii) all rats were able to access and feed on bait pellets despite the high density of land crabs. Moreover, the trial found that endemic snails exposed to bait pellets did not experience significant mortality rates. The State Party further notes that the Operational Plan for the rat

eradication programme has been prepared as part of a project managed by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), and that work is underway to secure the £1.25 million funding necessary for the eradication operations.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress achieved by the State Party in addressing the conservation obstacles to the rat eradication scheme. The principal long-standing threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is predation by the Polynesian rat on chicks of the endemic Henderson petrel (*Pterodroma atrata*); in particular: a recent study concluded that rat predation represents a threat of extinction to the Henderson petrel. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider it essential that the State Party rapidly secures the funding necessary for the rat eradication operations, indicated at £1.25 million.

*b) Ranger Post*

The State Party reports that a Ranger Post on Henderson Island is considered feasible and has been discussed in collaboration with the Island Council and the wider community. To date, a job description has been drafted, a basic accommodation plan developed and shipping logistics considered. The State Party further notes that funding for a Ranger posting has been submitted by the Government of Pitcairn Islands to the Overseas Territories Environment Programme (OTEP), and that a decision on funding is expected in February 2010. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress achieved by the State Party and the Pitcairn authorities in establishing a Ranger Post on Henderson Island.

*c) Sustainable use of timber, turtle nesting beaches, ex-situ conservation and translocation status of fauna and flora, and status of cetaceans*

The State Party reports briefly on the above conservation issues of concern:

- i. The State Party considers that there is no risk to the sustainability of miro and tou stocks on Henderson Island. The Pitcairn Islanders have not visited Henderson to harvest miro and tou since 2004 as Magareva Island donated miro wood to Pitcairn in 2007 and additional miro wood has been harvested on Pitcairn Island itself;
- ii. With respect to turtle nesting beaches, the State Party reports that the most likely threat to these beaches would be increased visitor numbers and/ or tourism developments. Given that there is no increase in tourism, and no plans for tourism infrastructure, turtle nesting beaches are not considered to be threatened;
- iii. With respect to ex-situ conservation, translocation and extinction, the State Party considers that given the absence of increased threats to Henderson Island, no plans for the above have been made, with the exception of testing whether the Henderson crane bird could be successfully kept in captivity during the rat eradication programme;
- iv. With respect to endemic flora and fauna and other invasive species, the State Party reports that no endemic species have become extinct in the life of the current Henderson Management Plan, and that there is no evidence of new invasive species on Henderson over the last year. The State Party further notes that the Henderson petrel has been added to the appendices of the *Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species* (CMS) with the full support of the Henderson Island Management Committee;
- v. With respect to the status of cetaceans, the State Party reports that 6-8 humpback whales were resident off Henderson Island over a six week period in August-September 2009. Furthermore, the State Party notes that a *Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Conservation of Cetaceans and their Habitats in the Pacific Island Region* has been signed by the Governor of Pitcairn Islands under the auspices of the CMS.



The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the State Party's report and commend the State Party's initiative in placing the Henderson petrel in the appendices of the CMS, and the initiative of the Pitcairn Islands in signing an MOU with CMS concerning the conservation of cetaceans, and consider that the key conservation issues remain the rat eradication programme and appointing a full-time Ranger on Henderson Island.

*d) Environmental Strategy for the Pitcairn Islands*

The State Party provided a copy of the Pitcairn Islands Environment Management Plan 2008 in annex to its state of conservation report for Henderson Island. IUCN and the World Heritage Centre note that the State Party and the Pitcairn Authorities took care to ensure the compatibility of this management plan with the Henderson Island Management Plan.

*e) Status of the management plan*

The State Party report outlines the progress against the targets set out in the Henderson Island World Heritage Site Management Plan 2004-2009. Overall the six targets of this Plan have been achieved or adequately addressed, including appointing members of the Henderson Island Management Committee, who have submitted a funding bid to OTEP to update the Henderson Island Management Plan.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the State Party should be commended for the considerable progress achieved in planning the rat eradication scheme and in securing a full time Ranger Post for Henderson Island, and strongly advise the State Party to rapidly secure the funding necessary to undertake the rat eradication scheme, as well as adequate funding for a full time Ranger Post on Henderson Island. They note that without the implementation of the rat eradication programme, the threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property would become critical.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.27**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B;*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.27**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Commends the State Party for the considerable progress achieved in planning the invasive rat eradication scheme, which is of critical importance to maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property;*
4. *Welcomes the progress achieved by the State Party in securing a full time Ranger Post for Henderson Island;*
5. *Urges the State Party, in close collaboration with the Pitcairn authorities and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), to rapidly secure adequate funding to implement the rat eradication scheme and the full time Ranger Post in order to safeguard the undisturbed ecology that is the key distinctive value for which Henderson Island was inscribed on the World Heritage List;*
6. *Also welcomes the State Party's initiative in placing the Henderson petrel (*Pterodroma atrata*) in the appendices of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species (CMS) and the initiative of the Pitcairn Islands in signing a Memorandum of Understanding with CMS concerning the conservation of cetaceans;*

7. Requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with a copy of the updated Henderson Island World Heritage Site Management Plan when it becomes available;
8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the overall state of conservation of the property, including reference to the implementation of the rat eradication scheme and the Ranger Post, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

## **28. Yellowstone National Park (United States of America) (N 28)**

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1978

### Criteria

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

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

1995 - 2003

### Previous Committee Decisions

**30 COM 7B.28; 30 COM 8B.17; 32 COM 7B.29**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

1995: World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Mining;
- b) Wildlife management: bison and cut-throat trout;
- c) Invasive alien species;
- d) Water quality;
- e) Road construction;
- f) Snow mobile noise and impact on air quality;
- g) High visitor use.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/28>

### Current conservation issues

On 8 March 2010, an electronic report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides a detailed overview of the status and management of bison, cut-throat trout, and grizzly bears, as well as pressures due to visitors.

#### a) *Bison management*

The State Party reports that the Interagency Bison Management Plan (IBMP) has been partially revised to include adaptive management measures, in line with the requests made by the Committee in Decision **32 COM 7B.29**. Two areas adjacent to the property have been

closed to cattle and opened up to migratory bison. A risk analysis of disease transmission between bison and cattle has been undertaken (including consideration of bison genetics), and ways to improve stakeholder involvement in the IBMP are being considered.

- *Progress towards securing bison migration routes:* The State Party notes that in 2008-2009 all grazing ceased on Horse Butte peninsula, adjacent to the park's western boundary, which has opened up this habitat to migratory bison. Moreover, in 2009, the state of Montana signed a 30-year livestock grazing restriction and bison access agreement to remove cattle from the park's northern boundary at Royal Teton Ranch. The State Party considers that this agreement, and the cessation of grazing at Horse Butte peninsula, should allow progressively larger numbers of migratory bison to use winter habitats along the Yellowstone River, up to 10 miles away from the park boundary.
- *Risk analysis of brucellosis disease transmission:* The State Party reports that a risk analysis of disease transmission from bison and elk to cattle is ongoing and that the final report is expected in December 2009. The analysis quantifies the risk of brucellosis transmission from bison and elk to cattle, estimates transmission rates within bison and elk populations, and assesses whether vaccination of bison could help mitigate risks and contribute to eliminating this disease. The State Party recalls that in 2000 the IBMP originally proposed to maintain bison genetic-diversity by balancing a population of 3000 animals with brucellosis risk management objectives, which include culling. Recent scientific research on this issue has concluded that maintaining an overall bison population between 2,500 – 4,500 pairs should retain 90-95% of genetic diversity currently present within the Yellowstone population for the next 200 years.
- *Enhancing stakeholder involvement in the IBMP:* The State Party indicates that a new website now provides up-to-date information on the IBMP's implementation. Moreover, the IBMP partner agencies have requested advice from the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution on how to enhance stakeholder involvement, and will continue to work with the Institute during 2009-2010 in order to improve the public engagement process.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the State Party's progress towards opening some areas to bison migration and enhancing stakeholder involvement in the Interagency Bison Management Plan. However, several key wildlife species in the park, aside from bison, have migratory routes that take them outside the property. While the revisions to the Interagency Bison Management Plan and the acquisition of several areas adjacent to the property for bison migration are welcome, there is a need to develop a more detailed understanding of the ecological role that the surrounding lands play in maintaining the property's values. IUCN and the World Heritage Centre suggest to encourage the State Party to continue its efforts to secure bison migration routes, and to increase its engagement with ranchers surrounding the property in order to keep landscapes open to bison movements, including through easement leases and buyouts to limit the loss of habitat, and also as a means to keep bison separate from cattle.

IUCN notes that there have been no documented cases of brucellosis transmission from unconfined bison to cattle, although transmission from elk to cattle has occurred several times around feed grounds. During the winter of 2009 roughly 30% of the property's bison population was culled due to concerns about the possible spread of a livestock disease to cattle that graze in areas around the park. A recent study assessing the risk of disease transmission from Yellowstone bison to cattle concluded that culling may be unnecessary, and that more cost-effective management solutions may be appropriate such as buying grazing rights from cattle ranchers in a few adjacent areas or testing all cattle within a special zone around the park.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note that development and other human-caused change to the landscapes surrounding the Yellowstone are affecting the ecological role that surrounding lands play in maintaining the values of the property, including animal movement. They note the importance of continued strengthened cooperation with land owners and land managers within the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, and of developing a long-term vision and action plan for integrated management of the property and its surrounding areas.

b) *Cut –throat trout*

The State Party reports that a scientific expert panel has reviewed the programme to remove invasive lake trout from the property's rivers. The panel noted that cut-throat trout, and the role they play in the property's ecosystem, are seriously threatened by the continued expansion of the invasive lake trout population. The panel concluded that the lake trout suppression programme cannot succeed on its present budget and that lake trout removal efforts must be intensified for a minimum of six years. The State Party notes that Yellowstone National Park is in the process of implementing the scientific expert panel's recommendations by developing a strategy to secure additional funding to support intensified lake trout suppression efforts. Moreover, the State Party indicates that a plan for the preservation and restoration of Yellowstone cut-throat trout will be developed during 2010. This plan will also investigate and address the effects of reduced lake levels, drought and climate change on the recovery of cut-throat trout, as requested in Decision **32 COM 7B.29**.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the State Party's efforts to rapidly implement the recommendations of the scientific expert panel on cut-throat trout recovery. They urge the State Party to ensure that adequate funding is secured to intensify lake trout suppression efforts over the next six years. The State Party should be requested to submit a copy of the plan for the preservation and restoration of Yellowstone cut-throat trout as soon as it becomes available, including an indication of the level of funding secured.

c) *The risks to grizzly bears from declining whitebark pine*

The State Party reports that Yellowstone grizzly bears were returned to Federal Protection under the Endangered Species Act, due to concerns that the effects of global climate change on whitebark pine may seriously affect their population of roughly 600 individuals (the seeds of whitebark pine are an important food source for grizzlies). Since 2000, mountain pine beetles have caused substantial and ongoing whitebark pine mortality, which may be exacerbated by climate change and competition from species like lodgepole pine that are more successful in warmer sites. The State Party notes that past widespread mortality of whitebark pine occurred in the 1930's and 1970's (also caused by the native mountain pine beetle), and that during these declines Yellowstone grizzlies switched to other food sources including meat from ungulates, cutworm moths and ant colonies. The State Party notes that while it is not possible to predict how changes in whitebark pine will affect the grizzly population, the greatest threats to grizzly bear survival remain human factors such as roads, the amount of secure habitat available and hunter caused mortality.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the grizzly bear population is a vital element of the property's Outstanding Universal Value. While the status of whitebark pine remains of concern, there are indications that grizzlies may be able to switch to other food sources. Given that the Yellowstone grizzly bear population only numbers roughly 600 individuals, IUCN recommends that the State Party review the population's connectivity with the larger population of bears in the region, as well as the need to further mitigate human-bear conflict, which the State Party acknowledges as one of the major causes of bear mortality.

d) *Reducing the impacts of visitation*

The State Party acknowledges that continued pressures from high visitor use are a recurring issue. To partly address this, a sustainability programme aimed at reducing the impacts of both visitation and park operations is being implemented, and visitor numbers and impacts continue to be assessed, including winter visitation and the effects of snowmobiles. The sustainability programme, titled Yellowstone Environmental Stewardship (YES), complements the park's environmental management programme and should help further reduce its ecological footprint. The State Party notes that visitor numbers have stabilised between 2.8 and 3.1 million per year. Concerning winter visitation and the effects of snowmobiles, the State Party recalls that for the past five years, a managed winter use programme has been in place. Snowmobiles continue to be prohibited off roads, must use Best Available Technology (which reduces their emissions by 70-90%), and the number of snowmobile groups and snow coaches has remained constant. The State Party further notes that snowmobiles and snow coach impacts are fairly similar and that they cause few known impacts on bison and elk. An interim winter plan has been completed to guide use during the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 seasons.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the State Party efforts to manage the large number of visitors to the property. They recommend that the State Party continue to monitor the impacts of visitor use, in particular winter visitation and snowmobiles, and adapt the Yellowstone Environmental Stewardship programme and the winter use plans accordingly.

e) *Other conservation issues of concern – the potential decline of wolf populations*

IUCN has received reports from NGOs that recent delisting of wolves in Idaho and Montana, which has led to the first public hunting of wolves in decades, has resulted in the shooting of the Cottonwood Yellowstone wolf pack after it left the boundaries of the property. Given that the Yellowstone wolf population's long-term survival depends on its connection to populations in central Idaho and northwest Montana, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommends that the State Party consider how public hunting of wolves in neighbouring public and private land may impact wolf population within Yellowstone National Park and ensure that the Yellowstone wolf population remains stable.

**Draft Decision:        34 COM 7B.28**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.29**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Welcomes the State Party's progress towards opening some areas to bison migration and enhancing stakeholder involvement in the Interagency Bison Management Plan;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to continue its efforts to secure bison migration routes, and to increase its engagement with ranchers surrounding the property in order to keep landscapes open to bison movements in order to ensure the effective conservation of this key species of the property;*
5. *Also welcomes the State Party's efforts to rapidly implement the recommendations of the scientific expert panel concerning the restoration of the property's native cut-throat trout population, and urges the State Party to ensure that adequate funding is secured to intensify lake trout suppression efforts over the next six years;*

6. *Requests that given the small size of Yellowstone's grizzly bear's population, the State Party seek to increase the population's connectivity with the larger population of bears in the region, and consider the need to further mitigate human-bear conflict;*
7. *Strongly urges the State Party to consider how recent delisting of wolves as a protected species in Idaho and Montana and hunting of wolves in neighbouring public and private land may impact the wolf population within the property ;*
8. *Also encourages the State Party to develop a more detailed understanding of the ecological role that the surrounding lands play in maintaining the property's values, and a long-term vision and action plan for integrated management of the property and its surrounding areas;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and the progress made in addressing the different issues above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

## **29. Everglades National Park (United States of America) (N 76)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1979

Criteria  
(viii) (ix) (x)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
1993-2007

Previous Committee Decisions  
**30 COM 7A.14; 31 COM 7A.12; 32 COM 7B.30**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
April 2006: IUCN participation in a technical workshop to identify benchmarks and corrective measures

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Quantity and quality of water entering the property;
- b) Urban encroachment;
- c) Agricultural fertiliser pollution;
- d) Mercury contamination of fish and wildlife;
- e) Lowered water levels due to flood control measures;
- f) Damage from hurricanes.

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/76>

### Current conservation issues

On 5 March 2010 a report was submitted by the State Party on the state of conservation of the property. This report describes the threats to the Everglades' aquatic ecosystem, briefly reports on progress in implementing the nine corrective measures developed when the property was previously included in the List of World Heritage in Danger, considers the property's vulnerability to climate change and sea-level rise, and requests the World Heritage Committee to consider re-inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The State Party also proposes to undertake a number of additional water infrastructure projects in order to fully restore and protect the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

#### a) *Alterations of the hydrological regime*

The State Party reports that water inflows to the property have been reduced by up to 60% due to water flow diversions to promote agricultural and urban development upstream of the property. This reduction in water flow has caused significant damage to the ecosystem.

Progress on the corrective measures associated with this threat is reported as follows:

- *Raising and bridging the Tamiami Trail, adding new conveyance and seepage management features and revising water management observations to increase water volumes and improve flow distributions to the property:* The State Party recalls that the National Park Service has worked with the Army Corps of Engineers to modify the Central South Florida project, in order to increase critical water flows to the property. This project supplies water and flood control regionally and is responsible for much of the 60% reduction in water availability for the property. To date, efforts to implement the above corrective measures developed when the property was on the List of World Heritage in Danger have resulted in minimal improvements in water volumes and flow distribution. However, the State Party notes that in December 2009, the construction of a one mile bridge and raising of the Tamiami Trail roadway began as part of the second phase of the Modified Water Deliverers (MWD) project, and is expected to be completed in 2013. The roadway improvements will allow the third phase of the MWD project to go forward, i.e. construction of new water conveyance features to move water through the upstream conservation areas and into Northeast Shark River Slough. However, the State Party notes that improvements to water flow under the MWD project will be limited as they will only increase water levels by a small amount.

The State Party concludes that even with the above measures in place by 2013, additional bridging and roadway improvements will be necessary to eliminate the flow impediment created by the Tamiami Trail in the 1920's and redirect the inflows to the historic eastern flow-way, thereby increasing water depths and flooding durations in Northeast Shark River Slough, and eventually leading to the return of wading birds. In 2009, the United States Congress directed the National Park Service to consider the feasibility of additional bridging on the Tamiami Trail in order to allow unconstrained water flows beneath the highway, which will restore habitat with the property. A Feasibility Study on this issue is expected to be available in April 2010. This new infrastructure project, combined with some additional upstream corrective measures, could begin to return the property back to pre-drainage conditions in the early 1900's.

#### b) *Impacts from adjacent urban and agricultural growth*

The State Party reports that agricultural and urban expansion into lower lying lands along the western edge of the Atlantic Coastal Ridge have created demands for increased flood protection, which has had the result of causing significant drainage within the eastern wetlands of the property. Progress on the corrective measures associated with this threat is reported as follows:

- *Complete the C-111 South Dade Project and C-111 Spreader Canal Project and revise water management operations to maintain higher water levels within Taylor Slough:* The State Party reports that all the original South Dade Project features were completed in 2009 and have shown limited benefits for maintaining slightly higher marsh water levels. A new engineering report has recommended an expansion of the C-111 detention area northward to connect with features for the Modified Water Deliveries Project, which would flood mitigation flows to pass southward. The planned completion date for this work is 2014. In addition to the above features, the C-111 Spreader Canal Phase 1 project will construct similar detention areas and other seepage management features to maintain high water levels in southern Taylor slough (to be completed in mid-2012).

The State Party concludes that some unintended detrimental impacts including increased nutrient loadings, elevated phosphorous levels and exotic fish invasions have been associated with the C-111 South Dade Project, and that improved management should minimise these impacts in the expanded water detention features. The State Party notes that while the above projects are a necessary first step, restoration of substantially greater water inflows into Taylor Slough via the newly proposed Tamiami Trail improvement project will be required to re-establish natural ecological conditions.

c) *Increased nutrient pollution from upstream agricultural activities*

The State Party notes that more than 16,200 ha of the property's wetlands show signs of eutrophication impacts, including reduced dissolved oxygen levels, loss of algal communities, loss of marl prairie habitat, reduced fish productive and loss of wading bird foraging habitat, and that the extent of affected wetland is increasing and compromising the structure and function of the property's aquatic ecosystem. Progress on the corrective measures associated with this threat is reported as follows:

- *Achieve compliance with the settlement agreement in United States v. South Florida Water Management District by further reducing phosphorous at its source and construction additional storm water treatment areas:* The State Party reports that the settlement agreement, which is now in its 19th year of implementation has achieved significant progress with a 44% reduction in total phosphorous loads entering the property. However, the State Party notes that recent inflows along the Tamiami Trail in 2008 and 2009, while not exceeding the long-term phosphorous limit are currently right at this limit, which suggests that additional water quality improvements are required. The State Party is evaluating these options, including additional source controls and increasing the size of storm water treatment areas, but that an additional 8-10 years will be required for these measures to be implemented.

d) *Protection and management of Florida Bay*

The State Party notes that at present Florida Bay remains stressed from persistent hypersaline conditions, recurring algal blooms and die-off of sea grass. Most of these issues have been caused by reduction in freshwater inflows and the productivity necessary to maintain estuarine fish communities, which has resulted in a significant reduction in wading bird and marine shorebird communities. Progress on the corrective measures associated with this threat is as follows:

- *Complete construction of the C-111 South Dade Project and the C-111 Spreader Canal Phase 1 project to reduce seepage losses and increase flows to the eastern basins of the property:* The C-111 South Dade Project and the C-111 Spreader Canal Phase 1 Project are designed to create a nearly continuous groundwater ridge along the eastern border of Taylor Slough to retain water within this watershed and redirect flows to the central region of Florida Bay. The State Party considers that in the future it will be important to focus on increasing the volume of freshwater delivered, as well as their quality, timing, and that substantial inflows into Northeast Shar River Slough will be required to restore freshwater inflows to the Bay, reduce salinity and restore



the estuarine ecosystem. The State Party notes that a planned Florida Bay Feasibility Study is on hold and should be reinitiated as the above projects progress, in order to evaluate the cumulative effectiveness of the planned restoration efforts and any additional improvements that may be needed to restore the Bay.

e) *Vulnerability assessment to climate change and sea-level rise*

The State Party considers that restoring the Everglades ecosystem is the best way to ensure that the property is resilient to climate change. The report notes that Everglades National Park is undertaking monitoring and research to address many of the identified species and communities at risk from climate change, and is examining modelling and decision support options to bring integrated, science-based adaptive management to climate change and sea level rise issues facing the property. Restoring historic freshwater flows can serve as a climate change adaptation tool by providing the freshwater necessary to offset (at least partially) saltwater transgressions as sea level rises. The State Party concludes that maintaining freshwater habitats for as long as possible gives species critical time to adapt or succeed gradually.

f) *List of World Heritage in Danger*

The State Party recalls that the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1993 due to the impacts of Hurricane Andrew and substantial decreases in water inflow to the property and deterioration of its ecosystem due to nearly five decades of the operation of the Central and South Florida project, combined with worsening water quality due to urbanisation and agriculture. While the World Heritage Committee decided to remove the property in 2007 due to efforts to restore the park and its wider ecosystem, the State Party considers that these goals have not been fully implemented, nor are fully underway, and that the restoration goals for increased water quantity and flow and increased water quality are not realised. The State Party notes that without the implementation of the planned Everglades' restoration projects, the property will continue to experience irreversible loss of its values and integrity.

The State Party reports that key ecological indicators have continued to deteriorate. Wading bird population sizes are only 5-10% of the levels observed in the early 1900's, and algal blooms lead to mortality of estuarine species, including sea grasses, sponges and corals, and degrade the habitats for important marine species such as pink shrimp. Moreover, populations of large predators are decreasing, including those of the threatened American crocodile.

As a result of the continuing degradation of the property, evidenced through monitoring of key ecological indicators, the United States recommend that the World Heritage Committee consider relisting the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger for a short period of time until the corrective measures to improve water quantity and flow are implemented, and to allow the State Party the opportunity to monitor the biologic response to determine if the property's ecosystem responds positively to these measures. As part of this process, the State Party requests a joint IUCN/ / World Heritage Centre mission to evaluate the state of conservation of the property in 2010, and to assist the National Park Service and its partners in developing a desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN commend the State Party for requesting the World Heritage Committee to consider re-inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. They concur with the State Party's analysis that the threats to the property continue to be serious, and recall IUCN's view, expressed at the World Heritage Committee in 2007, that the property remains in ascertained danger of losing the values for which it was inscribed on the World Heritage List. While some progress has been made towards meeting a number of the original nine corrective measures established by the Committee, many of these have not been implemented to date, as acknowledged by the State Party

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN agree with the State Party that the current nine corrective measures are insufficient to secure the long-term restoration and preservation of the Everglade's aquatic ecosystem, as evidenced by the limited improvements in water level occasioned by the implementation of some of the corrective measures. They also welcome the State Party proposal to consider the feasibility of additional bridging on the Tamiami Trail in order to allow unconstrained water flows beneath the highway, and restore historical water flow volumes and pathways through the property, thereby securing long-term ecosystem function. They consider that the implementation of these projects is critical to ensuring the restoration and preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Therefore, they strongly urge the State Party to finalise the Feasibility Plan for additional bridging on the Tamiami Trail, as well as the plans for additional upstream corrective measures, and to reinstate the planned Florida Bay Feasibility Study. Copies of these feasibility studies and plans should be provided to the World Heritage Centre as soon as they become available.

With regard to the threat of climate change and sea level rise, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN endorse the State Party's view that the effective restoration of the Everglade's aquatic ecosystem would be the single greatest contribution to mitigating these. Therefore, the implementation of an expanded restoration project is essential to not only contribute to restoring the property's Outstanding Universal Value, but also preserve it over the medium and long-term.

Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre has asked the State Party to keep it informed of any impacts from the Gulf of Mexico Oil Spill that begun in April 2010, and will inform the world Heritage Committee accordingly.

**Draft Decision:        34 COM 7B.29**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.30**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes with concern that the property's aquatic ecosystem continues to deteriorate, and commends the State Party's initiative in requesting that the World Heritage Committee consider re-inscribing on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
4. ***Decides to inscribe Everglades National Park (United States of America) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;***
5. *Welcomes the State Party's proposal to consider the feasibility of additional bridging on the Tamiami Trail, which if implemented should restore historical water flow volumes and pathways through the property and secure long-term ecosystem function;*
6. *Encourages the State Party to finalise the Feasibility Plan for additional bridging on the Tamiami Trail, as well as the plans for additional upstream corrective measures, and to reinstate the planned Florida Bay Feasibility Study as soon as possible, and requests the State Party to submit copies of these documents to the World Heritage Centre;*
7. *Considers that the single most effective strategy to preserve the Everglade's aquatic ecosystem in the face of climate change and sea level rise is the rapid implementation of the additional proposed restoration projects noted above;*

8. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property, contribute to establishing a Desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and revise the current corrective measures as necessary;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed state of conservation report, including information on the progress in implementing additional restoration projects and progress in reaching the Desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

### 30. Iguazu National Park (Argentina) (N 303)

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

### 31. Iguaçú National Park (Brazil) (N355)

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

### 32. 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

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**31COM 7B.36; 32COM 7B.35; 33COM 7B.35**

International Assistance

Conservation, amount: 231,350 USD

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

February 2008: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property 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).

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/205>

Current conservation issues

On 15 February 2010, the World Heritage Centre received a report on the state of conservation report from the State Party of Panama. The report appears to have been translated by computer and not subsequently proof-read. As a result, the report is very difficult to understand. The report details the progress achieved in identifying mitigation measures for the four planned hydroelectric dams on the Changuinola and Bonyic rivers: CHAN 75, CHAN 140 and CHAN 220 (Changuinola river) and the Bonyic dam (Bonyic river). Two of these dams, CHAN 75 and Bonyic, are nearing completion. While the report provides details on the legal requirements for environmental assessments in Panama, and lists the terms and conditions of construction permits, it provides little concrete information on the measures proposed to mitigate the impacts of the above dams in order to maintain the migratory corridors of fish and shrimp species within the property.

a) *Mitigating the impacts of hydroelectric dams on fish and shrimp species in the Changuinola and Bonyic rivers*

The State Party briefly overviews the proposed mitigation measures for the CHAN 75, 140 and 220 dams and the Bonyic dam, which are outside the property's boundaries, but affect waterways within the property, as an important proportion of these flow into the Changuinola and Bonyic systems:

- i. *CHAN 75, 140 and 220 dams (Changuinola River)*: The State Party considers that the migration corridors of fish and shrimp species will not be threatened, given that these species are also found in other areas. The report notes that AES Changuinola, the company constructing the dams, has developed a '*Proposed mitigation strategy for fish and shrimp*', which recommends two main mitigation measures: 1) construction of spawning channels mimicking the high water flow required by some fish species to reproduce; and 2) aquaculture cultivation upstream of the dam for those fish and shrimp species unable to reproduce due to the dams. In response to the above proposed mitigation measures, Panama's environmental authority (ANAM) requested AES Changuinola to create an environmental management unit to monitor the impacts of the dam, to undertake other biological studies, and to consider carrying out modelling their likely impacts. The State Party considers that artificial spawning channels are not necessarily a viable mitigation measure for the CHAN 75 dam, currently under construction, and notes that they have requested AES Changuinola to further investigate aquaculture so that both mitigation measures may be applied over the short term. The State Party also details the legislation enabling the Government of Panama to request additional mitigation measures for infrastructure projects or order payment/ compensation for environmental damage.
- ii. *Bonyic dam (Bonyic River)*: The State Party notes that the mitigation measures proposed by Teribe Hydroecological S.A. for the Bonyic project are reflected in their Business Plan. However, these general commitments simply state that the company in question will implement mitigation measures, undertake ecological surveys, and build a research station to monitor and study fish in the region.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the brief report submitted by the Government of Panama does not fully address the Committee's repeated requests for a detailed technical report on the measures proposed to mitigate the likely serious impacts of the four proposed dams on the values and integrity of the property (as per Decision **33 COM 7B.35**). They recall that the life cycles of the fish and shrimp species concerned are reliant on being able to migrate between the rivers within the property and the sea, and note that the dams will create a migratory barrier that, without effective mitigation measures, will most likely result in the loss of up to 16 fish and shrimp species from most of the property's waterways.

- i. *Adequacy of the mitigation measures proposed by the State Party*: IUCN and the World Heritage Centre consider that the mitigation measures proposed by the State Party of Panama for the proposed dams, namely construction of spawning channels

(also known as fish passes) and aquaculture, are inadequate to fully mitigate their likely negative impacts. IUCN notes that few, if any, fish passes for tropical migratory fish and shrimp species have been successfully implemented, and that their elaboration is complicated by the wide variety of body size and seasonality of migration exhibited by the affected species. Moreover, IUCN considers that aquaculture is not an appropriate mitigation strategy as it does not maintain river corridor function and very little is known about the life cycles of the species concerned. The development of aquaculture would necessitate, in IUCN's view, several multi-year research projects prior to dam construction. While the State Party report suggests that mitigation at the regional scale might be possible, i.e. mitigating the damage to the Changuinola and Bonyic rivers by protecting other rivers, namely the Teribe, this does not in IUCN's view constitute mitigation as these rivers, which are within the property, are already adequately protected.

- ii. *The potential secondary and cumulative effects of the dams on the property's values and integrity:* IUCN considers that it is highly probable that the effects of the dams will extend beyond the loss of species, and result in serious secondary impacts on biodiversity within the property. IUCN notes that construction of the CHAN 75 dam in particular would result in the loss of the most numerous and largest fish and shrimp species over 500 kilometres of streams, and would therefore most likely impact predatory birds, reptiles and mammals. Moreover, construction of the dams could increase accessibility to the park, and potentially lead to increased encroachment, poaching and illegal logging. Ultimately, the impacts of the dam upstream would also affect the ecosystems downstream, as the periodic upstream migration of larval fish and shrimp, would be reduced, with concomitant reductions in the amount of food available for predators.
- iii. *The urgent need to undertake a transboundary Strategic Environmental Assessment of all dam proposals affecting the property:* IUCN and the World Heritage Centre urge both the State Party of Panama and the State Party of Costa Rica to consider the collective impact of all proposed dams on the property's values and integrity through a transboundary Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), including a comprehensive options assessment, to identify the least environmentally damaging solutions for their energy and water resource management needs. Moreover, the Government of Panama is strongly encouraged to follow the recommendations on of the World Commission on Dams regarding dam planning and construction (available at [http://www.unep.org/dams/WCD/report/WCD\\_DAMS%20report.pdf](http://www.unep.org/dams/WCD/report/WCD_DAMS%20report.pdf)).

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that it will likely be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to adequately mitigate the habitat loss and fragmentation effects of the proposed dams on the property's freshwater ecosystem, and that the possible secondary and cumulative effects of eliminating up to 16 migratory aquatic species within portions of the property may significantly affect predatory bird and mammal populations. Until the State Party of Panama investigates alternatives to the four proposed dams through a detailed transboundary Strategic Environmental Assessment process, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that all dam construction be halted to safeguard the property's values and integrity.

The potential loss of key migratory fish and shrimp species from up to 70% of the property's rivers poses a potential danger to the property's Outstanding Universal Value and integrity, as per paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee consider inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 35th session in 2011, in the absence of substantial progress in undertaking a detailed transboundary Strategic Environmental Assessment of the different dam proposals affecting the property. The joint report that is due to be submitted by the State

Parties of Panama and Costa Rica at the World Heritage Committee's 35th session in 2011 should provide an opportunity to evaluate the conclusions of an eventual transboundary SEA concerning dam site selection.

*b) Other conservation issues of concern – Additional proposed dams within the property*

IUCN has received reports that a further eight dams are proposed for the Atlantic slope of La Amistad, as well as one large and several smaller dams for the Pacific slope of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that these dams should also be evaluated within a transboundary Strategic Environmental Assessment.

*c) Other conservation issues of concern - Plans to build a road traversing the property from north Boquete to the province of Bocas del Toro*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are seriously concerned by reports that the State Party of Panama is planning to build a road from north Boquete to the province of Bocas del Toro, in conjunction with intensive tourism development, and note that this project is listed in the *Panama Government Strategic Plan for 2010-2016*. They consider that this road, if built, would seriously degrade the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. As per Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the State Party should inform the World Heritage Committee about any such plans so that appropriate solutions can be identified.

*d) Other conservation issues of concern – presence of cattle within the property*

Decision **32 COM 7B.35** (Quebec, 2008) requested the State Party of Panama to deal with the issue of cattle within the property. Decision **33 COM 7B.35** (Seville, 2009) noted with concern that the state of conservation report from the State Party of Panama lacked sufficient detail to be considered as a response to Decision **32 COM 7B.35**. No further information on this issue has since been provided. There is as yet no reason to believe that this issue is being addressed. Under these circumstances, the apparent lack of action on behalf of the State Party in resolving the problem of cattle moving about the property remains a source of increasing concern.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.32**

*The World Heritage Committee;*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.35**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes with utmost concern that the dams currently under construction on the Changuinola and Bonyic rivers are highly likely to result in both the direct loss of up to 16 species of migratory fish and shrimp species, as well as having potential negative secondary impacts on biodiversity within the property;*
4. *Considers that the mitigation measures proposed to maintain the migratory corridors of the affected species, namely fish passes and aquaculture, are inadequate to effectively mitigate the impacts of the proposed dams;*
5. *Requests the Government of Panama and the Government of Costa Rica to consider the collective impact of all proposed dams, including those under construction, likely to affect the property's values and integrity through a transboundary Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), in order to identify the least environmentally damaging options to meet energy and water management needs;*

6. Also requests the State Party of Panama to halt all dam construction until a detailed transboundary Strategic Environmental Assessment process is undertaken, in order to safeguard the property's values and integrity;
7. Also notes with concern the State Party of Panama's intention to build a road traversing the property from north Boquete to the province of Bocas del Toro, which would seriously degrade its integrity, and further requests the State Party to submit any preliminary environmental assessments to the World Heritage Centre as soon as these become available;
8. Reiterates its request to the State Party that measures be adopted to ensure the complete removal of cattle from the property;
9. Recalls its request to the Governments of Panama and Costa Rica to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a joint report on the state of conservation of the property, and requests furthermore that this report include an update on the progress achieved in undertaking a transboundary dam SEA, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

### 33. Alejandro de Humboldt National Park (Cuba) (N 839 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2001

Criteria  
(ix) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
**31 COM 7B.37; 32COM 7B.36; 33COM 7B.36**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
Potential impacts from mining activities

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/839>

#### Current conservation issues

In response to the World Heritage Committee's Decision **33 COM 7B.36**, the State Party submitted on 22 February 2010 a state of conservation report outlining the progress



achieved in enhancing the management of the property. However, the report does not address the World Heritage Committee's repeated requests for a commitment to close down the mining concessions granted within the boundaries of the property, and those in its periphery, that could seriously and irreversibly affect the property's Outstanding Universal Value and integrity if activated.

a) *Mining concession within, and in the periphery of, the properties boundaries*

While the State Party notes that no mining surveys or exploitation have occurred within the property since 1995, it does not address the central issue raised by the World Heritage Committee (Decisions **32 COM 7B.36** and **33 COM 7B.36**), namely: "to make a clear and unequivocal commitment to close down the mining concessions granted within the boundaries of the property, or those in its periphery that could affect the property." A letter to this effect was sent to the State Party by the World Heritage Centre on 1 April 2009. The on-going existence of mining concessions in the property represents, in the view of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, an expression of intent to mine these areas in the future. If not clearly addressed by the State Party, the continued existence of mining concessions must be considered as a potential threat, as per Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The values for which this property was inscribed on the World Heritage List under criteria (ix) and (x) are intrinsically linked to the maintenance of the existing ecosystems and of the varied topography and complex underlying geology that have given rise to one of the most biologically diverse tropical islands sites on Earth. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that any open mining would lead to the loss of the Outstanding Universal Value of this property, and make a clear case for delisting this property from the World Heritage List.

b) *Progress achieved in enhancing the management of the property*

The State Party reports that the first annual Operational Plan, forming part of the Management Plan for 2009-2013, has been implemented and that management activities to date include targeted prevention of forest fires, restoration of habitats damaged by hurricane Ike in September 2008, implementation of soil conservation measures, control of invasive species, ecotourism infrastructure maintenance, and environmental education. Support has been received from Green Gold and the UNESCO Man and Biosphere Programme to help address the disturbances caused by the hurricane in the communities of Cuchillas del Toa Biosphere Reserve, of which the property is the core area. The report also notes that a hurricane recovery evaluation was undertaken at the end of 2009. This evaluation was linked to community training programs focused on climate change adaptation through land management, control of forest fires, and control of invasive species.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress achieved in implementing the 2009 Operation Plan. The damage caused by Hurricane Ike, which affected forest areas throughout several sectors of the park, does not appear to have created serious or irreversible impacts to the values and integrity of the property and available evidence appears to confirm that the property is recovering well.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.33**

*The World Heritage Committee;*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.36**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),

3. *Notes the progress achieved by the State Party in implementing the 2009 Operational Plan, which has enhanced the effectiveness of management of the property;*
4. *Notes with appreciation the information provided by the State Party that the industry ministry has confirmed that at present no mining is planned in the property, but considers that the continued existence of mining concessions must be considered as a potential threat to the property, as per Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines;*
5. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to make a clear and unequivocal commitment to eliminate the mining concessions granted within the boundaries of the property (in line with the international policy statement of the International Council of Mining and Metals (ICMM) of not undertaking these activities in World Heritage properties), and those in its periphery, that could seriously and irreversibly affect its Outstanding Universal Value and integrity if activated;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the specific actions confirming the elimination of all mining concessions that could affect the property, and updating the World Heritage Committee on any other factors significantly affecting the values and integrity of the property.*

#### **34. Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

#### **35. Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve (Mexico) (N 1290)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

#### **36. Manu National Park (Peru) (N 402)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

Minor modification 2009

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 7B.41; 32 COM 7B.39; 33 COM 8B.39**

International Assistance

conservation, amount: 60,000 USD

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

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

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/402>

Current conservation issues

On 2 March 2010, the State Party submitted a short report on the state of conservation of the property. This report provides an overview of the multiple threats currently affecting the property, including agricultural encroachment, cattle ranching, illegal logging and the management and financing situation.

a) *Agricultural encroachment*

The State Party notes that agriculture is mainly undertaken by indigenous peoples to sustain their livelihoods and thus has little impact on the integrity of the property. The report further notes that human occupation is restricted to a limited area representing only 2.32% of the total area of the property, and that this area coincides with the "Special Use Zone" of the Manu Biosphere Reserve. This zone is mostly occupied by indigenous peoples groups that lived in the area prior to the establishment of the National Park. Key threats to the integrity of the park are associated to the expansion of the agricultural frontier, including coca cultivation in the buffer zone, increasing livestock, illegal extraction of timber and non-timber forest resources, as well as illegal hunting and fishing. The report does not provide an assessment on the trends of these threats and their impact on the conservation of the property. IUCN has received reports that the population of the agricultural community of Callanga is increasing, resulting in more livestock and more land being converted to agriculture in the area.

b) *Cattle ranching*

The report indicates that cattle ranching, which existed before the creation of the park, is limited to the recovery zone of the property in line with existing agreements to temporarily maintain this activity. Whilst the report notes that the number of cattle cannot be increased, it does not provide any information on the number of cattle currently present, nor whether this is impacting the integrity of the property. IUCN has received reports that the high altitude areas of the park are being degraded by grazing. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the State Party explore the possibility of addressing this issue through REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) processes, with the long-term aim of excluding all domestic animals from the property and a program of reforestation and recuperation of natural vegetation cover in the area.

c) *Illegal logging*

The State Party notes that logging mainly consists in the collection of trunks fallen and dragged by the Manu River during the rainy season due to the erosion of the river banks by flooding. The report indicates that these trees are mainly used by local communities living in the buffer zone of the park. However, IUCN notes that it continues to receive reports of illegal logging within the property, particularly illegal mahogany logging.

d) *Management and financing*

The State Party report notes that the financial resources allocated to managing the park have increased from USD 205,719 in 2009 to USD 260,221 in 2010. However, no information is provided on whether or not these resources are sufficient to manage a park that is over 1.7 million ha with very difficult conditions for patrolling and control. It is also noted that the State Party is in the process of updating the Management Plan for the property and of establishing the Park's Management Committee, involving all key local actors and stakeholders. The report does not provide information on the timeframe and deadlines to finalize the updated Management Plan and to initiate its implementation. Information is also provided on the ongoing efforts of the State Parties of Peru and Bolivia to develop the Vilcabamba-Amboro Corridor which includes Manu National Park. However, no further details are provided on activities implemented so far under this initiative, nor on the effectiveness of these efforts in enhancing the conservation and management of the property.

e) *Oil concessions*

IUCN notes that it has received reports of exploration for oil in a concession block adjacent to the property. While there is no oil exploitation allowed or scheduled within the property, IUCN has received reports that in the event of exploitation an oil pipeline would be built, which might traverse the property to unite with the Camisea pipeline. There are also other risks that should be taken into account regarding the property should oil exploitation proceed in adjacent areas. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that an oil pipeline traversing the property would have adverse effects on its values and integrity and urge the State Party to exclude Manu National Park as a possible pipeline route, and to ensure that adjacent oil exploration and exploitation does not impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and to notify the World Heritage Centre of any such plans, as requested in Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

f) *Increasing coca plantations within the park*

IUCN has received reports from that illegal coca plantations in or near the park boundary in the Kosnipata valley are increasing, which is of concern as it may affect the integrity of the property.

g) *Planned road between Boca Manu and Boca Colorado*

IUCN has received reports that the construction of a new road from Boca Manu to Boca Colorado has begun. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned about the adverse effects this road may have in the buffer zone of the property, including facilitation illegal logging and poaching, which may also indirectly adversely affect the property's values.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN continue to receive reports of illegal activities affecting the conservation of the property, particularly from agricultural encroachment and illegal logging. Given the multiple localised threats currently affecting the property's values, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that a reactive monitoring mission is needed to evaluate the state of conservation of the property and determine the significance of these threats and appropriate responses.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.36**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.39**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Regrets that the State Party has not provided a more detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including full details on the reported threats and any other potential threats directly and indirectly affecting the integrity of the property, along with management's response to these threats, as requested in Decision **32 COM 7B.39**;
4. Reiterates its concern about continued reports of threats to the conservation and integrity of the property, including incidents of deforestation, agricultural encroachment, invasion and insecurity;
5. Expresses its concern about reports of oil exploration adjacent to the property and the possibility of an oil pipeline traversing the property, and strongly urges the State Party to exclude Manu National Park as a possible oil pipeline route and to consider the possible impacts of the oil exploration adjacent to the property on its Outstanding Universal Value;
6. Also expresses its concern about reports that the construction of a new road from Boca Manu to Boca Colorado outside the property's boundaries has begun, which may directly affect the property's buffer zone and indirectly affect its values by facilitating illegal logging and poaching;
7. Requests the State Party to submit the Environmental Impact Assessments for the road from Boca Manu to Boca Colorado, as well as for any future oil exploration adjacent to the property, to the World Heritage Centre as soon as these are available;
8. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ IUCN reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property;
9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

**37. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161)**

See Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add (Complementary information received late)

## **MIXED PROPERTIES**

### **ASIA-PACIFIC**

#### **38. Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982 / 1989

Criteria

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

Previous Committee Decisions

**30 COM 7B.32; 31 COM 7B.43; 32 COM 7B.41**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Commercial logging in areas adjacent to the World Heritage property

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/181>

#### Current conservation issues

On 1st February 2010 the State Party submitted a report on the State of Conservation of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA). This provided detailed information on issues previously considered by the World Heritage Committee, and as requested in World Heritage Committee Decision **32 COM 7B.41**.

With respect to the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **32 COM 7B.41**, the State Party reported as follows:

a) *Matters related to the management of the existing World Heritage property*

- *Stakeholder involvement and monitoring:* In collaboration with the Australian Government, the Tasmanian Government is considering a range of options to establish the most appropriate and representative framework to monitor, assess and manage the TWWHA and adjoining reserves for ecological integrity. The roles and arrangements for stakeholder involvement and engagement in TWWHA management are also being considered in the context of a national review of World Heritage advisory committees and executive officers, to be completed in March 2010. A national agreement on the establishment of property specific World Heritage Advisory Committees is being discussed, and the State Party reports that it is envisaged that there will be a bilateral agreement regarding an improved mechanism by June 2010. This is stated to also be a critical consideration in the processes for future monitoring, assessment and reporting on the TWWHA and adjacent areas, including in the context of the next review of the TWWHA management plan.

- *Mineral exploration, exploitation and rehabilitation:* The State Party states that it considers mining to be inappropriate in the World Heritage property, notes that the Southwest Conservation Area, south of Melaleuca to Cox Bight, should be incorporated into the property as soon as the existing mining leases expire, and that renewal or granting of any new leases should not be considered. It reports that the Governments are working together to resolve other existing exploration license arrangements, such as those in the area of Adamsfield. The State Party reiterates its view that the National Environmental Legislation protects the values of the property from internal and external threats, including mining.
- *Resourcing for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage:* The State Party notes that additional funds and resources have been made available for Aboriginal cultural heritage identification and management within, and around, the property, and for Aboriginal community capacity building. This support includes an additional AU\$ 387,500 from the Australian Government for an Aboriginal heritage project inside the property.
- *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage management outside property:* Forestry Tasmania have endorsed all recommendations from the 2008 Reactive Monitoring Mission, including enhanced protection measures for archaeological and Aboriginal sites within and adjacent to the TWWHA.
- *Logging Roads:* The State Party notes that through the application of the Tasmanian Forest Practices Code, and relevant recommendations emanating from the 2008 Second Five Yearly Review of the Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement, the ecological integrity and aesthetic values of the property, and possible cultural sites, continue to be taken into account in the planning and management of forest harvesting operations, including logging roads in areas adjacent to the TWWHA. Decisions on the reclamation and rehabilitation of the adjacent logging roads no longer needed for forestry purposes are taken in the context of future recreational opportunities, and the zoning of adjacent areas, within the TWWHA.
- *Vegetation Management:* The Tasmanian Government is reviewing vegetation management planning for the TWWHA and adjoining forest reserves in the light of several initiatives, including the next review of the TWWHA Management Plan, the management of the expanded TWWHA area (once the above boundary modification is adopted), and initiatives already under way relating to managing the risks to vegetation from fire and climate change.
- *Second Five-Yearly Review of Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement:* In January 2010 a detailed Joint Australian and Tasmanian Government Response to the “Second Five Yearly Review of Progress with Implementation of the Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement” was released. This sets out a range of actions to address each recommendation and their implementation targets.
- *Climate Change:* The risks of climate change to the property have been identified and assessed, and this information is incorporated in an active monitoring program and risk management strategy.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note that the State Party report includes information regarding commitments and work undertaken since the last World Heritage Committee Decision. The recognition of inappropriate mining is an important statement, and the commitment to add the Melaleuca-Cox Bight area to the property after mining licences expire is also welcomed. The review of the Tasmania RFA also provides a public statement on improvements sought in relation to the overall management of forestry in Tasmania.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received a number of detailed reports from nature conservation NGOs, and an Australian Senator, one of which was submitted with an indication that it is seen by the NGO as a report to the World Heritage Committee. The reports express concern regarding forestry practices in areas adjoining the property,

including the impact of a reported 80 logging coupes within 5km of the property boundary that have been scheduled for exploitation until 2012. Resultant impacts on the integrity of the property are suggested to arise from a variety of factors. These include concern over the reported logging of two coupes that have boundaries that are stated to be contiguous with the property boundary and others near to the boundary, that may expose the area to the risk of “edge effects,” such as vegetation die-back, soil desiccation and increased exposure to wind and sunlight within the property. In addition, the impact of logging on fire risk and water systems; the direct and indirect impacts of associated logging roads as a vector for invasive species and diseases; habitat fragmentation; impacts of logging coupes on views out of and into the property, are amongst other cited concerns. It is reported that, in the past year, a further eleven coupes have been subject to logging, and an additional two, mainly in the Upper Florentine Valley and Styx Valley, have been impacted by road construction and operations. NGO submissions express dissatisfaction regarding the consultations between the State Party and key stakeholders over the last two years regarding the logging of forest surrounding the TWWHA.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note the progress towards the establishment of a monitoring mechanism that could involve all relevant stakeholders, and that the completion of such a mechanism can be anticipated following the conclusion of the national review of World Heritage governance and advisory Committees in June 2010. They consider that an agreed, objective system is essential to underpin the assessment of the degree to which adjoining activities impact or have the potential to impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Such arrangements could, over time, lead to enhanced dialogue and a better consensus on the balance of land uses between logging and provision for conservation in the forests that surround the property, including those areas that have previously been noted as having potential for eventual addition to the property. IUCN considers that logging coupes close to or contiguous with the property boundary could pose avoidable risks to its integrity, and is concerned at continued reports of such logging.

*b) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

The State Party has prepared a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the Committee’s consideration that, it considers, better reflects all the values of the property, and the cultural landscape elements. The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies welcome the submission of the draft, which will be carefully reviewed in collaboration with the State Party, for presentation to the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee for adoption.

*c) Boundaries of the property*

The State Party report includes a proposal that would add a total of 23,873 hectares to the property, which already extends to 1.38 million hectares, or 20% of the area of the State of Tasmania. Supported by a map illustrating the boundary modification, this proposal – which will be considered as a “minor modification” by the World Heritage Committee under the corresponding item - responds to the recommendations from the 2008 Reactive Monitoring Mission to include adjacent reserves, provides for a more coherent management regime, and increases the representation of tall eucalyptus forest in the TWWHA. When mining licenses have expired, the State Party also proposes to add the area of Melaleuca to Cox Bight to the property.

The State Party was requested by the Committee, in Decision **32 COM 7B.41**, to consider, at its discretion, a potential extension of the property to include additional areas considered by IUCN and ICOMOS to have potential to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value. Apart from the addition of the 21 adjacent formal reserves, and the Southwest Conservation Area south of Melaleuca to Cox Bight, the State Party does not propose to further extend the boundary of the TWWHA. It considers the addition of the 21 adjacent formal reserves sufficiently representative of tall eucalypt forests, and cultural sites of significance to the Aboriginal community, in the property.



The reports received from NGOs and other conservation interests consider that the 21 adjacent formal reserves are not sufficiently representative of tall eucalypt forests, and identify areas they consider should be added as a further extension to the property. The extent of areas they consider meet World Heritage criteria could extend to 806,000ha, including areas currently managed as part of the TWWHA Management Plan. Biodiversity surveys recently conducted by NGOs report evidence of vulnerable and endangered species in coupes scheduled for logging in the Upper Florentine Valley. The reports strongly recommend that the TWWHA boundaries be extended to include the surrounding high conservation value forests, and request the World Heritage Committee to call on the State Party to implement an immediate moratorium on all forest operations within 2km of the TWWHA boundary, noting that logging of these areas clearly limits the possibility to include them in any possible extension of the property.

IUCN carefully considered the above issues in the advice it provided in the State of Conservation Report to the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee. It considered the evidence of ecological surveys of the area, the information provided by the State Party at the time of inscription and extension of the property, and the different expert missions to the property. IUCN reiterates its position, as reported to the 33rd session, regarding the potential of areas adjoining the property to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value. IUCN acknowledges that it is a matter for the State Party to consider whether to proceed with any extension, but regrets that a more positive approach of the State Party to considering the request in the previous decision of the World Heritage Committee has not been forthcoming to date, and that areas with potential for addition to the property have continued to be subject to logging. As the property is a mixed property, ICOMOS notes that any proposal for extension would need to consider the relevance, within the added area, of the same cultural criteria used for the inscribed property. This would have to be based on archaeological evidence resulting from adequate surveys and documentation.

In summary, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recognize the progress made in the management of the property in response to the last Committee decision whilst noting the continued lack of agreement between the State Party, logging and conservation concerns over the management of the adjacent forest reserves and the management of the impacts of adjacent logging on the integrity of the property. The conclusion of an agreed monitoring framework involving all stakeholders, as previously requested by the World Heritage Committee appears to remain highly important to resolving these issues.

**.Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.38**

*The World Heritage Committee;*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B;*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.41**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008);*
3. *Recognizes the efforts made by the State Party to address the actions requested in Decision **32 COM 7B.41**;*
4. *Welcomes the submission of a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property;*
5. *Thanks the State Party for proposing a minor modification to include 21 formal reserves within the property that are already covered by the TWWHA Management Plan,*

*welcomes its commitment to add the Melaleuca-Cox Bight area to the property once mining licences have expired, and also recalls its request regarding the potential for further additional areas to be considered at the discretion of the State Party for eventual addition to the property;*

- 6. Notes the potential for impact on the integrity of the existing World Heritage property from adjoining forestry operations, and requests the State Party to maintain rigorous assessment and management systems to ensure that no such impacts arise;*
- 7. Requests the State Party to finalise as soon as possible the creation of a mechanism involving all relevant stakeholders, to monitor, assess and manage the impact of forestry operations, road construction and regeneration on the integrity of the TWWHA, and adjoining reserves, as previously requested by the Committee;*
- 8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, especially on the outcomes of the monitoring arrangements focusing specifically on the impact of the logging operations and road construction on the Outstanding Universal Value of the existing property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

## EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

### 39. Pyrénées – Mont Perdu (France / Spain) (C/N 773 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997; extension in 1999

Criteria

(iii) (iv) (v) (vii) (viii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 7B.44; 32 COM 7B.42; 33 COM 7B.40**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1998: UNESCO visit; July 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Impacts of the Gavarnie Festival (France);
- b) insufficient support for agroastoralism;
- c) inefficient transboundary cooperation.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/773>

#### Current conservation issues

The States Parties of France and Spain submitted two separate state of conservation reports on 1 February 2010, in relation to the issues raised in Decision **33 COM 7B.40**, on (a) transboundary management arrangements, (b) increased support for Agropastoralism, (c) the impacts of the Gavarnie Festival, (d) the closure of the Troumouse Road. A joint report by the State Parties, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, was not submitted. In addition to the points reported on below, the report of the State Party of France contains a useful résumé of points of progress in the management of the property in the last ten years.

#### a) *Transboundary Management Arrangements*

Both State Party reports confirm the establishment of a Charter of Cooperation between the two relevant national park authorities: Parc National d'Ordesa et du Monte Perdido (Spain) and the Parc National des Pyrénées (France), and of a nine-person Joint Steering Committee including both park agencies as well as other stakeholder representatives for its implementation. The six-page text of the Charter is provided in the Spanish State Party report. The States Parties also provide details, in different forms, of joint activities that are foreseen to be undertaken as well as details of a number of transboundary meetings and technical working groups that are in operation, as well as a proposal for a bid to the EU Interreg IV programme regarding joint management. The Charter indicates that the States Parties view the two national parks as the main guarantors of the management of the property, and establishes common high level objectives for both Parks. The Charter specifies mechanisms of cooperation via the presence of observer seats on each others management bodies for the other park, and two meetings annually: one at directorate level, and one at

technical level. A number of points of cooperation are noted, at the general level, on topics such as sustainable development, monitoring, joint planning, coordination of information, signage and school exchanges. A plan of action related to the Charter is also provided in the report by Spain, whilst the report by France notes a number of “perspectives 2010” regarding possible future projects.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies consider that the establishment of the Joint Steering Committee and Charter are positive steps that appear to provide the start of an effective response to the need for strengthened and consistent transboundary management of the property. The full extent of this cooperation is not fully clear from the reports, and durable terms of reference and regular meetings and follow up actions need to be confirmed. The lack of a joint report, as previously requested by the World Heritage Committee, and the differences in the level and nature of the information provided indicate that there is still some way to go to establish a fully functional transboundary approach. As such arrangements inevitably take a considerable period of time to become established, it appears that a reasonable start has been made, however, it is important for continued and strengthened commitment and evidence of concrete results. A fully developed joint management approach appears to be still at least one to two years away from realization and as with other transboundary properties should include a clear joint management plan for the property as whole. In relation to the joint transboundary workshop involving both the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre, which was requested by the World Heritage Committee, the State Party of France mentions that the completion of a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (see below) will help support the effectiveness of such a workshop. Such a workshop remains necessary to fully understand the situation and plans for the future, and to determine the measures required sustaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

b) *Agropastoralism*

The State Party of France reports on a programme for restoration of the pastoral heritage (cabanes) indicating various structures that were restored in 2006 and 2007. There is no mention in the report of any other measures to support the agro-pastoralist systems and no mention in the report from the State Party of Spain on any matters connected to agro-pastoralism.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain concerned that the decision of the Committee that increased support be given to agro-pastoralism as the main process that shaped the cultural landscape, has not been taken into account. They consider that one of the key priorities of the new management agreement should be to ensure that the agro-pastoralist system is seen as the basis for sustainable management of the landscape in both National Parks.

c) *The impacts of the Gavarnie Festival*

The issue of the Gavarnie Festival is reported on by the State Party of France, as it is located on French territory. The State Party of France firstly maintains its position that the impacts of the Gavarnie Festival are not significant regarding the integrity of the property, due to the limit in time and space of the festival, and considers that there are no permanent impacts on the property. The State Party notes a number of measures that were taken for the 2008 and 2009 festivals that it considered to have further reduced its impact. It also notes a number of new measures that are being acted on by the organizers including visitor management, reduction of a number of the festival facilities, provision of public information and decreasing the presence of the festival infrastructure to 8 days before the event, and 3 days afterwards. The State Party further reports that the possibility to transfer the festival to a different location, Prat-Bert, is not possible as the owner of the land seems unwilling to agree to the relocation on his land.

As noted in previous reports the key issue is the incongruity of the presence of the festival with the value for which the property was recognised on the World Heritage List, and the relocation which the State Party of France agreed to undertake at the time of inscription, but

has not been achieved. The World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session requested a detailed plan and schedule for the relocation of the Gavarnie Festival or mitigation of all of its negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies consider that the report does not fully meet this request. However the measures taken, or proposed, do appear to materially reduce the impacts of this event. The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies remain of the view that relocation of the Festival is the only acceptable long-term solution, as advised to the world Heritage Committee at its 33rd session, time is needed to negotiate this outcome, which will take more than a single year of work. As the locality at Prat-Bert is not practicable in the foreseeable future, it is recommended that other alternative locations be investigated, to allow for the transfer of the Festival outside the property. In the meantime, the continued reduction of the impacts of the Festival are welcome, but are not a substitute for the action being undertaken by the State Party of France, in line with the commitment it made at the time of inscription. In previous reports it was also noted that the Festival receives a subvention of public funds from the State authorities, and thus there is a clear means by which the State Party could influence the situation to a more satisfactory outcome, by making its future funding on the condition of relocation.

d) *The closure of the Troumouse Road*

The issue of the closure of the Troumouse Road is reported on by the State Party of France, as it is located on French territory. The State Party reports that the commune of Gèdre is in favour of studies on the options to reorganize the traffic arrangements for the Troumouse Road, and the completion of one phase of an expert study to consider the options for management of the road and surrounding areas in the event of its closure. This envisages closure of the road at Héas, except to busses and authorized users, the establishment of a minibus service to Troumouse, and a programme of landscape restoration and the establishment of additional museographic display spaces. A further study will be undertaken in early 2010 to consider the options for the establishment of the bus services and the economic scenarios. The State Party of France notes that it will remain for the commune of Gèdre to take a decision, recalling the agreed overall objective to close the Troumouse Road to private traffic. If agreed the proposed amendments would be included in a programme of work for the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the announcement of these studies, which if completed and acted upon as outlined in the State Party report, would appear to address the concern previously expressed by the world Heritage Committee. The World Heritage Centre, should be notified about the plans as foreseen in paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. Further information on the agreement to the proposals, and the provision of the necessary funding would also be required.

e) *Other conservation issues – Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

The World Heritage Committee also requested the States Parties to develop a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property, in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies. A first draft of such a statement, not yet been discussed with the Advisory Bodies, is annexed to both State Party reports. This statement does not represent a completed draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value ready for review as it is not in the format required. It is partly in French and partly in Spanish and deals with the French and Spanish components in separate sections. The submitted Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value requires reconsideration before submission to the World Heritage Committee, following further discussion and review with IUCN and ICOMOS, and it is recommended that this is undertaken through the transboundary workshop that has been requested by the World Heritage Committee.

In summary, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that there is evidence of progress in addressing a number of the key issues facing this property, which if

sustained and increased over the coming years could address the most significant issues facing the property. The progress in the establishment of a joint management body, charter and related action plan is the most notable point and appears to be complemented by implementation at both management and operational levels. However, mechanisms to achieve more active support for agro-pastoralism have not been addressed and there is concern that this issue did not feature at all in the report from the State Party of Spain and only briefly in the report from the State Party of France. The positive progress on the Troumouze Road is welcome as a basis for implementation of a long-term solution to this issue. Nevertheless, the continued lack of a joint report, the differences in the format and content of some of the information provided indicates that further efforts are required to fully establish an effective approach. The establishment of structures and processes is also still at an early stage with relative modest results, and needs to be accompanied by the completion of a jointly agreed management plan for the property as a whole, and sustained delivery of policy and action. The issue of the Gavarnie Festival remains unresolved and requires further action by the State Party of France. Its impact cannot simply be redefined as insignificant, considering that its incongruous presence in one of the most important and sensitive locations within the property has been repeatedly identified as having a significant impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

In view of evidence of progress, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that a period of two years should be adopted before a further report on the state of conservation of the property is requested, during which time actions should be completed to (i) establish fully the joint management body, a joint management plan and an ongoing programme of actions and joint reporting, (ii) carry out activities in relation to agropastoralism, (iii) continue to reduce the impacts of the Gavarnie Festival and identify other alternatives for its relocation and (iv) complete and implement the plans for closure of the Troumouze Road. To complement these requirements, the transboundary workshop requested by the Committee should be carried out as soon as possible, to both complete the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property, and to reinforce the development of durable transboundary cooperation and the necessary management and action plans to support this.

**Draft Decision:        34 COM 7B.39**

*The World Heritage Committee;*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.40**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the States Parties of France and Spain on the actions being taken in response to the previous decisions by the World Heritage Committee, but regrets that a joint report was not provided as requested;*
4. *Welcomes the establishment of a Joint Steering Committee and Charter for the property, on a mutually agreed basis, and requests the two States Parties to confirm the terms of reference for the Joint Steering Committee, and to elaborate a jointly agreed management plan for the property as a whole including clear indicators for the operation of the Charter, and an agreed programme of specific joint management actions and projects;*

5. *Remains concerned that increased support for agro-pastoralism that underpins the cultural landscape has not been addressed and reiterates its requests to the two States Parties to provide more proactive management to ensure that agro-pastoralism is seen as key mechanism that underpins the sustainable development of the property;*
6. *Also regrets that, whilst some reductions in the level of impact of the Gavarnie Festival have been undertaken, the request of the World Heritage Committee for the relocation of the Festival or the mitigation of all of its negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has not been implemented, and therefore strongly urges the State Party of France to increase its efforts towards an agreed alternative location for the Festival by 2012;*
7. *Welcomes the progress achieved in the development of plans for the closure of the Troumouse Road, and also urges the State Party of France to complete the necessary studies and implement agreed plans for the closure of the road by 2012;*
8. *Also reiterates its request to the two States Parties to develop with the Joint Steering Committee and the Advisory Bodies a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property, in the correct format by **1 February 2011**;*
9. *Further reiterates its request to the two States Parties to organize a transboundary workshop, before the end of 2010, and in cooperation with the Joint Steering Committee for the property, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to support the establishment and consolidation of a joint vision and management arrangements for the property, as well as to assist the elaboration of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property;*
10. *Also requests the States Parties of France and Spain to submit to the World Heritage Centre, before **1 February 2012**, a single joint report by both States Parties on the progress made in addressing the above recommendations, including the terms of reference and meetings of the Joint Steering Committee, the activities and projects undertaken within the framework of the Charter for Cooperation by the Joint Steering Committee and other actors, increased support for agro-pastoralism and the confirmation of plans for the relocation of the Gavarnie Festival and the closure of the Troumouse Road, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

#### **40. Mount Athos (Greece) (C/N 454)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1988

Criteria  
(i) (ii) (iv) (v) (vi) (vii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
**29 COM 7B.32; 30 COM 7B.34; 32 COM 7B.43**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January/February 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of overall management plan covering both the natural and cultural values of the property;
- b) Risk preparedness study, including seismic preparedness;
- c) Fire damage to Chilandar Monastery;
- d) Timber extraction.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/454>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee decision taken at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) while noting with satisfaction the continuous efforts between the national authorities and the leadership of the monastic community to collaborate effectively, also noted that the submitted State Party reports did not address the need to prepare an overall management framework for the property, as recommended by the joint mission of 2006 and endorsed by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006). The Committee therefore urged the State Party and competent authorities to continue to implement all recommendations of the joint mission.

The State Party submitted a report on 1 February 2010, which includes a report prepared by the Ministry of Tourism and Culture on the “Conservation Works of the 10th Ephorate of Byzantine and post-Byzantine Antiquities during the period 2008-2009” and also a “Supplementary Memorandum from the Holy Community of Mount Athos on the state of conservation of Mt. Athos”, dated December 2009.

The State Party report describes conservation, restoration and excavation works undertaken at seven Mount Athos monasteries during 2008-2009 by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism with European financial support, and on successfully mounting an exposition “Mount Athos and the Byzantine Empire, Treasures from the Holy Mountain” which took place in Paris from April to July 2009. This report does not refer to the requests of the Committee formulated at its 32nd session.

The Holy Community report provides a comprehensive overview of actions taken during 2008-2009 to improve conservation of the World Heritage property including development of a “Mount Athos Digital Ark” with the objective of digitization and systematic electronic documentation of the cultural resources of all of the monasteries, projects concerning buildings and infrastructure (including those concerned with improving safety in the monasteries), projects improving environmental conditions and management (including projects for renewable energy source development, waste management, anti erosion, floodwater management, forest fire management, forest coppice management, natural disaster management for the peninsula), and a framework for comprehensive management of the property’s natural and cultural values.

With reference to the management framework, the Holy Community has made a formal undertaking to prepare a broad management study for Mt. Athos, the first phase of which involves launching a consultant-led, multi-disciplinary preliminary study to help shape the desired management framework. It is expected that the study will address goals of the larger study terms of reference, organisation, methodology, costs and funding. The preliminary study is described as addressing as the main points recommended in the 2006 mission, and seven of these are listed in the Holy Community report, touching key issues important from both cultural and natural heritage perspectives. The report concludes by noting the



importance of conservation activity being carried out in the context of preserving traditional “institutional forms” of Mount Athos and “integrated and systematic response’ in collaboration with the national authorities.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies commend the Holy Community and the national authorities for the progress made since the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee in developing modes of co-operation that respect their respective realities and working parameters, while collaboratively seeking the preservation of the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage property, in ways which maintain and strengthen the spiritual role played by Mt. Athos in the contemporary world.

They welcome the initial steps taken by the Holy Community to develop a management framework for Mt. Athos which will bring cultural and natural heritage together, pursues the objectives established by the 2006 mission, and notes the importance of involving the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre in the early stages of this work to ensure understanding of the Outstanding Universal Value is a key factor in articulating the management framework.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.40**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.43**, adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) session,*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the efforts of the national authorities and the Holy Community of Mount Athos to strengthen collaboration for the long-term conservation of the World Heritage property;*
4. *Also notes with appreciation the report of the Holy Community transmitted through the national authorities concerning efforts to implement all recommendations of the 2006 joint reactive monitoring mission, in particular the development of an overall management framework for the property covering both natural and cultural values, as endorsed by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006);*
5. *Urges the State Party and the Holy Community to consider possibilities to support a multi-disciplinary workshop of key stakeholders to shape the approach to development of the management framework;*
6. *Requests the State Party, in collaboration with the Holy Community, to provide to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2012** a report on progress made in developing an integrated management framework and in implementing the recommendations of the joint 2006 World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN reactive monitoring mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

## 41. Ibiza, Biodiversity and Culture (C 417rev)

### Year of Inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

### Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**23 COM B.1; 33 COM 7B.41**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

November 2009: joint World Heritage / ICOMOS / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Large-scale port expansion planned.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/417>

### Current conservation issues

Following information and press articles on a proposed project for expanding the port of Ibiza and potential impacts on the marine component of the World Heritage property, the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) requested a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to Ibiza, Biodiversity and Culture (Decision **33 COM 7B.41**). Following the invitation by the State Party of Spain the mission took place from 3 to 6 November 2009 to review the port expansion project, evaluate its Environmental Impact Assessment, and assess the state of conservation of the property, its conditions of integrity and authenticity.

The mission reviewed the extensive information provided and held numerous meetings with stakeholders. It concluded that the current overall state of conservation is satisfactory. However, the mission made a number of observations and recommendations to better manage potential threats to the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of this cultural and natural serial World Heritage property. Many issues noted in the detailed mission report available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM> have the potential to have negative effects on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and require urgent and immediate attention by the Spanish authorities. These are specifically:

#### a) *Management including visitor management and site presentation*

The mission recommended that the roles and responsibilities of the different entities responsible for the planning, protection and management of the property, and especially its natural components, be clarified in relation to the overall integrated management of the property and its buffer zone as a whole, and that a shared vision and clear programme of joint actions be established and implemented.

The mission recommended that the authorities complete the project for the Visitor Centre at San Francisco Eremita as soon as possible. Concerning the area of Ses Feixes, the mission encouraged the authorities to improve the site's presentation with panels and explanations on the connection between the natural and cultural parts of the property.

b) *Harbour development and reorganization*

The mission reviewed in detail the proposed development of the port and recognised the need for a reorganization considering international and EU safety requirements, the integrity of the landscape setting, reduction of traffic impacts and visual impacts on the Old City. The mission also noted that the waters of the port area are outside of the property and its buffer zone, whereas the Botafoc area, where major dredging and construction would occur is included in the buffer zone of the cultural component of the property.

The mission was concerned about a number of specific issues including potential direct and indirect impacts on the natural portion of the World Heritage property through: i) effects of the dredging and then the immersion of the dredged materials into the so-called "zona de vertido"; ii) potential loss of archaeological evidence from the Botafoc area; iii) the size of the platform and justification for this size; iv) the lack of conceptual development of the harbour with the overall urban and regional development and traffic concepts for Ibiza and Formentera despite the existence of a territorial plan.

The mission recommended that the proposed port development be carefully reviewed and reconsidered, taking into account these concerns, and in particular to ensure no negative direct or indirect impacts on the natural and cultural aspects of the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property, and in particular to the key species associated with the Posidonia meadows. Furthermore, all port activities should ensure that any any potential visual impacts of constructions in the port area (height of buildings, form and materials) be reviewed in order to prevent any negative visual impacts on the city and the wetlands in the buffer zone and vicinity of the site.

The mission also recommended to:

- carefully assess all potential archaeological finds which could be relevant for the understanding of the site using the latest techniques including testing and to reduce the amount of dredged materials with a possible reduction of the platform, and the re-use of these materials within the platform, to investigate all technical processes to avoid the dispersion of the mud not only inside the port (geotextile barrier) but during the immersion including ensuring no wind and no-current conditions, no immersion in surface, use of pipelines for a deposition at depth (at least under the thermo cline and preferably as deep as possible) in order to reduce the amount of deposition on the deep-bottom;
- to verify and control regularly the quality of the dredged material before re-immersion, and halting deposition in case of punctual contamination by trace-metals or permanent organic pollutants;
- to control during all building phases the distribution of the dredged material in the vicinity of the "zona di vertido" and on the borders of the natural site with sediments traps; to implement an adapted monitoring system for the natural resources (species and habitats), with a particular focus on the stability of the lower limits of the Posidonia meadows that could be impacted, and that any works be carried out with extreme caution taking into account the concerns expressed above and to avoid impacts on the natural values and the key species as Posidonia;

Given the potential negative impacts of the proposed new port development on the underwater archaeological resources (which could be related to the cultural values of the property), and potentially on the eco-system of the harbour, and wider area, the mission urged the Spanish authorities to adopt an alternative approach which would reduce these impacts to acceptable levels.

c) *Boundaries*

The mission also reviewed the boundaries and buffer zones of the site and made detailed recommendations which may be taken into consideration by the Spanish authorities in a potential future extension to the property to provide for a more effective control of further development that could impact the property.

The Spanish authorities provided a state of conservation report on 1 February 2010 highlighting that the project is outside of the World Heritage property and that it does not impact on the city of Ibiza and “...could hardly affect the *Posidonia meadows of Ses Salines Natural Park* given that the latter is situated over 5 miles away.” The report further notes that the silt dumping point within the Natural Park, for which the Port authorities plans to take important measures to control the invasive algae which might be withdrawn from the area during dredging operations, is also outside the property’s boundaries. They note in response to the world Heritage Committee’s Decision **33 COM 7B.41**, point 6, that the complete Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was handed to the mission in November 2009 and that the port reorganization project has been carried out in full compliance with regulations in force. They also underline specific activities for the heritage assets of the Walled City (Direct Walls Plan of 2003), Puig des Molins (excavations), Sa Caleta (land acquisition) and *Posidonia meadows of ses Salines* (enhanced protection status). They conclude that the “...improvement of the Port of Ibiza will not imply a deterioration of the state of conservation of any of the four protected assets.”

The full mission report was submitted to the Spanish authorities for comments on 3 February 2010. In response to the report the State Party transmitted a response prepared by the Balearic Port Authority on 16 March 2010 including the following specific information on the harbour development and reorganization:

They emphasize the necessity for the reorganization because of insufficient infrastructure of the port. They highlight these specific issues:

- the esplanade of the future Terminal has been designed to a minimum and does not include storage areas, only transit zones; the project has been developed according to regulations in force and full EIS carried out including cultural aspects; respectful dredging techniques will be used and additional surveys may be carried out in case required by archaeologists; concerning invasive species (*Caulerpa racemosa*) they note that none have been found so far and in case they occur they would be eliminated;
- the dredging volumes have been adjusted as constructions if now by a deep foundation of pontoons by piles instead of a gravity concrete caisson;
- a system for monitoring the water quality during disposal has been established to ensure risk management at times required; the disposal place had already been used previously; They note that the dredged material is uncontaminated they also indicate that National Contingency Plan for Accidental Marine Pollution approved by the Ministry of Development on 23 February 2001 and the Special Contingency Plan for the Accidental Contamination of Sea Water of the Balearic Islands of 2 December 2008; and
- they conclude that all issues indicated by the mission were carefully considered and that therefore the work would commence on 1 May 2010.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the detailed reply provided by the Balearic Port Authorities and specifically that the key concerns of the mission have been carefully studied. However they express their concern that the State Party has not commented on the management, boundaries and presentation of the World Heritage site. They also note with regret that, according to press reports, work on the port expansion is due

to commence on 1 May 2010 without any amendments to plans to mitigate its adverse impacts on the property.

Additional information of a total of 124 pages was provided with a cover letter dated 12 April 2010 from the Spanish Ministry of Culture and received on 19 April 2010 by the World Heritage Centre. The information concerning answers and comments on the mission report from the City of Ibiza, the Port Authorities and the Ministry for the Environment is currently under review with the Advisory Bodies.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.41**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.41**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes the results and recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property carried out in November 2009 and urges the national and local authorities to take these into account in the management of the property;*
4. *Also notes the State Party report and the detailed comments from the Balearic Port Authority on the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission report and deeply regrets that construction of the proposed expansion of the port's facility has commenced on 1 May 2010 without awaiting the review of the outcome of the reactive monitoring mission to the property by the World Heritage Committee;*
5. *Also urges the State Party to immediately inform the World Heritage Centre of any unexpected or adverse impacts that occur during the dredging and requests the State Party to undertake and report on appropriate mitigation and monitoring measures during and after the work on the port in order to avoid any significant negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and the status of the harbour reorganization project, including information on how the key recommendations arising from the reactive monitoring mission the have been addressed, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

### **42. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission)

## **CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

### **AFRICA**

#### **43. Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323bis)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

#### **44. 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

**31 COM 7B.46; 32 COM 7B.47; 33 COM 7B.43**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: 1996 – USD 6,500 Restoration studies in Lalibela; 1980 – USD 57,386 Photogrammetric equipment

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 800,000 for the « Conservation Action Plan for Lalibela » -Phase 1 and Phase 2 (Norwegian Funds-in-Trust).

Previous monitoring missions

2004, 2005, 2008, 2009: World Heritage Centre follow-up missions; 2006,: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring missions; 2007, 2008: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission;

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) No boundaries for the property nor for the buffer zone ;
- b) Impact of the four constructed temporary shelters in 2008;
- 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) Impact of earthquakes ;
- h) Geological and architectural characteristics of the churches.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/18>

### Current conservation issues

On 29 January 2010, a report on the state of conservation of Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela was submitted by the State Party. This is the first report submitted for three years. The report addressed issues outlined in the Decision **33 COM 7B.43** of the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), which in turn referred to decisions of the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008).

#### a) *Conservation:*

Restoration and conservation of the Aba Libanos Church: the drainage problem at this church is a result of problems with the shelter and drainage of the Biet Merqorios church located behind it at a higher level to its north. Temporary arrangements have been made to divert this water away from the Aba Libanos Church.

Restoration and conservation of the Aba Gabriel Rufael church: restoration work comprising the covering of the roof with cement mortar to prevent rainwater ingress was undertaken due to the recent appearance of a long crack running across the eastern wall of the church. Funds were allocated by the Ethiopian Government in 2008/09 to enable investigation by Ethiopian experts of the construction of a temporary shelter for this church.

#### b) *Monitoring of the Shelters:*

Following completion of the shelter project in February 2008, the State Party planned to carry out monthly monitoring missions. The current report from the State Party only mentions monitoring in general terms and does not set out its frequency or how it is carried out.

The monitoring of the Aba Libanos Church has revealed no instability at the base of the shelter, nor any adverse impact on the property arising from construction of the shelter. The State Party states that it is convinced of the need for the shelter to protect the church from further deterioration.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recall that they had strongly advised not to build this shelter because of a potential land sliding risk that the weight of the shelter could aggravate.

#### c) *Boundaries and Buffer Zones:*

The boundaries of the property and the buffer zone have been established following two workshops held by the State Party with technical and financial support from the University of Dublin and from the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. After the final approval by the Ethiopian Authorities, the State Party will submit the maps to the World Heritage Committee.

#### d) *Implementation of the Conservation Action Plan:*

The State Party expresses the need for a multi-disciplinary study on the identification and analysis of decay factors and the design and implementation of sustainable solutions that would enable removal of the temporary shelters. Until such a study has been completed, the State Party does not consider that further conservation work should be undertaken, unless for emergency repairs.

#### e) *Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

The State Party indicates that some progress has been made on the development of the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, including the conditions of authenticity and integrity. However it is reported that more time is required due to various questions raised by participants on authenticity and integrity relating to boundary delineation and the possibility of changing or adding criteria.

#### f) *Legal and Regulatory Framework:*



Proclamation for the legal and regulatory protection is in progress, (for four World Heritage properties) with parliamentary ratification expected soon. The site is currently protected by Proclamation 209/2000 relating to the Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage.

*g) Management:*

The State Party states that the development plan for the historic town of Lalibela has been prepared in consultation with the community and other stakeholders and will be implemented under the relevant Government bodies. No further details are given as to whether this plan includes planning regulations concerning the private development around the property that has been highlighted in past reports.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recall that in the framework of the Lalibela Conservation Action Plan funded by the Norwegian Government, the World Heritage Centre is supporting the State Party in its efforts to draft a Site Management Plan for the property. A Site Management workshop was organized in December 2009 and resulted in the establishment of a Site Management Committee; another workshop is planned for July 2010. Regular technical assistance is also on-going and will continue until November 2011 with the aim of producing and implementing the Management Plan.

*h) Other projects:*

The State Party report does not mention progress with the World Monuments Fund project on the conservation of the property, nor whether the World Bank funded tourism development project is being taken forward.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recall that in the framework of the Lalibela Conservation Action Plan, the World Heritage Centre and the World Monuments Fund have produced an inter-disciplinary structural, architectural and decay factors study for the conservation of the Gabriel Rufael Church and will undertake conservation and consolidation works that could constitute a pilot project applicable at other parts of the property. The gradual implementation of this work should facilitate the eventual removal of the temporary shelters.

The World Monuments Fund installed a structural monitoring system in the Gabriel Rufael and Aba Libanos Churches, carried out a complete laser scan survey of the property and a comprehensive analysis of its architectural and typological features.

Furthermore, in the framework of the World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme, the World Heritage Centre will undertake a conservation project funded by Italy in the traditional village of Lalibela, which forms part of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are informed that the World Bank project includes conservation and enhancement components at the property and is in contact with the State Party and the World Bank to mitigate any adverse effects of their project on the property's integrity.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge the progress made with basic conservation work, (although are concerned at the use of cement), with monitoring the impact of the shelters and with mapping boundaries. They note that more work is needed to complete the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and reminds the State Party that adding additional criteria would need a new nomination to be submitted to the World Heritage Committee.

In the light of the growing urban development that is threatening the Outstanding Universal Value and Integrity of the property, there remains an urgent need to accelerate the creation and implementation of the management plan. Such a plan should link the management of the churches to the sustainable development of the wider setting of the property.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.44**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision 33COM 7B.43, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009);
3. Acknowledges the progress made by the State Party in basic conservation and monitoring, in delineating the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone; and reiterates its request to the State Party to submit maps of the boundaries and buffer zone to the World Heritage Centre;
4. Requests the State Party to submit details of the type and frequency of monitoring arrangements of the temporary shelters;
5. Expresses its concern at the uncontrolled urban encroachment that threatens the property and urges the State Party to halt this encroachment;
6. Recognizing the importance of a Management Plan that could link the management of the churches to the sustainable development of the wider setting of the property, also requests the State Party to pursue its efforts in establishing a Site Management Plan with the support of the World Heritage Centre ;
7. Also recognizing the importance of an holistic, inter-disciplinary project to study the cause of decay of the churches in relation to the wider landscape as well as to stone decay, further requests the State Party to pursue its efforts in implementing the pilot project at the Gabriel Rufael Church in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and World Monuments Fund, with a view to finding a sustainable solution that would allow the removal of the temporary shelters ;
8. Requests furthermore the State Party to regularly inform the World Heritage Centre about the World Bank tourism development project that is being implemented at the property, and to submit to the World Heritage Centre all related planned conservation and enhancement projects for review by the Advisory Bodies and by the World Heritage Centre prior to any commitment being made, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
9. Notes the completion of a development plan for Lalibela area and requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a copy of the plan with information on its related regulatory framework;
10. Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

**45. Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 12)**

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

**29 COM 7B.34; 30 COM 7B.39; 32 COM 7B.46**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 5.07 million by the Italian Funds in Trust for the "Aksum Archaeological Site Improvement Project: Preparatory studies for the reinstallation of the Obelisk and capacity building for archaeological conservation - Phase 1", "Reinstallation of the Obelisk - Phase 2" and "Consolidation of Stele 3".

### Previous monitoring missions

2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009: missions of the World Heritage Centre and experts for the implementation of the project. 2010: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission.

### Factors affecting 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;

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/15>

### Current conservation issues

On 29 January 2010, a report on the state of conservation of Aksum was submitted by the State Party. The report addressed Decision **32 COM 7B.46** of the World Heritage Committee. A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited Aksum on 4-8 February 2010. The main recommendations of the mission relate to the need for the definition of boundaries, for a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, for a Memorandum of Understanding on governance arrangements, for qualified staff, for planning controls, for a Management Plan, and to address the structural instability of Stele 3 and related rising water table issues. The mission also commented on the re-installation of Stele 2, and site interpretation and the need to control encroachment and development and in particular the planned construction of a large museum within the property.

#### *a) Provision of a map showing the boundary of the property and the buffer zone:*

The State Party reports that the boundary was discussed and a map drawn at the site management capacity building workshop organised by the World Heritage Centre in May 2008; this map constitutes a first draft of the property's boundaries and buffer zone. The Mission considered there was an urgent need to formalise the boundaries.

#### *b) Rising Water Table at Stelae Park:*

The mission reported that as the rise in the water table or water seepage in the Bricks Arch Tomb continues and drainage using an electric pump appears to be only a temporary solution; a study by a civil engineer and a hydrologist must be carried out to identify the reasons and seek ways to divert drainage away from the funerary chambers. The temporary

structural supports for Stele 3 must now be seen as permanent until there is a better understanding of the causes and possible remedial action.

The World Heritage Committee, at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) had invited the State Party to address the water table issue through an international assistance request. The mission members reiterated this possibility during their meeting with the Authority for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage Director General. The State Party reports that it proposes to work with the University of Aksum to prepare this request.

c) *Implementation of the site management road map and necessary protective measures:*

The State Party reported that the Management Plan is yet to be done. The Mission considered that although the central, regional and local authorities have consultative and participatory working methods, management decisions are taken ad-hoc and the need for a site management plan is pressing. They noted that UNESCO had undertaken a workshop for the management of Aksum, which had produced a useful starting point for the process. One of the reasons to explain the delay in the preparation of the Management Plan appeared to be the lack of funding and expertise. The Mission suggested that an International Assistance request could be made to support the elaboration of a Management Plan.

The mission noted the State Party's decision to open an adequately staffed office of the Authority for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage (ARCCH) at the property - ARCCH being the statutory body established in terms of the Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage Proclamation No 209/2000 to manage national sites including World Heritage properties. The mission considered that there was an urgent need to fill the staff vacancies in the critical fields of Conservation, Heritage Management, and Archaeology.

d) *Legislative and planning protection:*

The Mission considered that most urgently protective laws and regulations are needed, as currently the only protective framework for the property is the amended Antiquities Law. The mission was told that a Master Plan is currently being prepared. The Mission considered that there was an urgent need for urban planning regulations to protect heritage and to ensure that urban processes are controlled to avoid future planned constructions in the property such as the Church Museum and urban encroachment at the Gudit Stelae Park, as well as to ensure that constructions such as the Site Museum built in the Stelae Park in 2005 will not be repeated. It was suggested that advice might be needed to ensure that such controls might reflect international best practices and experience on heritage management in living cities.

The State Party reported that a draft proclamation for protection of the site has been prepared and presented to Parliament for adoption, but no further details are provided.

e) *Retrospective draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value:*

The State Party reports that at the capacity building workshop referred to above a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of integrity and authenticity was developed by the participants but notes that the State Party would need technical assistance to finalize its drafting.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS commend the State Party for the great achievement in reinstating Stele 2 between 2007 and 2009 after its return from Italy.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that the Mission has highlighted a number of issues that have to be addressed with some urgency. These relate to the need for urban planning regulations, more structured management set out based on an agreed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and adequate professional staff, the need for research on the rising water table and water ingress, as well as for a sustainable consolidation solution for the Stele 3 foundation.

The structured management and urban planning is needed in order to:

- Halt the urban encroachment at the Gudit Stelae field;
- Maintain protection of the integrity of the archaeological remains in the living Town;
- Conduct test excavations prior to any building works;
- Restrict new construction within the buffer zone;
- Control planned construction within the World Heritage property and for major changes within the buffer zone;
- Ensure that the physical interventions of the World Bank Tourism Development project within the property do not hinder its integrity;
- Improve when possible, the site presentation through minimalist interventions.

There is an urgent need to create a management plan that will link the management of the property to the sustainable development of the wider setting of the property and which could encompass the planning, use and management of structures, archaeological remains and landscape. The mission noted the complexity and importance of dealing with the Aksum Town modern settlement built over the archaeological remains, and reported on relocation of inhabitants intended to allow excavation and opening to visitors of three main palaces that form part of the inscribed property. Such activities need to be considered in an Interpretation and Visitor Management Plan for the property, as part of the overall Management Plan.

Development of the Management Plan needs to continue the commendable participatory and consultative process used at the local level as noted by the 2010 mission, and to foster and strengthen a shared vision amongst the major stakeholders to avoid parallel and conflicting decisions.

The draft Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity needs to be finalised and submitted to the World Heritage Centre. This is a fundamental precursor for the satisfactory development of the Management Plan.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.45**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.46** adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Urges the State Party to implement the recommendations of the February 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission;*
4. *Considers that the vulnerability of the property to urban encroachment and unregulated development needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency through the adoption of appropriate urban planning regulations and requests that the State Party put in place such regulations as soon as possible;*
5. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to finalise a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity as previously requested and submit it for review by ICOMOS and for approval by the World Heritage Committee;*
6. *Also considers that there is a need for more structured management arrangements at the property which need to be encapsulated in a management plan based on an agreed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value;*

7. *Further considers that there is an urgent need to investigate the causes of the rising water table and to develop technical solutions to address them, and also reiterates its invitation to the State Party to submit a request for International Assistance for this study;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to pursue its efforts in consolidating the Stele 3 foundation in a sustainable manner and suggests that the State Party considers fundraising for the implementation of the consolidation works;*
9. *Further reiterates its request to the State Party to provide a map of the property of sufficient scale and detail to indicate clearly the boundaries of the World Heritage property and to submit a map of the proposed buffer zone, with details of protective arrangements to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS and for approval by the World Heritage Committee ;*
10. *Regrets the development of the Site Museum within the property and further requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed about changes and new construction within the World Heritage property and its proposed buffer zone including the planned Church Museum, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, before any commitment is made;*
11. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

#### **46. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

#### **47. Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116rev)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

#### **48. Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev)**

*Year of inscription on the World Heritage List*  
1988

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (v)

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

1990-2005

Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 7B.47; 32 COM 7B.49; 33 COM 7B.45**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: 1989, USD 5,500, Preparatory Assistance; 1991-1995-1996-2004-2006: USD 150,000, Technical Cooperation

UNESCO extra budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 100,000 (Italian Funds-in-Trust at UNESCO)

Previous monitoring missions

2002, 2004, 2005, 2006: World Heritage Centre missions; 2008 and 2009 joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Inappropriate design and scale of new Ahmed Baba Cultural Centre in the vicinity of the Sankoré Mosque; lack of detailed drawings supplied to the Committee
- b) Approaches to the restoration of the Djingareyber Mosque;
- c) Urban development pressure;
- d) Flooding and rubbish disposal;
- e) Lack of building regulations and land use plan;
- f) Lack of adequate maintenance of the buildings.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/119>

Current conservation issues

A report on the state of conservation of the property was provided by the State Party on 12th February 2010, and a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission visited the property from 22nd to 29th March 2010 in order to consider progress with the corrective measures adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) and a timetable for their implementation.

*a) Corrective measures around the Sankore Mosque*

The mission observed that the new Ahmed Baba Centre and its amphitheatre were still not in use in March 2010, 14 months after inauguration of the buildings. The mission reaffirmed that the design of the Centre may have been appropriate for an administrative area on the outskirts of the old city but are not compatible with their urban surroundings in a symbolic part of the city opposite the Sankore Mosque.

Regarding corrections to the exterior colours of the Ahmed Baba Centre, the State Party has modified the colour of the southern façade to a yellow-cream colour, but this change was not considered as having resolved the aesthetic compatibility of the building. The State Party had also constructed a fencing wall around the Centre. However this fence does not hide the Centre, does not offer much protection from sand and it has not contributed to resolve the issue of the visual integrity of the Sankore Mosque.

On the issue of relocation of classrooms of the Madrasa and toilets, the mission noted that this had not been undertaken and an alternate location had not yet been identified by the city of Timbuktu. The mission noted that the community had made the effort to change the roof and joinery details of these two blocks, which is a visual improvement.

The mission was informed that the Ministry of Culture envisages a new project for the public space around the Sankore Mosque, with the support of the Aga Khan Trust for Culture (AKTC). This is scheduled to commence in 2011. The mission suggested that any rearrangement of the public space in the area of the Sankore Mosque needs to be based on an accurate knowledge of the site's history and archaeology, as recommended by previous monitoring missions. It also considered that the project should take into account ways of reducing the visual impact of the mass of the Ahmed Baba Centre complex through measures such as revision of the new fencing wall, possible planting of local trees, removal of the amphitheatre if still unused, and possible relocation of the toilets elsewhere.

*b) Creation of a national coordinating committee for Timbuktu as the unique authority to receive and evaluate projects which could impact the property*

The State Party stated that an inter-ministerial Committee for Timbuktu was in existence, although no legal documents on its creation was provided to the mission, nor the list of members. The State Party however mentioned that a first meeting of such a Committee had been held in Bamako in early 2010.

*c) Development of a plan for the participation of the population of the town in matters of heritage*

A Management Committee established in the framework of the implementation of the 2006-2010 Management Plan is in place, chaired by the Mayor and involving local community representatives, taking into account the voices of the various parts of the Old City. The mission considered that this Committee needed to be strengthened, as the catalyst for all related works, and to meet more regularly.

*d) Development of detailed building regulations and a land-use plan for the property and buffer zones*

The mission noted that the draft "Urban Regulations for Old City of Timbuktu" and the draft "Manual for the conservation of the City of Timbuktu" are being finalised by the Malian authorities, who are well aware of the need for community consultation before these documents can be approved. A buffer zone for the Old City aligned with the ring road exists in the 2006 Management Plan, and previous missions have proposed larger areas. In order for a buffer zone to offer appropriate protection to the property, the mission considered that it should be defined as a result of studies of land use, including peripheral cemeteries, new residential areas and the character of the urban fabric of the Old City.

As for the issue of the extension of the World Heritage boundary to cover the entire Old City, the debate on the extension of the property to cover the entire Old City of Timbuktu has been initiated with local people since 2005 and many key stakeholders are supporting this approach, in order to protect both the monuments and their urban context. However, in order to start a potential extension of the property, the mission considered that intensive documentation works (studies on urban morphology and typologies, condition surveys, mapping, etc.) were necessary to underpin planning and restoration programmes to sustain the distinctive local architecture. At the same time, a system of professional training is required to ensure the permanence of craftsmen to support restoration works on houses. The mission considered that at least two years work would be needed to put all these in place and that a realistic timeframe for the possible extension of the property to cover the entire Old City would be between five to seven years. There is some urgency to begin this work as, if the houses of Timbuktu lose their traditional methods of construction, this may reduce the possibility of a future expansion of the property to cover the Old City being successful. In this context, the mission recommended a pilot project to restore houses in the Old City, using traditional techniques and materials, and to rehabilitate houses now mostly in ruins, ensuring the cooperation of the Imams of the mosques and local communities.



e) *State of conservation of the property*

The mission reviewed the requirements for urgent restoration works to be carried out at the Sidi Yahia Mosque with the builders and the Cultural Mission, and agreed on priority actions. The Djingareyber Mosque has been restored under the direction of a team from AKTC, and foresees inauguration in September 2010. The project has become a training school for craftsmen who may train other craftsmen in earthen architecture to work on houses in the Old City. Local authorities of Timbuktu are planning to acquire ruined houses northwest of the mosque, in order to provide more space in the environs of the mosque to avoid a repeat of the recent stampede of February 26, 2010 when more than 20 people died.

As for the sixteen mausoleums, the mission noted the gates of cemeteries' fences being torn down and waste spreading everywhere, which is a worrying situation common to the surroundings of all the mausoleums visited.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the conclusion of the mission that there is no possibility to correct the adverse impact of the Ahmed Baba Cultural Centre and amphitheatre built near the Sankore Mosque and inaugurated in January 2009. They further note the views of the mission that the project was completed without appropriate consultation that might have allowed the building to be in harmony with its urban environment. Of great concern is that since the inauguration, the centre has been unused and is already beginning to deteriorate.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the possibility of a project led by the AKTC to improve the public space around the Sankore Mosque. They consider that details of such project would need to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies in line with *Operational Guidelines*, Paragraph 172 before any commitment is made.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that progress in the urban building regulations and the formal delineation of the buffer zone are to be seen as the short term priority actions.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the fragility of many of the traditional buildings in the Old City, the use of modern materials, coupled with the lack of detailed adopted planning policies, means that the earthen architecture of the Old City as an entity is reaching a critical stage. They note the support for extending the property to encompass the Old City but, as the mission indicated that studies and structures necessary for such an extension could take between five and seven years, they consider that it is essential that work commences on the necessary documentation and planning stage immediately, before the prevalence of modern materials has reached an irreversible stage.

Finally, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the plan of the local authorities of Timbuktu to acquire ruined houses northwest of the Djingareyber Mosque, and consider that any proposals for demolishing houses and enlarging the public space should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, including full details of the houses concerned, for evaluation by the Advisory Bodies, before any commitment is made, in line with Paragraph 172 of *Operational Guidelines*.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.48**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.45**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Notes the results of the reactive monitoring mission that visited the property in March 2010;
4. Regrets that there is no possibility to correct the adverse impact of the Ahmed Baba Cultural Centre and amphitheatre built near the Sankore Mosque to allow it to be in harmony with its urban environment, and expresses great concern that since its inauguration, the centre has been unused and is already beginning to deteriorate;
5. Also notes the possibility of a project to improve the public space around the Sankore Mosque led by the Aga Khan Trust for Culture and requests the State Party to submit details of such a project to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies before any commitment is made, in line with Paragraph 172 of Operational Guidelines;
6. Further notes the initiative for working towards an extension of the property to encompass the Old City and also requests the State Party to consider ways of harnessing resources to commence works of documentation and planning frameworks necessary for the envisaged extension of the property, as recommended by the mission, before the urban deterioration has reached an irreversible stage ;
7. Further notes the possible project to demolish ruined houses northwest of the Djingareyber Mosque in order to provide more space around the mosque, and further requests the State Party to submit details on the project to the World Heritage Centre, for evaluation by the Advisory Bodies, before any commitment is made, in line with Paragraph 172 of Operational Guidelines;
8. Urges the State Party to strengthen the inter-ministerial Committee for Timbuktu and the Management Committee, and to allow them to meet more regularly;
9. Also urges the State Party to finalize the urban building regulations and a land-use plan for the Old City and its buffer zone;
10. Requests furthermore the State Party to address the need for waste removal especially around the mausoleums and to implement the priority actions for the repair work needed on the Sidi Yahia Mosque;
11. Encourages the State Party to attract the necessary resources to conduct a pilot project for repairing and renovating a dozen or so houses in the Old City with a training component for craftsmen;
12. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

#### **49. Apravasi Ghat (Mauritius) (C 1227)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

#### **50. Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission)

#### **51. Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956 bis)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2000, extension 2007

Criteria  
(ii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
**31 COM 8B.56; 32 COM 7B.53; 33COM 7B.47**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 11,500 for preparatory assistance in 1997

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 139,000 (France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement)

Previous monitoring missions  
2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission; 2007: France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement mission; February 2009: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of monitoring and control mechanism;
- b) The lack of a Conservation and Management Plan;
- c) New construction and architectural modification and urban projects affecting authenticity and integrity;
- d) Inappropriate housing restoration;
- e) Environmental disorder due to the modification of the mouth of the Senegal River;
- f) Extremely poor state of conservation of numerous derelict buildings endangering occupants;
- g) Lack of a site manager.

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/956>

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted the state of conservation report on 30 January 2010. The report provides a succinct response to the recommendations provided by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).

#### a) *Implementation of the Safeguarding and enhancement plan*

The State Party reports that the official installation of the Safeguarding Committee was foreseen within the launching of the periodic reporting cycle for Africa in January 2010 in Dakar but could not take place. Notwithstanding, it notes that collaboration has continued among the new municipal authorities, ICOMOS Senegal and the Directorate of Cultural Heritage.

#### b) *Appointment of a site manager for the property*

The State Party reports that a site manager has been appointed to oversee the implementation of the Safeguarding and Enhancement Plan, in collaboration with the Committee aforementioned and other parties to secure the conservation of the property.

#### c) *Preparation of the conservation and management plan*

The State Party reports that it currently is implementing the conservation action plan and that several actions are in course. Among these, capacity building workshops have been undertaken to create a larger group of technicians capable of addressing conservation needs at the property. In addition, the State party also reports on three major rehabilitation projects to be implemented at the Assemblée Territoriale du Fleuve, the Rognât Sud and the Faidherbe Bridge. These projects receive international support from the Spanish Cooperation Agency, the Walloon Region and from France. Also, through cooperation with the French Development Agency, a large infrastructure, economic development, rehabilitation, tourism and capacity building programme totalling two million Euro is foreseen.

In addition, the Senegal Chief of State has decided to implement a general rehabilitation programme for Saint-Louis, which considers a first phase of interventions for 13 units in grave danger. The programme will be financed by the State of Senegal and implementation overseen by the Foundation of Cultural Heritage.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned about the proper coordination amongst the ongoing development and conservation projects implemented at the property and about involving the local communities who are the major actors and beneficiaries of the implemented activities.

#### d) *Coordination of international co-operation partners*

The State Party reports that it wishes to organize a coordination meeting for international partners and is negotiating with France UNESCO Cooperation Agreement for possible support.

#### e) *Threats to the property derived from lack of implementation of management initiatives and from modern interventions, which do not respect the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property*

The State Party reports that the situation has been stabilized. The Cultural Heritage Direction, the Municipality and ICOMOS Senegal are overseeing different initiatives to avoid further detrimental interventions. The installation of the Safeguarding Committee will also

contribute to strengthen this action and to the eventual reversal of inappropriate construction, which is detrimental to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain concerned about the pace of implementation to systematically address threats to the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and the need to regulate the granting of construction and restoration permits within the property.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the steps that the State Party has taken to address the threats and conditions highlighted in past decisions by the World Heritage Committee. While this indicates that some progress has been made, they remain concerned about the effective implementation of the measures undertaken and their sustainability in light of the limited resources.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have recently received information on a proposed mineral port in the context of the "Organisation pour la Mise en Valeur du fleuve Sénégal" (O.M.V.S.; *Organisation for the enhancement of the Senegal River*). The World Heritage Centre has requested information on this project from the State Party by a letter dated 18 March 2010 but the State Party did not yet reply to this letter. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned about this project's potential direct and indirect impact on the property. They consider that the State Party needs to provide information on this project and an appropriate environmental impact assessment study on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property for review prior to any commitment being made.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.51**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.47**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009);*
3. *Notes the efforts made by the State Party in implementing measures to improve the state of conservation of the property;*
4. *Urges it to continue the implementation of the recommendations made by the reactive monitoring mission in 2009, particularly:*
  - a) *developing and consolidating the conservation and management arrangements,*
  - b) *securing resources for effective operation of the Safeguarding Committee and for the office of the site manager,*
  - c) *implementing building control and building permits mechanisms,*
  - d) *coordination amongst initiatives being developed at the property;*
5. *Also urges the State Party to prepare the management plan as requested by the World Heritage Committee taking into account conservation decisions, tourism plans, and the local communities who are the major actors and beneficiaries of the implemented actions;*

6. *Invites the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with detailed information including an Environmental Impact Assessment on any project that could affect the property's integrity, such as the potential construction of a port receiving minerals at the south mouth of the Senegal River, for review by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

**52. Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

**53. Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) (C 1022)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late information about fire)

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

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

## ARAB STATES

### 55. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1979

Criteria  
(i) (iii) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
**31 COM 7B.55; 32 COM 7B.57; 33 COM 7B.54**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 14,000 for technical assistance

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 1,131,000 from the Japanese Funds-in-Trust 2002-2004 and 2008 (wall paintings restoration).

Previous monitoring missions  
2001: ICOMOS mission; 2002: hydrology expert mission; July 2006 and May 2007: World Heritage Centre missions; April 2008: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission; May 2009: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Raise of the underground water level;
- b) Risks of flooding (Valleys of Kings and Queens);
- c) Absence of a comprehensive Management Plan;
- d) Major infrastructure and development projects taking place or scheduled;
- e) Uncontrolled urban development;
- f) Housing and agricultural encroachment on the West Bank;
- g) Demolitions in the villages of Gurna on the West Bank of the Nile and transfer of the population.

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/87>

#### Current conservation issues

The State Party has submitted a state of conservation report on 15 February 2010 which highlights responses to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee during its 33rd session (Seville, 2009):

- a) In response to the World Heritage Committee's request to revise the design of the Avenue of the Sphinxes and to submit it with appropriate details, the State Party declares its will to develop an overall and detailed urban plan, based on a multi-disciplinary approach and benefiting from international expertise, to ensure the integration of the "avenue" in the urban context. The plan is expected to be completed in the six coming months. The State Party acknowledges the loss of an historical minaret which collapsed from too hasty demolition of adjacent buildings.
- b) In response to the World Heritage Committee's request for an integrated Management Plan for Karnak, Luxor and the West Bank, the State Party has promised a "Super Master Plan" for the two river banks in 2010.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that there could be a confusion between a Master Plan and a Management Plan that would integrate all the components of the property. At the request of the State Party, the World Heritage Centre has earmarked extrabudgetary funds to support the preparation of the integrated Management Plan.

- c) In response to the World Heritage Committee's request for a formal co-ordination mechanism under the responsibility of the Supreme Council of Antiquities (SCA) to review all projects with the potential to affect the property and its buffer zone, the State Party is creating a Piloting Committee for Heritage Conservation and Urban Rehabilitation with a range of functions including implementation of the Master Plan, and integrating the Corniche and Avenue of the Sphinxes projects in the city centre rehabilitation.
- d) In response to the World Heritage Committee's request for the development of a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, the State Party notes efforts to establish a dialogue on this subject with the World Heritage Centre. However, the State Party has not yet submitted a draft Statement.
- e) In relation to the landing stage for cruise boats to be developed in the West Bank, the State Party notes its eagerness to formulate terms of reference for an international bid for the development and implementation of an inland harbour, in order to limit tourist development, reduce the sail boat docking area, and establish clear limitations and building regulations for related commercial and leisure activities.
- f) In response to the World Heritage Committee's request for the development of a buffer zone on the West Bank, the State Party has not reported.
- g) In response to the World Heritage Committee's request to adopt the recommendations made by the recent joint mission of 2009, the State Party reported on plans for development of the Corniche, and on the Hassan Fathy New Gurna village largely based on the recommendations.

At the request of the State Party, the World Heritage Centre has earmarked extrabudgetary funds to develop a conservation and restoration project at New Gurna, within the framework of the World Heritage Earthen Architecture programme.

- h) In response to the World Heritage Committee's suggestion that the State Party organise an international consultation in order to design projects and plans to highlight and present the property's Outstanding Universal Value, the State Party notes that it is strengthening the dialogue with international experts.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge the submission of a complete state of conservation report from the State Party. However while this report includes several positive segments (on for example the development of plans for the Corniche and for New Gurna), some of the World Heritage Committee's requests remain unmet.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain concerned by the rapid pace of works undertaken by the State Party in the property without adequate detailed projects with underlined research and methodology being submitted to the World Heritage Centre as required by paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are also concerned by the number of other World Heritage Committee requests not yet met by the State Party.



**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.55**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.54**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Takes note of the detailed state of conservation report provided by the State Party;
4. Notes that the report however does not respond to some of the requests made by the World Heritage Committee in previous decisions and reiterates its request for:
  - a) an integrated management plan for the property as a whole,
  - b) the establishment of a West Bank buffer zone,
  - c) a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value;
5. Requests the State Party to provide detailed information on the planning and design of proposed and on going projects, in particular for the Avenue of the Sphinx, the Corniche and the landing stage for cruise boats on the West Bank in line with the Operational Guidelines;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, a detailed progress report on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

**56. Petra (Jordan) (C 326)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late request for a State Party's report on the state of conservation)

**57. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

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

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

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

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission foreseen, but postponed)

## 60. Ancient *Ksour* of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

### Criteria

(iii) (iv) (v)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**30 COM 7B.54; 31 COM 7B.64 ; 33 COM 7B.59**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 117,069 for Preparatory and Emergency Assistance, Technical Cooperation and Promotion.

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 44,166 in the framework of the France-UNESCO Convention; USD 40,860 for the supervision of the World Bank - Mauritanian Government-UNESCO tripartite project (USD 1,245.000).

### Previous monitoring missions

April 2001: World Heritage Centre; 2002-2004: six World Heritage Centre missions in the framework of the World Bank project; December 2006: France-UNESCO mission and joint ICOMOS-World Heritage Centre reactive monitoring mission.

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Socio-economic and climatic changes;
- b) Gradual abandonment of the towns;
- c) Transformations made to houses affecting their authenticity;
- d) Tourism pressure;
- e) No technical conservation capacities;
- f) No management mechanism (including legal);
- g) Lack of human and financial resources;
- h) Weak institutional coordination.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/750>

### Current conservation issues

On 24 January 2010, the State Party submitted a very full and detailed report on the state of conservation of each *ksar*. This report indicates that in general the *ksour* have not undergone

any change greatly affecting the state of conservation of the property and that in the opinion of the State Party, the state of conservation is satisfactory. Information is provided hereunder for each *ksar* evoking also certain specific problems to be monitored regularly.

- a) At Chinguetti, a problem of silting;
- b) At Ouadane, use of cement, paint and installation of ventilation windows, visible water pipes, as well as the reinstallation of the Mauritel antenna in an open area, are all new phenomena having a visual impact on the town;
- c) At Tichitt, the introduction of power lines and the development of gas kitchens, as well as the problem of the conservation of the minaret of the mosque;
- d) At Oualata, the proliferation of power lines, the installation of parabolic antennas and decaying rubbish.

The report stipulated that several measures aimed at strengthening the conservation of the *ksour* have been undertaken by the State Party, notably:

- e) Reinforcing the action of the National Foundation for the Safeguarding of the Ancient Towns (FNSVA) through the establishment of a Public Fund to finance different conservation operations and the enhancement of the *ksour*;
- f) Training for the local conservation services in treatment techniques for manuscripts;
- g) Preparation of the Management Plan for the *ksour*;
- h) Preparation of the restoration of the minaret and of the Tichitt Mosque. The report indicates that the formalities and the tender for the execution of the work are nearing completion.

Moreover, the State Party recommends the implementation of several actions for the increased reinforcement of the property's conservation, such as:

- i) An awareness raising campaign targeted at local populations;
- j) Training of personnel from the local conservation services on conservation techniques for the built environment;
- k) Strengthening of the sub-regional exchanges initiated during the Periodic Report;
- l) Development and implementation of the Management Plan for the property.

Concerning the implementation of Decision 31 COM 7B.64, the report notes in particular:

- m) Decree N° 2009-246 of 16 December 2009, defining the organizational, management and operational regulations of the Fund for the urban and built rehabilitation of the Ancient Towns. This Fund aims at financing all the safeguarding and conservation activities for the property. In particular, it will serve for the implementation of the Management Plan.
- n) A law for the protection of the different types of cultural heritage is under preparation. Its main objective is to fill the gaps and/or imprecisions noted in Law 46-2005, concerning the protection of cultural heritage.
- o) Local conservation services have been established in the different *ksour* and the Management Plan is under preparation and shall be submitted to UNESCO for support and approval very shortly.
- p) A training programme for the personnel of the local conservation services has been approved: it will be submitted to UNESCO for support and approval.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note with satisfaction the progress achieved by the State Party in the implementation of the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee. They recall the importance of developing the Management Plan to coordinate all the projects in the property and guarantee the implementation of existing regulations. It is also essential to ensure the financial, human and technical resources for an operational management system for the property. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also recall the possibility for the State Party to submit an International Assistance Request to facilitate the pursuit of the work already begun.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.60**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.59**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the progress achieved by the State Party in the implementation of some of the recommendations of Decision **31 COM 7B.64**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007);*
4. *Requests the State Party to implement all its recommendations, in particular those concerning the establishment of legal protection, and the consolidation of appropriate local management mechanisms;*
5. *Urges the State Party to accelerate the preparation of the Management Plan for the property;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to transmit the technical dossier for the restoration of the Tichitt Mosque for examination by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies before works begin;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the progress accomplished in the implementation of the recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

**61. Historic City of Meknes (Morocco) (C 793)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

## 62. Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

### Criteria

(iv)

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

1988-2004

### Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 7B.67; 32 COM 7B.62; 33 COM 7B. 61**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 66,772 for Technical Assistance.

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 25,000 (private funding).

### Previous monitoring missions

2001, 2002 and 2003: World Heritage Centre expert missions; December 2009: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Deterioration of the earthen structures of the Fort;
- b) Use of inappropriate conservation techniques;
- c) Urban pressure;
- d) Lack of a management plan and appropriate legislation.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/433>

### Current conservation issues

On 12 February 2010 a report on the state of conservation of the Bahla Fort and its Oasis was submitted by the State Party. The report outlines progress made on the management plan and institutional framework at the property, as well as updates on ongoing restoration works at various parts of the property. The report also covers progress on the souq rehabilitation project and improving traditional skills in earthen architecture.

From 18 to 23 December 2009, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM monitoring mission visited the property as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).

#### *a) Management Plan*

The State Party's report states that a first management plan was developed for the site in 2003 and completed in 2005. It also states, however, that only part of the 2005 management plan has been adopted by the Ministry of Heritage and Culture: that part which deals with policies for safeguarding and enhancement of the property.

The reactive monitoring mission found that the management plan was still in the phase of being finalized. The mission team met with the consultants carrying out the work and were presented with a draft of the updated plan, still to be officially endorsed by the State Party. Assurances were given to the mission that the State Party would be shortly adopting the management plan, probably through a royal decree.

*b) Institutional development*

The State Party reports that a new regional office of the Ministry of Heritage and Culture has been established in the Dakhliyah region which is responsible for the Bahla Fort. A site office has also been established at Bahla and additional staff has been appointed. Local community involvement in the site has also been encouraged through the work of these new offices. Building regulations have also been adopted.

*c) Project proposal for the restoration and rehabilitation of the souq*

The original project proposal for the rehabilitation of the souq was reviewed by ICOMOS in 2009 and a number of significant changes were requested. The State Party reports that as a result, an ICOMOS specialist architect has been appointed to work with the project consultants on an updated proposal. The State Party reports that it will not take any further action until the proposal is approved by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

The mission team had the opportunity to review progress on the new design concept for the souq and found that the project addressed many of the concerns outlined by ICOMOS. In the meantime, the mission also noticed significant issues related to the state of conservation of some of the earthen buildings in the souq, caused primarily by flooding and that the drainage system needs to be significantly improved in order to alleviate risks from flooding.

*d) Improvements in earthen construction know-how*

The State Party reports that in order to allow for the traditional techniques of working with earthen architecture, a new sustainable source of the basic material needed to be located. A sustainable source was found and the Ministry of Heritage and Culture has established a centralized production facility for making earthen bricks for the property.

The mission noted that while the establishment of this new production facility was a positive step, there was still some concern about the need for proper research and guidance on the use of the correct materials and mixes for the earthen bricks. Such research will lead to improvements in the quality of the bricks and, therefore, fewer conservation problems.

*e) Other issues*

The mission noted that the currently defined boundaries may not provide adequate protection. It therefore recommended that a study be carried out with the aim of enlarging the protected area and establishing a buffer zone..

Another issue examined by the mission was the Falaj water system, which is an important component of the Oasis. The mission recommended that conservation work be carried out on some parts of the system.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies feel that the completion of an updated Management Plan would constitute a significant achievement for the establishment of an appropriate management system at the property. They urge, however, for the full adoption of the final plan by the State Party as soon as possible, as has been requested in the past by the World Heritage Committee.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies feel that the strengthening of the institutional framework and the involvement of the local community at the Fort should be seen as a very positive step in the long-term sustainability of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are pleased with the steps being taken by the State Party to improve the design approach to the souq, and will examine the new proposal when it is finalized by the State Party and submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.62**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B. 61**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Commends the State Party for the progress achieved both on the Management Plan, the Souq project, and the restoration of various parts of the property;
4. Requests the State Party to fully adopt the Management Plan as soon as it is finalized to ensure the proper management and conservation of the property;
5. Also requests the State Party to submit the revised proposal for the restoration of the souq to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre;
6. Further requests the State Party to implement the set of recommendations outlined in the World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission report of December 2009, notably to continue with research on the earthen bricks with the aim of producing guidelines for improving their quality as a building material, to consider enlarging the buffer zone to ensure the necessary protection of the property and to take steps to begin the conservation of the Falaj system;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2012** an updated report on the state of conservation and progress made in responding to the recommendations above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th Session in 2012.

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

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late request for a State Party's report on the state of conservation)

**64. 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; 32 COM 7B.63; 33 COM 7B. 63**

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 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust.

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property 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.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/20>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted on 5 February 2010 a report prepared by the Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums (DGAM) in which the following information was transmitted, responding to the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session:

a) *King Faisal street*

The report recalls that King Faisal Street is situated at the northern limit of the protected area of the Ancient city and, therefore, any project concerning the Street will be reviewed by the concerned Antiquities authorities in accordance with the national legislation (Law of Archaeology).

b) *Medhat Pacha cultural centre*

The report indicates that the municipality of Damascus ordered the destruction of the addition made to the modern building and that its façade should correspond to the style of the surrounding buildings. However, the requested documentation on the project has not been sent to the World Heritage Centre.

c) *Ongoing conservation and rehabilitation projects*

The report stipulates the following projects proposed for 2010 without, however, providing detailed information on their implementation:

- i) rehabilitation project of the north-south passage of the Citadel and its separation from Souq Hammidyya;
- ii) rehabilitation project of the lighting of the "Temple of Sirens" situated in the in the old jewellery souq;
- iii) infrastructure rehabilitation project in the Naqacchat neighbourhood;
- iv) infrastructure rehabilitation project in the Saida Roukayya neighbourhood.

Regarding the rehabilitation of housing, the report notes that it will respond to the needs presented by the inhabitants in conformity with construction priorities, using traditional



materials both when restoring and reconstructing. In parallel, commissions will be established in order to study and organise the system of new constructions in the old city, in conformity with international standards and the Syrian law.

d) *Management Plan*

No information on the preparation of a Management Plan was included in the report, nor on the coordination of the various activities carried out either by the national authorities or international organisations.

e) *Buffer zone*

The report includes Decree number 27/A of 26 January 2010 for the establishment of a buffer zone around the Ancient City. The State Party announces that the maps for the buffer zone will be sent to the World Heritage Centre for approval by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note that a decree has been issued for the establishment of a buffer zone and await submission of a minor modification *with* the official maps indicating the boundaries of this buffer zone and details of its protective regulations,

They regret the absence of documentation requested by the World Heritage Committee for the Medhat Pacha cultural centre, and of confirmation that the King Faisal project will be abandoned as requested by the World Heritage Committee during its 32nd session,

The *World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies* are concerned that no progress has been made in the preparation of a management plan, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at several sessions, in order to improve overall co-ordination of the conservation and development of the property and to set out overall strategies, such as for when reconstruction is allowed.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.64**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B. 63**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Takes note with satisfaction of the progress made by the State Party in establishing a buffer zone for the property through the approval of Decree number 27/A of 26 January 2010;
4. Requests the State Party to send detailed information on the four rehabilitation projects mentioned in the report as early as possible for examination by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
5. Also requests the authorities to continue to inform the World Heritage Centre in detail of any proposals to re-design or re-shape the King Faisal street area;
6. Takes note of interventions undertaken to reduce the impact of the cultural centre on Medhat Pasha street, but reiterates its request that the State Party send further documentation on the building project as early as possible Centre for review by the to the World Heritage and the Advisory Bodies;

7. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to develop a Management Plan for the property, to ensure coordination of all actions undertaken in the property;*
8. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 **February 2011**, 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 35th session in 2011.*

## **ASIA-PACIFIC**

### **65. Angkor (Cambodia) (C 668)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

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

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Application of the Reinforced monitoring mechanism)

### **67. Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

### **68. Taj Mahal, Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri (India) (C 252; C 251; C 255)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

### **69. Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India) (C 1101)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

## 70. Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodhgaya (India) (C1056 rev)

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

2002

### Criteria

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

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7B.52; 30 COM 7B.64; 31 COM 7B.82**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

April 2005: Joint ICOMOS-World Heritage Centre mission

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

- a) Lack of co-ordinated and integrated management system;
- b) Loss of character of the cultural landscape directly associated with the property and its outstanding universal value;
- c) Lack of protection under national legislation.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1056>

### Current conservation issues

On 5 February 2010 a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. This report covered management and visitor related issues, conservation works carried out at the property, the state of progress on the implementation of the management plan, and a report on the health of the Bodhi Tree. The report also included a copy of the legal act protecting the property at the Bihar State level, and the minutes of the annual meetings of the Expert Advisory Committee on Mahabodhi Temple from 2005 to 2009.

- a) *Confirmation of the adoption of the Vision 2005-2031 Development Plan by the Gaya Region, integrating relevant provisions of the site management plan*

The State Party report indicates that the site is being managed by the Bodhgaya Temple Management Committee (BTMC) under the Bodhgaya Temple Act of 1949. There is also an Expert Advisory Committee on Mahabodhi to give regular advice to the management committee on activities to be undertaken. In specific reference to the request by the World Heritage Committee in regard to ensuring that the management plan has been integrated into the larger 2005 – 2031 Development Plan, the State Party report states clearly that all development activities in Bodhgaya, including those related to tourism management, are now guided by the management plan. The report further states that the level of visitors remains on the increase. There are, however, no indications as to how this increased visitor flow is being dealt with, and the annexed minutes of the Expert Advisory Committee indicate that work has not yet been initiated for the improvement of signage and visitor information at the site.

The Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre welcome this confirmation by the BTMC that the site management plan is now being used as a guideline for development at the Temple complex and in Bodhgaya. It is not always clear, however, how the decisions taken

by the Expert Advisory Committee (as found in the minutes provided), conform to the management plan. Concerns also still remain in regard to the management of the increasing number of pilgrims and other visitors to the site.

b) *Commitment of the authorities to continue to enforce the ban on construction at the property*

The State Party report states clearly that all development activities in Bodhgaya are now guided by the management plan, which states along with the development plan that no new construction should take place within the World Heritage property, and that very limited development related to religious and related usage can be allowed in the buffer zone. However, no indications as to the commitment of the authorities to continue to enforce the ban on construction at the property was contained in the State Party report as requested by the Committee at its 31st session.

c) *Conservation issues (including the state of the Bodhi Tree)*

The State Party report provides a short update on completed and ongoing conservation and restoration of specific elements within the temple compound. There is mention within the Expert Advisory Committee minutes to proposals for new boundary railings and carved panels showing the life of the Buddha, for which advice from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would be sought. There is also extensive information on the health of the Bodhi tree, which has improved in the past three years with proper attention.

The Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre welcome the ongoing conservation works that have been carried out at the property in cooperation with the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI). The State Party reports, however, does not provide enough information on the conservation work carried out or on the proposed additional elements (railings and panels) referred to in the Expert Advisory Committee minutes. There also remains some concern about the use of appropriate materials for conservation and repair work.

d) *Protection of the landscape surrounding the property including by the submission of a re-nomination for the inscription of an extended area as a cultural landscape*

Due to the importance of the property within its larger cultural landscape associated with the life of Buddha, the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), strongly urged the State Party to submit a nomination for the property as a cultural landscape incorporating not only the temple complex but the surrounding landscape. There was no information in the state of conservation report submitted by the State Party on this issue.

As stated in previous reports, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the extension of this property to include its landscape is an important objective in order to capture additional aspects that would enhance the Outstanding Universal Value and to allow for the protection of this significant landscape. Recognising that it is the prerogative of the State Party to decide whether or not to re-nominate an extended property, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that it would be useful to further discuss this issue with the State Party in the context of any missions to the site and/or of the Periodic Reporting process,

e) *Legal Status of the property*

Although not contained in the body of the State of Conservation Report, the annexed minutes of the Expert Advisory Committee on Mahabodhi Temple, dated July 2009, mention that no progress has been made on the request by the World Heritage Committee to have the site protected at the national level in addition to the state protection.

Given its status as a World Heritage property, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies continue to consider that the declaration of the property as a national monument would give additional protection. It may be, however, that the State Party and the BTMC feel that the current legal protection under Bihar State law is sufficient with the ASI being called in

for conservation works. This is an issue that should be further explored in consultation with the State Party, the BTMC, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies possibly in the context of a mission.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome progress made by the BTMC at the property. It should be emphasized, however, that as requested in the mission report from 2005, a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is needed to guide conservation and management decisions. Attention should also be called to the need to ensure that decision-making by both the BTMC and Expert Advisory Committee is in conformity with the management plan, and that proper advice is sought on conservation activities and any new proposals for the property. For this reason, a mission would be useful in 2011 with the aim of discussing with the State Party and BTMC the progress made on the site to date, and to clarify the feasibility of earlier recommendations of the World Heritage Committee for national legal protection and an extension to the property.

**Draft Decision**      **34 COM 7B.70**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.82**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction that the State Party has confirmed that all development activities coming within the approved "Vision 2005-2031 Development Plan" are being guided by the provisions of the Site Management Plan for the property and encourages the State Party to continue the implementation of the Site Management Plan and the Development Plan 2005-2031;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to consider re-nominating the property as a cultural landscape, as already suggested at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), to enhance the Outstanding Universal Value and protect the character of the important landscape directly associated with both the life and wanderings of Buddha and the inscribed Mahabodhi Temple site;*
5. *Requests the State Party to explore the possibility of improving the legal protection of the property by declaring the property a national monument;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to the property in 2011 with the aim of discussing with the State Party and the Bodhgaya Temple Management Committee (BTMC) the progress made at the site to date, as well as to clarify the feasibility and possible modalities of implementation of the above recommendations;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre on **1 February 2012** an updated report on the state of conservation and progress made in responding to the requests made above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

## 71. Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Iran, Islamic Republic of) (C 115)

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

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

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

## 73. Parthian Fortresses of Nisa (Turkmenistan) (C 1242)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2007

Criteria  
(ii) (iii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
**31 COM 8B.30; 32 COM 7B.78; 33 COM 7B.83**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
a) Lack of interpretation and visitor management plan.  
b) Archaeological excavations without conservation.

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1242>

### Current conservation issues

On 28 January 2010 a report on the state of conservation of the Parthian Fortresses of Nisa was submitted by the State Party. The report consists of an updated version of the Management Plan and of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. This is the last of the three annual reports on the implementation of the Management Plan, that were requested by the Committee in its Decision **31 COM 8B.30** at the time of inscription.

With respect to the implementation of the Management Plan, progress made includes the completion of drainage works within the site, notably at the by-pass corridors of the Round Hall. As for the Round Hall itself, drainage works are still ongoing and should be completed in 2010. A drainage plan for the entire site was also prepared in 2009.

A new hall on Nisa has been arranged within the National Museum of Applied Arts of Turkmenistan, displaying objects found during archaeological excavations. At the same time, the ceiling of the existing site Museum has been repaired while a new storeroom has been created. A new administrative building appears to have been constructed at the site, according to the State Party report. This suggests that the State Party has abandoned the idea of constructing a new site museum, as indicated in its report of 2009. This, however, should be clarified with the State Party. With regard to visitors' management and interpretation, signage and promotional materials were developed in 2009 along "well defined excursion routes", and catering facilities set up within the site.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the progress made in implementing conservation activities at the site. They note, at the same time, that the document submitted is still an outline of a Management Plan, in that it consists mainly of a compilation of activities, at different stages of implementation, complemented by administrative and financial information on the managing authority. The timeframe for the implementation of these activities, moreover, does not go beyond 2010. What seems to be missing is an explicit vision articulated through specific conservation objectives – and a sufficiently long timeframe - which would address identified factors affecting the property and be aimed to maintain its Outstanding Universal Value.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.73**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.83** adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the implementation of the Management Plan including on interpretation and visitor management and welcomes the efforts made to improve conservation at the property;*
4. *Requests the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre clarification on:*
  - a) *Whether or not a new site Museum is envisaged and, in the affirmative, to provide details on its location and design,*
  - b) *Details of the siting and design of the new administrative building;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a more comprehensive Management Plan including an explicit vision for the future of the World Heritage property articulated through specific conservation objectives – and a sufficiently long timeframe - which would address identified factors affecting the property and aiming at maintaining its Outstanding Universal Value;*



6. Further requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed on progress on the development of the above-mentioned management plan, on the issues detailed in paragraph 4 above, as well as on the implementation of activities contained in the outline management plan submitted in 2010.

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1993

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

N/A

International Assistance

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

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

In 2009, in the framework of a reactive monitoring to the World Heritage property of Samarkand, the Director of the World Heritage Centre had had the opportunity to visit the city of Bukhara and discuss its state of conservation with the local authorities. On 4 January 2010, the World Heritage Centre received a technical report commissioned by the UNESCO Office in Tashkent, titled "Creation of the Management Plan for the Historical City of Bukhara" and primarily concerning the Khodja Zaynuddin area of the Historic Centre of Bukhara. While covering only one area of the Historic Centre of Bukhara, this comprehensive report contains a number of insights and observations highly relevant for the conservation of the entire World Heritage property and was prepared in close cooperation and consultation with the Board of Monuments of Uzbekistan. The report identifies a number of issues affecting the World Heritage property, as follows:

- a) Lack of a proper conservation and management plan;
- b) Recent hotel constructions which would negatively affect the integrity of the property;
- c) Heavy traffic, pollution and poor sewerage system;
- d) Use of new building material and methods (mainly burnt bricks and cement, which are replacing traditional timber-framed earthen architecture);

e) Varying state of conservation of monuments.

Based on this report, and considering that Bukhara has not been the subject of a state of conservation report to the Committee since its inscription in 1993, the World Heritage Centre requested comments and complementary information from the State Party in February 2010.

On 12 March 2010, a detailed "Report on conservation and preservation of the Historic City of Bukhara" was submitted by the State Party accompanied by several other documents including "Report: Conditions of objects' safety of the World Heritage", "Project suggestion on conservation and restoration of walls of Bukhara city", "State programme for the conservation, restoration and utilisation of cultural heritage of Bukhara city until 2020 (in Russian)", and "Amendment to the law on the protection of the cultural heritage in Uzbekistan (in Russian)".

The report by the State Party provides a summary of past and ongoing projects and activities carried out in Bukhara and related to its conservation. Particular emphasis is given to the above-mentioned 'State Programme', which according to the State Party is currently at the stage of approval by the Cabinet of Ministers. The Programme, some activities of which have apparently already started, will be carried out in two phases for a total amount of around 20 million US dollars and includes the development of a GIS. It will aim at developing cultural tourism and sustainable development through the conservation and presentation of the cultural heritage, including the continuation of a major project for the rehabilitation of the city-walls. It is expected that the Programme will provide job opportunities for some 4000 persons and increase revenues from tourism by 50 %.

The State Party report does not comment on the specific issues raised in the technical report commissioned by the UNESCO Office in Tashkent. However, it recognises the need for the finalisation of the preparation of a management plan of the historic centre of Bukhara as well as the importance of exchange of experience with other countries in the world.

While welcoming the efforts being made by the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that the issues identified through the technical report commissioned by the UNESCO Office in Tashkent require further investigation and would justify a reactive monitoring mission to assist the authorities in the integrated response to the many technical conservation and tourism development issues raised by the report. This could also review the scope and progress of the announced State Programme for the conservation, restoration and utilisation of cultural heritage of Bukhara, with special attention paid to the proposed project for the conservation of the city-walls. At the same time, the mission could advise the Uzbek authorities on the appropriate form and contents for an effective conservation and management plan for the property that could include capacity-building issues.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.74**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Acknowledging the rapidly prepared and detailed information on the state of conservation of the property provided by the State Party at the request of the World Heritage Centre,*
3. *Considering the need to assess the full extent of the conservation issues referred to in a technical report commissioned by the UNESCO Office in Tashkent and prepared in close consultation with the State Party,*

4. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property, review the recommendations of the technical report commissioned by the UNESCO Office in Tashkent, the scope and contents of the ongoing “State Programme for the conservation, restoration and utilisation of cultural heritage of the city of Bukhara” and advise the State Party on the appropriate form and contents for an effective conservation and management plan for the property ;
5. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

## EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

### 75. Madriu - Perafita - Claror Valley (Andorra) (C 1160)

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

**29 COM 7B.71; 30 COM 7B.80; 32 COM 7B.80**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Completion of management plan and inventory

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1160>

#### Current conservation issues

In accordance with the decision taken at the 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) of the World Heritage Committee concerning progress in the implementation of the management plan, the State Party transmitted a report on 1 February 2010.

The State Party report indicated difficulties in making progress in the development of a management instrument for the property, this time due to a new legal procedure concerning the Urban Development Plans for the four *Comuns* (town authorities), on the territory where the World Heritage property is located. Indeed, the private owners have appealed to the High Courts against the provisions established by the Urban Development Plan of the *Comú d'Escaldes-Engordonay* (one of the four town authorities that had not approved the preliminary draft of the management plan in 2007). These provisions concerned the reduction in the level of authorised building in one of the sectors located at the foot of the Valley. This procedure blocked once again the development process of the management document for the Valley. It was concluded on 11 December 2009 when the Court recognized the validity of the urban standards set by the *Comú d'Escaldes-Engordonay*. Consequently, since December 2009, the four *Comuns* (town authorities) have recommenced work on the development of a management instrument for the Madriu-Perafite-Claror Valley.

The State Party rightly emphasized that, legally, partial approval of the management plan, by only three *Comuns*, would be insufficient. On the other hand, the lack of consensus would prevent achieving the objectives for the positive management of the Valley.

The report of the State Party furthermore indicates that the Ministry of Culture is awaiting the proposal developed by the four *Comuns* (town authorities) in order to make an evaluation.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies regret the delay incurred in the development of the management plan and its implementation due to the decision of the Courts in the appeal case concerning competences and the new legal procedure linked to the Urban Development Plan.

Furthermore, in accordance with Decision **28 COM 14B.36** taken at the time of the inscription of the property (Suzhou, 2004), an entomological inventory of the property was carried out in 2008 by the authorities and transmitted by the Permanent Delegation on 31 August 2009.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the study was highly efficiently carried out and congratulate the State Party for its achievement. They consider that the study confirmed the entomological wealth of this property, including the aspects regarding its human use. They also note that it has resulted in new discoveries, as regards the Pyrenees and the Andoran massifs. An important conclusion of this study is the indication of the impacts of climatic change on certain species, including endemic. The World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies recommend the State Party to continue the work targeted through this study, concerning the «supramountain» fauna, and the potential conservation options relating to climate change. However, these options must be linked to pastoralism that has created the landscape inscribed on the World Heritage List.

They also recommend that the study be considered as a basis to continue surveillance of the site, including the maintenance of associated values to pastoral and agricultural practices and the impacts of climate change.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.75**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.80**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec, 2008),*
3. *Takes note with concern of the delays observed in the finalization of the management plan, due to the outstanding decision of the Courts in the appeal case concerning competences and the new legal procedure linked to the Urban Development Plan;*
4. *Takes note with satisfaction of the entomological inventory of the property carried out in 2008 and requests the State Party to pursue the work targeted through this study, concerning the «supramountain» fauna, and the potential conservation options relating to climate change;*
5. *Recommends that the inventory work be considered as a basis to pursue surveillance of the property, including the maintenance of the associated values to pastoral and agricultural practices and impacts of climate change;*
6. *Requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic examples of the revised management plan for examination by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a progress report on the implementation of the management plan for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

## 76. World Heritage properties of Vienna

- **Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786)**
- **Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

## 77. Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower (Azerbaijan) (C 958)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2000

Criteria  
(iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
2003 - 2009

Previous Committee Decisions  
**31 COM 7A.26; 32 COM 7A.25; 33 COM 7A.25**

International Assistance  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 15,000 for preparatory assistance (1998); USD 14,800 for technical assistance (2004).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds  
Total amount provided to the property: USD 30,000 (American Funds Special Account 2005/06); USD 22,000 (Netherlands Funds-in-Trust, 2005/06)

Previous monitoring missions  
February 2002: UNESCO mission; October 2002: UNESCO/ICOMOS mission; January 2003 and April 2003: UNESCO missions; November 2003: ICCROM mission; October 2004: UNESCO mission to participate in the Round Table; September 2005: UNESCO mission (with the University of Minnesota, USA); March 2007 and January 2009: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS missions.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Changing urban fabric due to the demolition of buildings and uncontrolled construction within the Walled City;
- Overall lack of any management system and in particular insufficient coordination between the national and municipal authorities;
- Absence of a comprehensive management plan that addresses conservation problems, urban development control and tourism activities.

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/958>

### Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee during its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) decided to remove the Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower (Azerbaijan) from the List of World Heritage in Danger. This decision recognized the State Party's efforts to

improve the state of conservation of the property and the significant progress made in the implementation of the corrective measures for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

At the same time, the Committee also requested the State Party to:

- formally approve the draft Conservation Master Plan (CMP), and submit it to the World Heritage Centre, and integrate it within the Integrated Area Management Action Plan (IAMAP):

- extend and develop the design guidelines for the rehabilitation and restoration of historic buildings, and the design of new constructions and street furniture, already included in the IAMAP, for efficient use by the State Department of the Historical-Architectural Reserve "Icherisheher" and Icherisheher owners:

- ensure that the integrated CMP and IAMAP acknowledge and reference the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to be approved by the World Heritage Committee,
- formally adopt the revised IAMAP in the urban planning system of the City of Baku;

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 9 March 2010. This report states that the Conservation Master Plan (CMP) has been translated into Azerbaijani, provisionally approved for implementation by the State Department of the Historical-Architectural Reserve "Icherisheher" under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Azerbaijan (SHAHAR) in December 2009, and submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers for ultimate approval. The report also notes that an international management consulting firm (McKinsey and Company) has provided a document that integrates the Integrated Area Management Action Plan (IAMAP) and the CMP into a single document, including a high level strategy and Action Plan for medium term implementation. The State Party notes that the purpose of the McKinsey Document is to transform Icherisheher into a world class tourism destination possessing adequate infrastructure, a strong cultural calendar, enjoying transparent public-private partnership and being regulated by special legislation.

The report further notes the issues concerning legislation, that SHAHAR has adopted two documents: "*Rules on enjoyment and protection of historical buildings*" and "*Agreement on protection of historical monuments*". The report notes that the design guidelines within the IAMAP have been adopted, that the State Party has adopted best practices from historic towns around the world, including "*Municipal Regulations of UNESCO Zone of City of Brussels*", and that local experts, including representatives of State Committee on Urban Planning and Architecture, and National Academy of Sciences have been involved in this process.

The report also notes that the State Party has contracted a building conservation firm, headquartered in Germany, "Remmers Fachplanung", to carry out conservation work on the "Maiden Tower" and "Mohammed Mosque" and to support the on-site work with a local training component.

The State Party report also notes in relation to the adoption of the revised IAMAP, that the Draft Law on Icherisheher, currently being considered, needs to harmonize the municipal planning systems of Icherisheher and Baku, and that the Draft Regulation of the buffer zone of Icherisheher is still being reviewed by relevant state authorities (including the State Committee of Urban Planning and Architecture, the Ministry of Justice, the National Academy of Sciences and the Executive Power of Baku).

The State Party report also includes detailed information on many aspects of management of the property including provisions of the Draft "Law on Icherisheher", the Order of the Cabinet

of Ministers On Establishment of Buffer Zone of Icherisheher (dated 25 May 2009) submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers (August 2009), the status of the Conservation Master Plan provisionally approved by SHAHAR, and the McKinsey document, integrating the CMP and the IAMAP (submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers for approval), and new rules and regulations for traffic management, building refurbishment, exploitation and preservation of historic monuments and buildings by their owners and for establishing the "Scientific-Technical Council and Council of Elders" and their respective regulations. The report also details building and facade repairs, investigations, restoration and repair priorities, monument conservation works and infrastructure improvements.

The report also notes that as a follow up to recommendations contained in the CMP to ensure means of passage between the National Seaside Park and the Old City, a "building in state of danger and not subject to the reconstruction works was removed".

The State Party report also notes a number of important activities, including landscape gardening measures, dismantling of satellite dishes, installation of special lighting systems in the Shirvanshahs Palace, and introduction of segregated waste collection. The State Party report describes a number of activities aimed at strengthening Icherisheher as a touristic centre, including numerous public activities. The report also notes efforts by the authorities to develop contacts and exchanges with other World Heritage historic towns, and to develop an international seminar in Baku on protection, management and conservation of historic urban landscapes in 2010.

The report also includes a brief summary of important measures undertaken by the State Party, including expenditure of 3.75 million USD allocated from the Reserve Fund of the President to "repair buildings, replace utilities, improve tourism infrastructure in the place of collapsed buildings and buildings in danger of collapse and constructions having no historical-architectural importance by preserving traditional street patterns", following a Presidential Order of 16 December 2009, on the improvement of "Icherisheher" State Historical-Architectural Reserve. The report notes that a SHAHAR staff team now prepares an Action Plan for improvement of tourism infrastructure within the area.

On 15 April 2010, the State Party provided a supplementary report "*Gesamtdokumentation / Baku, Aserbaidshjan*" dated 31 March 2010, in German, by the office "Remmers Fachplanung", which gives an overview of the analysis and proposed restoration methodologies for two sites: the Maiden Tower and the Mohammed Mosque.

ICOMOS notes that the technical analysis provided by the State Party addresses various masonry and mortar stability issues identified, but that no risk analysis (important for interventions of the type proposed, in the context of World Heritage sites) is provided and that the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property of various projects is not assessed.

The State Party also provided a complementary report on damages to the buildings located at Neftchilar avenue, Sabial District, justifying demolition of the structures. The report describes the conditions and the lack of adequate maintenance which has led to dangerous instability of some portions of both structures.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are deeply concerned that the Presidential Reserve Fund was used to 'improve tourism infrastructure in the place of collapsed buildings and buildings in danger of collapse and constructions having no historical-architectural importance' without apparently attempts to restore buildings that contribute to the overall urban characteristics of the property. They are also concerned that a decision to remove a significant historic structure within the World Heritage property has been taken without recourse to heritage conservation experts trained to carry out this analysis, and without even addressing its impact on the Outstanding Universal Value. It



would have been appropriate to ask: how can this important building be stabilized and retained? This approach epitomizes the concern that an over-arching conservation perspective does not yet exist to guide decision making in Baku, and that the effort to produce and integrate the CMP and the IAMAP has not yet succeeded in producing that over-arching management instrument and allowing it to operate with the authority of the Cabinet of Ministers.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies commend the State Party for its continuing high level and wide ranging efforts to ensure the long term conservation and effective management of this World Heritage property.

While the report of the 2009 reactive monitoring mission indicated that the State Party has put in place the corrective measures adopted by the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are still concerned by the approach described by the two reports (*Remmers Fachplanung report for the Maiden Tower and the Mohammed Mosque*, and *the State Agency report on damage to the buildings located at Neftchilar avenue*) which have not been prepared in the context of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. This can be specifically illustrated by the following:

- The State Party reports of blending the design guidelines in the IAMAP with design guidelines from other World Heritage cities, but does not explain how this will happen;
- Despite repeated requests from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, the State Party has not provided a report which is described as integrating the CMP and the IAMAP in one over-arching management document;
- Much of the State Party report describes the commoditisation of Icherisheher for tourists, and promotion of the World Heritage property as an interpreted tourist experience rather than as living city. This approach is of concern as it represents a development vision for the World Heritage property which seems aimed at exploiting rather than respecting the heritage value for which it was inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note in summary that appropriate measures should be developed in order to prevent any activities which could represent potential threat on the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property, and suggest that a reactive monitoring mission to the property be considered to review these issues.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.77**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7A.25**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Notes with great concern that the State Party report indicates that demolitions and rebuilding are being approved without heritage impact assessments being undertaken to consider the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
4. Reiterates and extends its requests to the State Party to:
  - a) *Formally approve the Conservation Master Plan (CMP), integrate it within the Integrated Area Management Action Plan (IAMAP), and submit it together*

*with a management document which is described as integrating the CMP and the IAMAP to the World Heritage Centre by 1 September 2010 for review by the Advisory Bodies,*

- b) *Ensure that the integrated CMP and IAMAP acknowledge and reference the Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to be approved by the World Heritage Committee,*
  - c) *Formally adopt the revised IAMAP in the urban planning system of the City of Baku,*
  - d) *Extend and develop the design guidelines for the rehabilitation and restoration of historic buildings, and the design of new constructions and street furniture, already included in the IAMAP (and any other relevant instruments), in a published document for efficient use by the State Department of the Historical-Architectural Reserve "Icherisheher" and Icherisheher owners,*
  - e) *Ensure that the overall management system in place gives priority to maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in all conservation, promotion and development actions which affect the property;*
5. Also requests *the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the World Heritage property, to assist the State Party in following-up on progress made in responding to the above requests, and in defining measures in order to prevent any activities which could represent a potential threat on the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property;*
6. Further requests *the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and progress made in the implementation of the abovementioned requests, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

#### **78. Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh (Belarus) (C 1196)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

#### **79. Historic Centre of Brugge (Belgium) (C 996)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation and Late mission)

## 80. Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 rev)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

### Criterion

(vi)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 7B.93; 32 COM 7B.85; 33 COM 7B.95**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 44,960.

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 190,000.

### Previous monitoring missions

2006 : ICOMOS mission ; 2007: UNESCO / ICOMOS mission ; 2008: ICCROM/ICOMOS expert mission.

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Construction of a hotel in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property, not in conformity with provisions of the Master Plan, which was part of the Management Plan included in the nomination file;
- b) Cracks appearing on the surface of the old bridge.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/946>

### Current conservation issues

On 2 February 2010, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, including the information on the monitoring of cracks in the re-built Mostar Bridge and the drawings of the proposed reconstruction of the Hotel Ruza, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).

#### *a) Construction of a new hotel within the buffer zone of the World Heritage property*

The newly submitted proposal for the hotel remains five storeys (ground floor plus four upper floors) as allowed in the building permit granted by the City of Mostar in 2004 (but one storey higher than allowed in the 2001 master plan and 2005 management plan). Following the recommendations of the 2008 expert mission, however, the facades of the hotel have been redesigned taking into account the need to better articulate it by breaking it into discrete sections, thereby diminishing the overall massing. The drawings do indicate, however, some additional rooftop constructions, which include the roof of a bar and sitting area, and the enclosures of stairways and other services, despite assurances by the developer that there would be no roof constructions for the pool level.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have examined the new designs and consider that while not the preferred solution, these designs do address a number of the previously expressed concerns. They do, however, remain extremely concerned about the constructions found above the fifth storey to house a bar, seating area, stairways, and other services. These additional elements effectively constitute a sixth storey to the building, even if their surface area is small in relation to the overall footprint of the hotel, and should be avoided.

Taking these considerations into account, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies are of the opinion that the newly articulated facades will not have an overall negative impact

on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property provided that there are no additional constructions above the fifth storey.

*b) Cracks in the surface of the Bridge*

In 2009, the State Party instituted a monitoring regime of the bridge in the framework of the activities by the UNESCO Venice Office related to the protection and promotion of cultural heritage in South Eastern Europe, with financial support from the World Heritage Fund, the Municipality will ensure that all required measures will be undertaken (review of the behavior of the bridge structure, review of the cause of the cracks, review of the tension in the steel cramps of extrados in five profiles, and the measurement of the wall construction, the arch, and topographic geodetic measurements) in order to determine if the cracks on the Mostar Bridge represent a potential threat to the bridge structure. The authorities will ensure functioning of a long-term monitoring system of the bridge with continuous analysis of results from adequate computer programmes, as well as an annual maintenance programme. The authorities will also define the necessary measures to be undertaken in order to halt and avoid further damages to the bridge, and for eventual restoration works. The final report on these activities will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by the end of 2010.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the work that the State Party is undertaking with regard to ensuring the structural stability of the bridge and will await the activity report at the end of 2010 in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the monitoring regime.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.80**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.95**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Also recalling the results and recommendations of the reactive monitoring missions of 2006 and 2007 and the expert mission of 2008,*
4. *Notes that the monitoring activities for structural stability of the bridge are being implemented by the Municipality of Mostar;*
5. *Acknowledges the receipt of the drawings for the revised design for the Hotel Ruza;*
6. *Requests the State Party to revise the drawings to ensure that no construction, of any kind is permitted above the fifth storey (ground floor plus four upper floors) of the proposed hotel building;*
7. *Considers that the new design as submitted to the World Heritage Centre, if the rooftop constructions are removed, will not have an overall negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a progress report on the monitoring of revised drawings and construction works*

*at the Hotel Ruza as well as the first results of the structural monitoring of the bridge for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

### **81. Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria) (C 217)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

### **82. Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late receipt of additional information)

### **83. Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay (France) (C 80bis)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(i)(iii)(vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions

**03 COM XII.46; 27 COM 7B.61;**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports (as identified by the State Party in the Periodic Report 2006):

- a) Development pressures
- b) Environmental constraints
- c) Natural disasters (earthquakes, wind storms (1987 and 1999), earth slides)
- d) Tourism/ visitor pressure (including the intensification of fish/shell industries and pasture in the bay)
- e) Problems related to the presentation of the site: Car parking at the foot of the Mount, sign posts

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/80>

### Current conservation issues

Further to concerns raised by French associations, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 23 December 2009. This included a copy of a letter from the Ministry of Ecology, Energy, Sustainable Development and the Sea that provided details of wind farm projects around the bay of Mont Saint Michel. On 18 March, the Director of the World Heritage Centre wrote to the State Party informing them that the property would be the subject of a state of conservation report and asking if they wished to supplement the information already provided. No supplementary information was received.

The report from the State Party provided brief details of windfarms already approved, in the course of construction, and those that have been refused, in the departments of la Manche and l'Ille et Vilaine. It set out their location and the number of turbines. No maps were provided nor details given on the heights of the turbines.

In La Manche a Departmental scheme for wind farms was published in 2007. This set out two zones within the landscape protection area for Mount Saint Michel, one of which was considered compatible with wind farms and the other not. In l'Ille et Vilaine a Wind Farm Charter was published in 2005 that identified environmental constraints and unfavourable sites. Further a regional study is being carried out to consider the limitations on zone of wind farm development. Development Zones for Wind farms (ZDE) are being investigated in both departments.

Nine schemes are listed, three in La Manche and six in Ille et Vilaine. These are between 17 and 50 km from Mont St Michel and consist of between 3 and 8 turbines. Of these, three have been refused, three have been approved and not yet constructed. It is stated that only one scheme has been authorised in the protected landscape area of Mont St Michel. This project, not yet constructed, is for three 100m high turbines. It is said to have been given permission as it did not impact on views from Mont St Michel. In the Ille-et-Vilaine Department, two requests for permits are being considered of which one for five turbines would be visible from the west of Mont Saint Michel.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned at the potential impact of wind turbines on the extensive landscape setting of Mont Saint Michel and its Bay. The information provided does not allow a full understanding of the potential impact of the one project that has been approved, nor of future projects that might be constructed in the ZDE zones. They consider that there is a need for impact assessments to be carried out for all potential wind turbine projects for their impact on the cultural attributes of the property that contribute to Outstanding Universal Value.

### **Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.83**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Expresses its concern at the potential impact of wind turbines on the landscape setting of the property;
3. Requests the State Party to provide full details, including heights and location of turbines, of the approved projects and those pending approval, and of the delineation

*of the Zones for Wind Farm Development (ZDE), to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies;*

4. *Also requests the State Party to provide details of the impact assessments that have been carried out on wind farm proposals in terms of impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
5. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2011, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

#### **84. Provins, Town of Medieval Fairs (France) (C 873 rev)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2001

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions

**25COM XA**

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/873>

#### Current conservation issues

In February and September 2009 information was brought to the knowledge of the World Heritage Centre by two associations expressing their strong concerns regarding the revision of the two Architectural, Urban and Heritage Landscape Protection Zones (ZPPAUP), one for the Upper Town and the second for the Lower Town, susceptible to affect the protection of the World Heritage property.

Consequently, on 26 February and 30 September 2009, the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party for their comments with regard to this revision. On 23 December 2009, a report was received from the Permanent Delegation of France to UNESCO. This report indicated that the Mayor of Provins has decided upon the revision of the two ZPPAUPs in order to facilitate the urbanisation of three currently non-constructible sectors in the local town plan and protected by the two ZPPAUPs. Thus, two construction projects are

envisaged in the buffer zone of the property: 1) at the foot of the ramparts in the non-constructible zone (Saint-Jean Gate), 2) Les Courtils, in a flood risk zone.

In its report, the State Party acknowledges that this revision project raises certain difficulties:

- a) The two access routes foreseen to link the planned development zone for 700 houses in Upper Provins with the town must cross through a wooded sector of the ZPPAUP and thus modify and in fact remove a part of the wooded area that preserves the visual aspect of the inscribed World Heritage property and maintains the rural character of its surroundings;
- b) The creation of a new constructible zone in the “Les Courtils” hamlet, protected moreover as a listed wooded area, also risks affecting the value of the property. It would lead to a strong risk of “urban sprawl” on the periphery of the property by similar requests from other hamlets.;
- c) The creation of a constructible zone at the Saint-Jean Gate, one of the main entrances to the fortified town, and in the immediate vicinity of the property, to remove a depot and install a brickwork company, would have a major negative impact and cause irreversible damage to the protection of the entire property.

The report of the State Party underlines that, despite unfavourable advice from the Chief of the Departmental Service for Architecture and Heritage, and the Regional Commission for Heritage and Sites in June 2009, on 29 July 2009 the Prefet of Seine-et-Marne pronounced in favour of the revision of the two ZPPAUPs.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS thank the State Party for its objective report that clearly highlights the potential impacts of the new constructions in the framework of the revised ZPPAUPs on the value and integrity of the property, and shares the concerns that have been expressed. It is to be noted that the nomination dossier of this property evokes the ZPPAUPs as one of the measures guaranteeing the protection and management of the property and its immediate area. Consequently, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that any measure that weakens the protection of World Heritage appears most unwise. Also, they question the fact that the authorities have decided to approve the revision of the ZPPAUPs despite the unfavourable advice of the competent regional services.

The problem necessitates an in-depth analysis of the needs of the community in order to establish a balance between the conservation requirements to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and the demands of an evolving community.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.84**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B;*
2. *Takes note of information provided by the State Party in response to concerns raised by the revision of the Architectural, Urban and Heritage Landscape Protection Zones (ZPPAUP);*
3. *Regrets the decision concerning the revision of the ZPPAUPs, despite the unfavourable advice of the competent regional services, thus weakening the protection of the entire property;*



4. Requests the State Party to reconsider the decision concerning the revision of the ZPPAUPs in order to guarantee a satisfactory legal protection and procedural authorization adapted to the statute of the property and its buffer zone, and to avoid any construction negatively impacting on its Outstanding Universal Value and its integrity;
5. Also requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, with detailed information and impact studies of any project affecting the World Heritage property, for evaluation by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, before granting any irreversible authorization;
6. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, before **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and progress achieved in the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1979

Criteria  
(i) (iii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
**32 COM 7B.88, 33COM 7B.100**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
2006: World Heritage Centre site visit; March 2009: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission;

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
Outbreaks of mould and bacterial spores on the surface of the cave paintings of Lascaux;

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/85/documents/>  
[http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dp/archeo/pdf/lascaux\\_unesco.pdf](http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dp/archeo/pdf/lascaux_unesco.pdf)  
<http://www.lascaux.culture.fr/>

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted on 1 February 2010 a state of conservation report including 17 Annexes, amounting to 313 pages reflecting the extensive practical and research work on Lascaux cave (as part of the World Heritage property of Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley) that has been carried out and documented.

In response to the World Heritage Committee requests the State Party report includes the following:

a) *Protocol on Intervention*

The State Party has not reported whether the protocol was made public, as suggested by the Committee.

b) *Develop a Communication Strategy*

The State Party reports that on 30 June 2009 a new web-site for Lascaux was launched that provides a virtual visit of the cave and thus provides virtual access to this part of the property. There was no information provided on a formal communication strategy.

c) *Document and map the overall climatic conditions of the cave*

Research between 2007 and 2009 concerned three control areas with different microclimates. The initial observations of the inter-disciplinary research involving microbiologists, geologists, and climatologists tend to confirm the hypothesis that the microclimate of the wall surface controls the development of microbes. As a result the Scientific Council has agreed to reorient the programme to two new zones, where it is possible to gain better data on the interaction between these two factors. These zones have been chosen for the nature of their substrate, and the presence of fungal contamination and black stains. The State Party report provides an initial summary of this research but states that a full appraisal of the results should await the final outcome at the end of 2010.

The State Party report also provides information on the progress with a Microbiological-Microclimate project that has been developing an inventory of the various bacteria and fungi present in the cave. This has shown that mushrooms are always associated with bacteria and that the two together constitute a 'biofilm' which gives the mushrooms resistance to stress including biocide treatments which explain the mismatch between the efficiency of various treatments in the laboratory and in the cave. In the light of these first results, the Scientific Council has promoted research on the link between mushrooms and the production of melanin linked to the black stains. The National Institute for Agricultural Research in Dijon and the National Institute of Natural Resources and Agrobiology in Seville have initiated a programme to better understand the metabolism of the mushrooms.

The State Party also informs that during 2009 no biocide treatment has been applied. Those responsible for monitoring the contaminated areas have not recorded any adverse changes. Indeed there has been a tendency for white mould and black stains to diminish. However during October 2009, the limited presence of apparently new vermiculations was noted and was mapped. This allowed an understanding of which were new and which have remained since 2005. A preliminary hypothesis suggests that they are linked to a film of water – which is in turn linked to wet weather. A visual and photographic weekly monitoring has been put in place and a study of the physical and chemical profile of the vermiculations is being undertaken by the University of Bordeaux.

d) *Development of appropriate climate control mechanisms; based on minimal intervention and defined conservation approach*

A project called the Lascaux Simulator has been designed to assist decision making on the development of appropriate control mechanisms. This has for instance looked at the impact of all disturbances linked to air circulations, of eventual introduction of materials, and of human presence and how long it takes to regain equilibrium after their departure. The installation in May 2009 of new air speed monitoring mechanisms is to collect data over a whole year. So far the data collected has confirmed the accuracy of the simulator, which is to become, as reported by the State Party, a crucial tool in preventive long-term conservation of the cave.

e) *Formalize the new management framework based on a separation between administrative and scientific functions*

The State Party has confirmed that this system is now in place. Archaeology is now the responsibility of the Director of the National Centre for Prehistory, while administration is the responsibility of Regional Directorate for historic monuments and is exercised by the Conservator of the cave appointed in April 2009. The new Scientific Council was officially created in January 2010 and a press release announced the names of the 13 members, nine from France the remaining four from United States of America, Spain and Italy.

*g) Invitation of representatives of ICOMOS and ICCROM to participate in Scientific Council meetings*

The press release of 16 February 2010 by the Ministry of Culture announcing the names of the new members of the Council contains the name of at least two representatives from ICOMOS, who participated in the reactive monitoring mission to the site in March 2009.

*h) Action Plan with priorities adopted by the International Scientific Committee, and timeframe for the next three years*

The State Party Report did not provide a formal Action Plan with a timeframe.

The State Party report also provided information on the following:

- Access to the Lascaux cave has been strictly limited during the year to 705 man-hours in the part with paintings and 147 man-hours in the vestibule area;
- The Scientific Committee of Lascaux has had recommended the re-location of parking serving the much visited facsimile cave, away from the vicinity of the cave as in line with the short-term plan to isolate the Lascaux hill. There are also plans to move interpretation away from the hill and to develop a new structure at the foot of the hill for visitors, similar to the one at Altamira;
- Plans are being pursued to acquire land around the hill by the State. Out of four private owners approached, one has already signed an agreement and agreements in principle are being discussed with the two public owners, SEMITOUR and the Dordogne Council;
- A "laboratory cave", Leye, has been chosen based on its similarity (geological, architectural, its position close to the surface) to Lascaux cave in order to serve as an experimental site for the conservation of Lascaux.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies welcome the continuation of extensive and detailed observation, monitoring, analysis and research work that has been detailed in the State Party report to develop a deeper understanding of the interaction between climatic and microbiological factors, and between manifestations such as mushrooms and the melanin of black stains. They also acknowledge the important work being undertaken to simulate the conditions in the cave as a precursor to the development of appropriate mechanism for climatic control. The apparent stability of the cave over the past year is noted as well as progress made with the isolation of the hill and the acquisition of land.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies also note the development of the new Lascaux web-site that provides virtual access. They consider that there is still a need to secure a full understanding of the conservation methodology and approaches being adopted and the future action plans being envisaged. They consider that there is still a need for public knowledge of the Protocol on Intervention through a communications strategy and of the specific Action Plan envisaged by the Scientific Council.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.85**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decisions 32 COM 7B.88, and 33 COM 7B.100 adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions respectively;
3. Welcomes the progress made with the extensive and detailed observation, monitoring, analysis and research to develop an understanding of the complex micro-biological and climatic dynamics of the Lascaux cave as a means to fully understand the causes of the surface decay;
4. Also welcomes the fact that during 2009, there were almost no adverse changes to the surface of the cave;
5. Notes the progress with research to identify appropriate mechanisms to control the climatic conditions of the cave, and the new management arrangements which separate scientific research and administrative functions;
6. Acknowledges the progress with the isolation of the hill, through proposals to move car parking and acquire land into State ownership;
7. Reiterates its request that the Protocol on Intervention that has been developed should be made public, as this could be used as a best practice example for other similar properties;
8. Also reiterates the need for the development of a formal communication strategy and the need for the Scientific Council to formulate the priorities adopted into a detailed action plan with a timeframe for the next three years;
9. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a progress report on the state of conservation of the property with respect to the points above and on progress made in the creation of the above-mentioned action plan, for the examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

**86. 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; 32 COM 7B.89; 33 COM 7B.101**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2009: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Destruction of the Pertuis bridge;
- b) Project of the draw bridge over the Garonne;
- c) Proposed demolition and re-development of a wine warehouse as part of Cassagnol College.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1256>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2010 the State Party submitted a detailed report that addressed issues relating to the demolition of the Pont de Pertuis, the proposed Bacalan-Bastide bridge, the re-development of the Collège Cassinol and the overall planning regulations for the property.

a) *Demolition of the Pont de Pertuis*

In order to bring the standard of documentation for the Bassins à flots area, within which the Pont de Pertuis used to exist, the State Party reports that the city has agreed to unify inventories of the area produced since 1997 and to produce a summary document and a systematic survey of the port areas. The inventory of trading houses, warehouses and cellars related to the wine trade will be pursued and should be completed in 2011.

With regards to the restoration of the canal to its original dimensions the report states that this is being considered alongside the whole development of the dock area including its water bodies. This will be a long-term plan. The City and the Urban Community of Bordeaux set as an objective the restoration of the canal to its original width from 2020, under the Urban Plan Bordeaux 2030.

b) *Planning Regulations*

With regards to the concerns expressed by the World Heritage Committee to ensure that the Bassins à flots area to the north of the property was covered by adequate protection and planning regulations, the State Party reports that for the overall property a Local UNESCO Bordeaux Committee, consisting of heritage experts was established in January 2009 to review planning applications that might impact on the property. It meets monthly. Although this Committee has no statutory powers, its recommendations have been accepted by the planning authorities. The State Party states that the City and Urban Community of Bordeaux will rely on the expertise of this Local Committee for all major restorations or new constructions which may impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

In terms of the specific planning of the Bassins à flots, the State Party reports that it is proposed to develop this area as a model of sustainable development. The area covers 154ha of former dock areas that extends up the Garonne River and includes the approach to the proposed Bacalan-Bastide Bridge on the left bank and the remains of industrial activities. The State Party reports that regular meetings have been held with stakeholders for the overall planning approach. There will be no high-rise building and no underground development. The preliminary studies are planned to be completed by the end of 2010. Following these studies, the development plan will be integrated with the Plan Local d'Urbanisme. Thus, the area will become fully integrated into the urban policy of the city.

The State Party also reports on further urban regeneration and re-development plans in other areas within the property and the buffer zone. These include Berge du Lac, Bastide-Brazza, Niel Bastide, Benauges-Deschamps and the Belcier Paludate sectors. All the proposed developments are structured in a similar way and involve the creation of inventories of the industrial and other buildings and public consultation on the way forward. These schemes

are said to be leading to a change of focus on brownfield sites that will allow buildings to be retained for their intrinsic interest and also their memories. An example is Neil barracks which instead of being demolished are now to the focus of re-development and restoration.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note the new structures for working upstream on the master plans for development areas, and the formation of the local expert Committee to oversee the development of the property. They consider that the overall plans for the development areas should be submitted at an early stage for assessment of their impact on the Outstanding Universal Value according to paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

c) *Proposed Bacalan-Bastide bridge*

The State Party report recalls the various impact assessments carried out for this proposed bridge and highlights that it is the essential pre-requisite for the development of the right bank and for the sustainable development of the whole city. In ten years time it is forecast that the creation of the bridge will save, in terms of time, more than 5 million hours for people working in the city and, more than 29 million km each year, reducing the production of greenhouse gas emissions and pollution.

In terms of mitigating its visual impact, as requested by the Committee at its 33rd session, the State Party reports on further changes made to the design of the bridge. These relate to expanding the public space on deck to reinforce the urban links on both sides of the river, and to viewing the design of the towers so that they better reflect the classicism of Bordeaux architecture. The height of the towers has been reduced from 83 to 77 metres, their profile reduced to 9,56 m x 5,30 m, instead of 10.96 m x 5,30 m, a reduction of almost 15%, and their upper 'bevel' has been reversed. These changes were approved in July 2009. Further landscaping changes include the colour of the concrete, suppression of elevated promontories, a revised lighting design and re-design of the control building on the right bank. The State Party is committed to further reduce the visual impact of the bridge on the historic centre mainly by creating a screen plant with high trees on the right bank of the river.

The visual impacts have been considered from the left bank where a 4.5 km promenade has been established along the river since the closure of the docks. Visual impact studies have shown that the towers will not be visible from the historic centre of the city – unless one mounts to the very top of the spire of Saint Michel. As a pedestrian moves north along the promenade, the bridge starts to become visible at Place des Quinconces. Continuing north, the bridge is fully visible at the Chartrons district, the heart of the former dock area, where it is seen with the silos of the Grands Moulins de Paris.

On the issue of large cruise ships having access to the city centre, the State Party points out that this is a separate issue, unrelated to the bridge project because this transit is already possible, in the absence of the bridge. The current operation is governed by an agreement between the City, the Urban Community and the port authorities. In this framework, local authorities have banned access to cruise ships located upstream of the Place des Quinconces, and limited to two the number of vessels allowed at the same time on the Quai Louis XVIII (the berth for cruise ships in the city centre). However, the realisation of the future bridge is said to provide an opportunity to question this management and it is now being suggested that access should be prohibited to the centre for very large cruise ships, and for large vessels over 250 meters long, and be limited for medium sized vessels, and that berthing arrangements should be facilitated downstream from the site of the proposed Bacalan-Bastide bridge. Only tall ships and historic vessels should berth in the upstream sector of the Quai des Quinconces.

d) *College Cassinol*

The State Party reports that the demolition of the college has been stopped and the facade of the old winery has been saved and maintained *in situ*. A new development programme is

being planned, details of which, when completed, will be forwarded to World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note the detailed arrangements for managing planning in the property, including the expert panel that oversees all interventions that might impact adversely on the outstanding universal value of the property. They note the consultative process for defining the development of the Bassins à flots area and welcome the approach to retain industrial structures, to limit the height of new development and to restrict underground interventions. A similar consultative approach to development envisaged for the outer areas of the city should allow for overall development plans to be agreed in outline at a formative stage and they suggest that it would be helpful if these could be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS at an early stage before an overall concept has been agreed.

For the proposed Bacalan-Bastide bridge, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS welcome the proposed modifications and consider that the final plans should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS. They recommend that the authorities pursue their on-going studies for the additional reduction of the visual impact of the bridge. They also welcome the plan for regulating ships coming up-river to the centre of the city.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note that a long-term commitment has been made to enlarge the canal under the re-built Pertuis bridge back to its original width and to submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS the modified proposals for the development of the Cassagnol warehouse.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.86**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.89** and **33 COM 7B.101**, adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions respectively;*
3. *Notes the inauguration of the Bordeaux UNESCO Committee of experts in January 2009 to advise on all planning matters that might impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and that the State Party considers that this Committee completes the necessary range of instruments for the management of the overall property;*
4. *Also notes the consultative processes and constraints in place for the development of the Bassin à flot area and requests the State Party to submit the overall development plan for this area to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS as well as any further development plans for the outer areas of the city at a conceptual stage;*
5. *Welcomes the medium term commitment by the State Party to widen the canal associated with the Pont de Pertuis before 2030;*
6. *Also welcomes the proposed modification to the proposed Bacalan-Bastide bridge and urges the State Party to pursue their on-going studies for additional reduction of the visual impact of the bridge and to submit the final plans to the World Heritage Centre for assessment by ICOMOS;*

7. Commends the State Party for their proposals to regulate ships coming up-river to the centre of the city;
8. Further notes that modified proposals for the development of the Cassagnol warehouses will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre in due course;
9. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, the final plans for the bridge as well as a report on the state of conservation of the property addressing the points above, for review by the Advisory Bodies.

## **87. Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2002

Criteria  
(ii) (iv) (v)

Previous Committee Decisions  
**32 COM 7B.93; 33 COM 7B.104**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
February 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS advisory mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports:  
a) Noise pollution and traffic increase;  
b) Potential impacts by Rhine crossing project.

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1066>

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted on 19 January 2010 an English version of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and on 8 February 2010 a report that included a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, a Visual Impact Assessment undertaken by the Technical University of Aachen and a traffic evaluation of the bridge, ferry and tunnel options also undertaken by the University of Aachen.

#### a) *Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)*

For the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee only the summary version of the EIA had been provided by the State Party. At the request of the Committee the full version has submitted and this has been assessed by ICOMOS.

Four different options are investigated in the EIA: a high bridge option and a low bridge option between St. Goar and St. Goarshausen, a bridge in the vicinity of Fellen/Wellmich (for which a competition has been held) as well as a tunnel option. The current situation, namely the ferry option between St. Goar and St. Goarshausen, is not included in the analysis.



The World Heritage status is covered in a one page discussion, quoting the criteria and the justification. A detailed analysis of all the attributes that contribute to the property's Outstanding Universal Value are not included nor the interplay between historic, natural and structural characteristics and associative features of the cultural landscape. Nonetheless the EIA's starting point is that "area of investigation ... to a large extent can be described as a prime example of a significant historical cultural landscape" that can be evaluated as being most important (pp. 93 -95).

The discussion concerns the "visual influence of the cultural historical context of fortified castles and the Rhine views" (ibid.). In conclusion it states that the potential danger of the two bridge options near St. Goar and St. Goarshausen can be considered "very high" and the tunnel option can be referred to as "moderate" (pp. 176f.). Regarding the bridge location at Fellen/Wellmich, it was considered that selected points of impairment of the landscape interfere with the cultural and historical context, with respect to the landscape of Burg Maus (Fortified Castle Maus), the settlement of Wellmich with its mediaeval church and its relationship with the Rhine are also endangered (p. 177). With respect to a bridge near Fellen/Wellmich the environmental impact study states that this location, in comparison to the others, "offers more favourable conditions in order to realize a bridge structure." (p. 167).

Moreover, it is stated that a bridge at this particular location coming from the south would create "a considerable break with the following natural landscape of the Rhine Valley section" and "the impressive cultural landscape located near Wellmich could be considerably impaired" (p. 167). This special character of landscape is described as also typical for the development of settlements along the exits of the side valleys of the Rhine Valley. "Wellmich stretches from alongside the Rhine Valley slope as well as into the Wellmich Brook Valley. The town developed with houses built close together around the church in the proportions of the valley exists and are integrated in a cultural and historical context into the upper Middle Rhine Valley architecturally by proportion, selection of colour and material. The church built using natural stone forms a charming ensemble with the castle positioned at the top" (p. 166).

The conclusions of the EIA are that "the tunnel option ... represents the alternative of a permanent Rhine crossing that influences the overall appearance of the Upper Middle Rhine Valley least." (pp. 182f.) The bridge options in comparison are all associated with visual impairments given the very delicate situation of the valley area" (p. 183). "In general it can be assumed that the already mentioned impairments of the landscape ... can appear more or less considerably with any type of structure. On the one hand, this depends on the technical requirements placed on the bridge construction ...; on the other hand, the Upper Middle Rhine Valley especially in the section of investigation between Wellmich and the Lorelei is considered a very delicate valley area especially with respect to the risks presented by new technical structures due to the high level importance associated with a clear and undisturbed view".

#### b) *Traffic evaluation of the bridge, ferry and tunnel options*

*This evaluation considers one bridge option, Fellen/Wellmich, a tunnel in the central location of St. Goar / St. Goarshausen and three ferries operating simultaneously in different locations. It considers economic and traffic arguments.*

It states that existing studies assume that the tunnel would take 7,400 vehicles a day and the bridge 7,000 and of that traffic between 1,500 and 2,000 cars would be 'new' traffic. However the study assumes that only 3,500 vehicles a day will use the ferry.

The key drivers for the bridge are seen as economic – in terms of the perceived worsening economic situation in the Rhine Valley. The bridge is seen as a way to improve contacts to the motorway network. The current roads are said to be "inhibited by the fact that an efficient connection to the A3 motorway on the right side of the Rhine is only accessible in a limited

fashion due to the relatively great distance.... The responsible authorities in the region hope not only for improved transportation conditions within the "Upper Middle Rhine Valley" from the planned new linking of the sub-areas on the right and left sides of the Rhine in the form of an additional Rhine bridge, but also impulses and symbolic effects that could reduce the currently clearly recognisable negative economic and demographic developments within the area of the World Heritage property".

The conclusions are that it is possible in principle to improve the ferry connections, but there are limitations in respect of reliability and usability and a ferry connection would generate significantly higher running costs than a bridge. A tunnel solution generates roughly the same level of costs as a ferry connection, and significantly higher costs than a bridge. A bridge represents the most economically favourable solution. It best improves availability for all classes of traffic and is the only possible solution that has no restrictions with regard to acceptance and usability. This means that it is best suited to forming the basis for a modern improvement in the structural situation in the Middle Rhine Valley.

#### c) *Visual Impact Assessment*

In the Visual Impact Assessment text the justification for the criteria are quoted as defining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property but not the 'Statement of Significance' and 'Brief Description' as set out in ICOMOS's evaluation. At the time of inscription, the Committee did not adopt a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value only the justification for the criteria. The State Party's text suggests that although ICOMOS had mentioned Rhine Romanticism in its text, it had not included cultural associations in its assessment of Outstanding Universal Value. However if the text of the Brief Description and Statement of Significance are considered, (*which would now be called the synthesis*) then clearly the Outstanding Universal Value does encompass the influence the landscape had on writers, artists and composers.

The impact assessment nevertheless does consider the visual significance of the Rhine Valley landscape and its Romantic associations:

"The visualisations of the planned Rhine bridge show that, due to its location between Hirzenach/Kestert and Fellen/Wellmich, it principally only minorly impairs the existing landscape qualities. The valley section can also continue to be perceived as an integral area from elevated viewpoints. The mostly intact slopes are not visually disrupted.

The "viewing triangle" between Rheinfels Castle (left bank of the Rhine) and the castles Katz or Maus (right bank of the Rhine) is also not influenced by the planned bridge structure. The planned bridge can also not be seen from historically important viewing points such as the Lorelei (right bank of the Rhine) and the "Werlauer Pilz" (left bank of the Rhine).

"Classic" views from the banks, like from Fellen in the direction of Wellmich with the Maus Castle, today have no prominent significance either as tourist attractions, but are also principally not impaired. When one approaches the bridge upstream on a ship, the views of Rhine ships in the direction of Wellmich and the Maus Castle are intermittently impaired. However, after passing beneath the bridge, there is still a comparatively long view corridor towards Wellmich".

The conclusion is thus drawn that 'The planned bridge between Wellmich and Fellen is located outside areas particularly sensitive in terms of cultural history or cultural landscape. In comparison with the other sections of the "Upper Middle Rhine Valley" this area is of subordinate significance with respect to the values and characteristics of the World Heritage property „Upper Middle Rhine Valley“.

#### d) *Management Plan*

The State Party reports states that the development of a locally and regionally promoted "master plan" for the property in the medium term is seen as absolutely essential, because

the planned Rhine bridge represents only one building block of many in this context of necessary measures.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the EIA clearly demonstrates the overall sensitivity of the Rhine Valley landscape and the adverse impact that the proposed bridge could have on the cultural landscape. The traffic assessment demonstrates that a bridge would be the easiest solution in terms of use and thus would probably generate most traffic. The Visual Impact Assessment suggests that the area of the Rhine Valley north of St. Goar and St. Goarhausen is in some way of lesser importance to the overall Outstanding Universal Value of the property than the area immediately to its south but does not set out a convincing argument as to how it might still contribute to Outstanding Universal Value. The landscape of the Rhine Valley is one of contrasts and surprises as the traveler moves down the river. The landscape near Wellmich clearly is not one of the dramatic views but is the approach to the dramatic views and as such a very necessary part of the overall harmonious landscape as is demonstrated by the fact that the whole property is designated as being of outstanding natural beauty.

The text also suggests that as the property was inscribed as a cultural landscape (evolving cultural landscape), then the development of a bridge can be seen to be in accordance with its categorisation. However, although evolving cultural landscapes will develop they must evolve in a way that protects the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value. Thus the impact assessment needs to consider the impact of the proposed bridge on the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value.

The State Party report also stresses that it is essential for any consideration of bridges to be integrated into an overall management plan for the property as it said that the planned Rhine bridge represents only one building block of many in this context of necessary measures. The World Heritage Centre the Advisory Bodies consider that this demonstrates the need for a greater understanding of where the development of the property might be heading, what these necessary measures are, and how they all might contribute to the sustainable development of the landscape. On the one hand, there are ambitious plans to restore terraced vineyards that contributed so strongly to the landscape patterns until the last few decades, while on the other hand, the proposed bridge would generate up to 2,000 extra cars a day, and add significantly to pollution and noise. In this context the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recall that concern was expressed to the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session at the overall noise levels emanating from both road and rail traffic.

There is an urgent need to set out a vision for this property that fully articulates how the attributes of the property might be developed in a sustainable way.

**Draft Decision:        34 COM 7B.87**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.104**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Acknowledges the receipt of the full Environmental Impact Assessment, the new Traffic Evaluation of bridge, tunnel and ferries and the Visual Impact Assessment supplied by the State Party;

4. Notes that
  - a) *the Environmental Impact Assessment clearly demonstrates the overall sensitivity of the Rhine Valley landscape and the adverse impact that the proposed bridge would have on the cultural landscape,*
  - b) *the traffic evaluation demonstrates that the bridge represents the most economically favourable solution, and*
  - c) *the Visual Impact Study demonstrates that, if the valley north of St. Goar and St. Goarhausen is in some way of lesser importance to the overall Outstanding Universal Value of the property than the area immediately to its south, then the bridge could be considered acceptable in visual terms;*
5. Also notes *that the State Party considers that it is essential that a “master plan” for the property is developed as ‘the planned Rhine bridge represents only one building block of many in this context of necessary measures’;*
6. Considers *that it is essential that any development of the valley not only sustains Outstanding Universal Value but also contributes to the overall sustainable development of the property, and that a Master Plan should be developed setting out a vision for the property and how it will be realized over the next few decades and thus setting out the further measures that might be associated with a new bridge;*
7. Acknowledges *receipt of the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value that will be reviewed by ICOMOS and presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session;*
8. Further requests *the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011** a report on the progress of the Master Plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

#### **88. Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party’s report on the state of conservation)

#### **89. Skellig Michael (Ireland) (C 757)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1996

Criteria  
(iii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
**32 COM 7B.96; 32 COM 8D**

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
November 2007: World Heritage Centre- ICOMOS advisory mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Revision of the management plan;
- b) Visitor infrastructure.

Illustrative material  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/757>

Current conservation issues

The Skellig Michael World Heritage Site Management Plan 2008-2018 was finalised and submitted by the State Party in July 2008. The 126 pages document offers a comprehensive appreciation of the built and natural heritage of the property, and can be found at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/757/documents>

A Progress Report on the implementation of the November 2007 advisory mission recommendations and the implementation of the management plan was submitted on 26 January 2010. This report covers relevant actions within the Management Plan and the progress with regard to their implementation.

Since 2005, conservation works on the property raised concern amongst a variety of stakeholders. There were also complaints about visitor access arrangements that had been put in place following the inscription. A review undertaken in September 2007 indicated that the official views, and those of critics, appeared irreconcilable. Accordingly, the Irish authorities requested an advisory mission, which was carried out in November 2007 and was reported to the Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.

a) *Advisory Committee*

The State Party reports that the Advisory Committee has been appointed and has met twice. It also reports that the results of all excavations carried out in the Monastery and on the South Peak will be fully written up and available on the website of the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government's World Heritage by the end of 2010. There is, however, no report on when a full academic publication of the conservation work will begin apart from that it will be undertaken during the life-time of the plan, nor of when the necessary resources for a fully costed programme will be put in place.

The Plan further states that a research framework will be established that would invite the involvement of universities and interested parties in research programmes. This will, in turn, inform a formal research strategy, which will be formulated for the island as a whole.

b) *Boatmen (boatpeople)*

The mission recommended annual minuted meetings should be held with the boatmen who ferry passengers to the island and that criteria for the granting of new landing permits should be identified in order to resolve disputes between the boatmen and the authorities. The State Party reports that a first meeting with the boatmen to consider these matters will take place in February 2010.

c) *Site Manager*

The mission recommended the appointment of a Site Manager who could fulfill an essential coordinating role between the various official and stakeholder interests and be responsible for driving forward the actions proposed in the Management Plan.

The State Party reports that a Site Management Team has been set up of four people – mostly senior professionals, some based in Dublin – rather than an individual site manager.

d) *Visitor study*

The mission considered that this was needed to identify needs and perceptions of visitors and vitally to confirm the carrying capacity of this small island with its precipitous cliffs and little flat walking space. The State Party reports that a survey is planned for the 2011 season.

e) *Visitor facilities*

The mission recommended that a detailed study should be commissioned to identify an environmentally acceptable solution to the lack of toilet facilities on the island. The State Party states that a report has been commissioned and a draft produced but no details are provided.

f) *Health and Safety*

This matter was brought sharply into focus by the tragic deaths of two visitors to the island in 2009, brought about by falls. The State Party reports that the safety of visitors is a priority and the Office of Public Works has commissioned a wide-ranging safety review that will be forwarded to the World Heritage Committee as soon as it is completed.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned about the lack of progress in implementing the recommendations of the 2007 Advisory Mission. The recommendations were pertinent in terms of addressing the key issues: approaches to conservation of the site and disputes with local boatmen. For the conservation approaches to be properly understood it is essential that sufficient information is provided to the public about the state of conservation of the site before restoration and the approaches that were developed with their rationale. Although the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are aware that there is a commitment to publication within the time span of the Management Plan (2008-2018), they consider that this should be implemented as a high priority action. Similarly, it considers that formalising arrangements with the boatmen who consider themselves to be guardians of the property should also be a high priority.

The tragic deaths of two tourists has highlighted the urgent need for a risk assessment for the property and the need for a survey of the carrying capacity of the island that was requested by the mission and which is only scheduled for 2011. The State Party has chosen not to appoint a Site Manager as recommended by the mission. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies do however consider that a Site Manager could be the catalyst that is needed to make progress with the mission recommendations and with the different actions addressed in the Management Plan.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.89**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.96**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),

3. *Acknowledges the progress achieved through the development of the Skellig Michael Management Plan 2008–2018 prepared by the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, in conjunction with the Office of Public Works and following an extensive consultation process, that was formally submitted to the World Heritage Centre in July 2008;*
4. *Regrets that no substantial progress has been made in delivering a fully resourced publication programme to enable the conservation approaches to be fully and widely understood and urges the State Party to begin this programme with appropriate scientific advice;*
5. *Notes that the first meeting with the boatmen only took place in February 2010 and requests the State Party to give higher priority to liaising with stakeholders who transport visitors in order to put in place formally agreed arrangements for landing and timetables;*
6. *Also regrets that the State Party did not consider the need for a specific Site Manager to be appointed for the property, and also requests that the State Party reconsider this or assign a member of the Site Management Team to take lead responsibility;*
7. *Also urges the State Party to complete a Risk Assessment and a Visitor Carrying Capacity Study as soon as possible in order to put in place adequate arrangements for visitors that mitigate as far as possible risks to which they may be exposed;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to report back on all the points above and the recommendations of the 2007 advisory mission to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies by **1 February 2012** .*

## **90. City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy) (C 712bis)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2000

Criteria  
(v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
**30 COM 7B.87, 31 COM 7B.114, 32 COM 7B.98**

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

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2001: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN mission; November 2003: World Heritage Centre mission; July 2009: ICOMOS / IUCN Technical Advisory mission (invited by Lithuania)

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

A state of conservation report was submitted by the State Party of the Russian Federation on 29 January and by the State Party of Lithuania on 8 February 2010.

Both reports highlighted threats from varying types and degrees of development pressures and also comment on the adverse impacts of storms on the reconstructed dunes that relate to work undertaken in the 19th century to form a long sand protection bank on the seaward side of the Spit in response to the devastating deforestation of the 16th century and the subsequent emergence of unstable desert dunes.

In July 2009 the Lithuanian State Party invited an ICOMOS/IUCN technical advisory mission to visit the Lithuanian part of the transboundary property to consider whether the current general plans of the Neringa and Klaipeda municipalities and the revised management plan of the Curonian Spit National Park, together still met the management requirements of the World Heritage property that were considered to be met at the time of inscription. The mission report is available on-line at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM/>

a) *Development Pressures*

The Russian State Party reported that a special economic zone for tourist and recreational purposes was being developed in Kaliningrad and that four allotments had been given permission. This was said to be part of what was called a 'commonplace project for real estate development on the Spit'. The State Party acknowledged that this type of development is in conflict with the very purpose of the National Park. Although an environmental impact assessment has been carried out, it is stated that this will allow only a relative reduction in the damage that may be inflicted on natural complexes of Curonian Spit by the development. What is not stated is the impact on the cultural landscape for which the property was inscribed on the List. The Lithuanian State Party report states that this issue was discussed at the 6th meeting of the joint Lithuanian-Russian Environmental Projection Commission that met in September 2009 in Moscow and that at this meeting it was confirmed that further development had not been approved by the Russian authorities. Furthermore the Russian State Party reports that borders of the Curonian Spit National Park have not yet been specified and activities to create a buffer zone are pending.

The joint advisory mission to the Lithuanian part of the Spit highlighted the vulnerability of the fishermen's houses, traditionally developed in parallel rows on the lagoon side of the Spit, some of which had been significantly extended or even reconstructed. The mission considered that the overall stock of authentic pre-World War II fisherman's houses has declined to a degree that the task of restoration is now crucial and urgent. In some of the settlements the degree of new development is such that overall they appear as new recreational developments rather than traditional villages. The Mission also noted the



pressure to extend the envelope of settlements for the development of hotels, houses and apartments, caravan and camp sites, as many of the Soviet era structures for these uses had been privatized, and to upgrade roads for large coaches and campervans.

The mission suggested nine specific recommendations relating to the restoration of fishermen's settlements, design guide for all construction, sustainable traffic strategy, constraints on the development of Soviet era remains, limitations on development near the lagoon, on the Sea coastal dune and on the development of marinas, presumption in favour of using existing settlement envelopes for appropriate scale development, the need to identify carrying capacities for visitors, and recognition that major developments of hotels, spas, health centres or other large developments in the southern part of the Spit, and the re-development of former isolated Soviet sites could impact adversely on Outstanding Universal Value.

The State Party of Lithuania reports that the recommendations for developing carrying capacities and design guides were being prepared and passed for appropriate funding.

b) *Management*

The advisory mission to the Lithuanian part of the Spit did not consider that the current revised plans for the National Park and the two municipalities delivered the detailed, sensitive and coherent management that is needed to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value. It recommended that these needed to be revised on the basis of an agreed Statement of Outstanding Universal value for the whole property, a vision for the property in the medium term and the development of a joint management plan for the whole property. For the Lithuanian part there was also a need for an agreed hierarchical structure between the plans of the Park and Municipalities. The Lithuanian State Party in its report stated that proposal for a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value were being developed between professionals and NGO representatives and this would be used for taking forward the recommendations.

c) *Inter-governmental cooperation*

The Lithuanian State Party reports that the signing of the two bilateral agreements between Lithuania and the Russian Federation on co-operation in case of pollution accidents, pollution prevention, mitigation and compensation measures and on the Lithuanian and Russian Action Plan for Co-operation in Case of Pollution Accidents in the Baltic Sea, has been delayed.

The State Party of the Russian Federation considers the threat of possible pollution of the Spit by the exploitation at the D-6 oil platform hypothetical and assures that there are no serious problems with environmental pollution.

Two meetings of the Lithuanian-Russian Working Group on liquidation of after effects of emergencies in the Baltic Sea were held in December 2008 and June 2009.

The Russian State Party further reports that since 2008, an Agreement on cooperation between the Curonian Spit National Park in the Russian part and Kursiu Nerija National Park in Lithuania was in place.

d) *Vulnerability of sand-dunes*

The report from the Russian Federation states that observations by researchers suggest that the processes of destruction of sand dunes by waves and storms now tend to dominate over those of restoration. It notes that over the last 25 years, 18 extreme storms hit the Kaliningrad coast of the Baltic region and it is suggested that there are places along the Spit where breakthrough by the Ocean and subsequent destruction of Curonian Spit are most probable.

The State Party of Lithuania reports that at the end of 2009 0.5ha of the dunes were partially eroded by a storm. Mitigation measures such as re-formation of the dunes using geo-textiles

were put in place. In 2009 16 ha of trees were planted and a further 126 ha were fenced to allow regeneration.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the Advisory Mission to the Lithuanian part of the property was timely in being asked to consider whether the changes to management arrangements still met the requirements of the property. The mission highlighted the fragility and vulnerability of the property in terms of the decline of authentic fishermen's houses, the impact of new development on the landscape of reconstructed dunes and forests and further threats from potential large-scale new developments and infrastructure projects. It also set out the need to revise the management arrangements to address these threats.

The threats from new tourist development are mirrored on the Russian part of the property, in terms of the 'tourist zones' mentioned in the report from the Russian State Party. Added to these threats are those reported from both States Parties related to the impact of recent storms on the reconstructed dunes facing the sea.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the distinctive character of the fragile and comparatively remote Spit is under potential threat from development that could completely over-shadow the small scale settlements and the maritime landscape. They consider that there is a need to define a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property and clearly define its attributes as a basis for management and for defining a clear vision for the sustainable development of the property.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.91**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7B.87**, **31 COM 7B.114** and **32 COM 7B.98** adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006), 31st (Christchurch, 2007) and 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) sessions respectively,*
3. *Regrets that the bilateral "Agreement Concerning Co-operation in Case of Pollution Accidents, Pollution Prevention, Mitigation and Compensation Measures" and the joint "Lithuanian and Russian Action Plan for Co-operation in Case of Pollution Accidents in the Baltic Sea", have not yet been signed, and urges the States Parties to progress this matter and to continue bilateral environmental monitoring;*
4. *Commends the State Party of Lithuania for inviting a joint ICOMOS/IUCN technical advisory mission and encourages it to continue to address the recommendations of the mission to ensure that the management systems and plans are adequate to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value, and that the traditional settlements are protected and conserved and have appropriate planning and development controls in place;*
5. *Expresses its concern about the possible tourism economic zone in Kaliningrad, and requests the State Party of the Russian Federation to provide full details of plans already approved, or in preparation and their related Environmental Impact Assessments for evaluation to the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN ;*

6. Also expresses its concern at the threats to the dunes, as set out in the report from the State Party of the Russian Federation and also requests it to provide details of mitigation measures that might be required in the light of measures deployed in the Lithuanian part of the property;
7. Also encourages the two States Parties to prepare a joint Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property as a basis for future management and conservation; and to strengthen collaboration over management and protection in line with assurances made at the time of inscription and to put in place a coordinated management mechanism in line with the requirements of the Operational Guidelines;
8. Further requests the States Parties of the Russian Federation and Lithuania to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to consider the state of conservation of the transboundary property in relation to threats of development and from the erosion of sand-dunes, and to review the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property;
9. Requests furthermore the States Parties of the Russian Federation and Lithuania to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, an updated joint report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above items, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

## 92. Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (C 723)

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission report)

## 93. Historic Centre of Sighisoara (Romania) (C 902)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

Criteria

(iii) (v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**29 COM 7B.82 ; 31 COM 7B.117 ; 32 COM 7B.103**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20 000

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2002 : World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Dracula Park project;
- b) Deterioration of monuments in general and the fortifications in particular;
- c) Lack of protection and maintenance measures, local responsibility and funding strategies.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/902>

Current conservation issues

The State Party report, received on 1 February 2010, provides information regarding the actions implemented by the National Institute for Historic Monuments of Romania and the Municipality of the town of Sighisoara since the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee (Quebec, 2008), namely:

a) *Monitoring of the state of conservation*

The National Institute for Historic Monuments has developed a « *Study on Interventions affecting the constructions of the urban ensemble of Sighisoara for the period 1990-2006* ». This study indicates examples of interventions on the buildings such as volume modifications, irregular interventions on facades, use of inadequate materials, replacement of traditional woodwork, changes in the function of buildings, development of interior courtyards and terrasses. In its report, the State Party recognizes that these types of intervention transform the urban aspect of the ensemble and could threaten the historic urban fabric. The study recommends the adoption of solutions aimed to avert major interventions and irreversible loss. In October 2008, the Mayor of Sighisoara founded a World Heritage Bureau to improve the management and monitoring of the state of conservation of the property.

b) *Protection and management of the site*

Since 2008, the town of Sighisoara is part of the thematic network HerO (Heritage as Opportunity) of the URBACT II Programme of the European Commission. Under this programme, and based on the results of the Framework Programme for the protection and management of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara finalised in 2007, the authorities expect to complete the management plan and the local action plan for this property before end-2010.

With the report, the State Party transmitted summaries of the following documents:

- Economic-social development strategy for the town of Sighisoara 2008-2013, approved by the Municipality of the town;
- The Zonal and Regulatory Urban Plan for the Protected Area of the property, approved by the National Commission for Town Planning;
- The Feasibility Study for the rehabilitation of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara as a part of the Documentation for Notice of Intervention Work;
- Study concerning the presentation of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara;
- Traffic Control Regulations in the Citadel;
- Regulations for street commerce;
- « Lighting Designers for Historic Urban Landscape » Project under the « Culture 2007 – 2013 » Programme;
- Funding Conventions for two road construction projects.

c) *Rehabilitation, restoration, construction*

With the report, the State Party also transmitted information concerning the following projects :

- Rehabilitation of systems for waste water and drinking water supplies

- Rehabilitation of the gas network
- Optical surveillance
- Architectural illumination
- Rehabilitation of street pavements in the Citadel and access roads
- Best practice guides
- Restoration and development of the Tailors' Tower in partnership between the Municipality of Sighisoara and the « Cele sapte Cetati » Association.

d) *Promotional activities*

The State Party transmitted with the report information concerning several promotional activities organized at Sighisoara, notably:

- Feasibility Study for the establishment of a National Centre for Tourist Information
- 25 cultural events organized in 2009 by the Town authorities, NGOs and the History Museum of Sighisoara
- Establishment of a partnership between the Municipality of Sighisoara and the « Mihai Eminescu Trust » Foundation, under the patronage of HRH Prince Charles of Great Britain.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the report prepared by the national authorities contains very detailed information concerning the actions taken by the State Party to ensure the monitoring of the state of conservation of the property, as well as its protection and management. However, information concerning the state of conservation presented in the *Study on Interventions affecting the Constructions of the Urban ensemble of Sighisoara* is only for the period 1990 to 2006. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies thank the State Party for its Study that clearly highlights the potential impacts of the interventions on the value and integrity of the property, and shares the concerns expressed in this document. Consequently, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the State Party should be encouraged to transmit for evaluation and comment detailed documents concerning the recent interventions, the detailed monitoring of the state of conservation of the property and in particular the general state of the monuments and fortifications. The description of any intent to undertake or authorize restoration, rehabilitation, conservation or construction projects, likely to affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara should also be transmitted for evaluation.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.93**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.103**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec, 2008),*
3. *Takes note of the actions taken by the State Party to ensure the monitoring of the state of conservation of the property, as well as its protection and management, and encourages it to pursue all the requisite steps to closely monitor the state of conservation of the Historic Centre of Sighisoara;*
4. *Urges the State Party to provide three printed examples and an electronic version of the approved Protection and Management Plan for examination by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*

5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, the description of any intent to undertake or to authorize restoration or construction projects, as well as impact studies of all projects likely to affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property, before granting any authorization that would be difficult to reverse;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated and detailed report on the state of conservation of all the components of this property and on the progress accomplished in the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

**94. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission)

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

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission)

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

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

**97. Ensemble of the Ferrapontov Monastery (Russian Federation) (C 982)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

## 98. Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320bis)

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

## 99. Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

### Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee decisions

**30 COM 7B.92; 32 COM 7B.109; 33 COM 7B.122**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

March 2002: ICOMOS mission; February 2009: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) *Urban development pressure (« Huerto de las Adoratrices » project and underground parking project at the Plaza de los Bandos);*
- b) Lack of comprehensive management plan.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/381>

### Current conservation issues

Since 2002, the World Heritage Committee has been expressing its concern on several occasions as regards the general measures taken for the conservation of the property and the lack of an comprehensive management plan, as well as some urban development projects, in particular the construction of an auditorium on the «Huerto de las Adoratrices». In January 2010, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report of Spanish properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, including the Old City of Salamanca. This report indicates the state of progress of the comprehensive management plan and provides information concerning the different urban development projects located in the protected area. It also provides information concerning the progress made following the other recommendations of the 2009 mission.

#### a) *Management plan*

A comprehensive management plan is being prepared, based on a detailed analysis of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and upon that which is defined as « essential concepts of outstanding universal value » such as cultural identity, urban vitality and citizenship.

The plan also takes into consideration the recommendations of the 2009 mission regarding the revision of the perimeter of the inscribed property and its buffer zone, the « Special Plan » for the protection of the historic zone and improved involvement of the local authorities and other concerned parties. Currently, the chapters of the management plan relating to the analysis and the diagnosis are complete. The other chapters shall comprise proposals for the different sectors of the town as regards conservation and protection and the coherent implementation of the management plan with the general urban plan.

b) *«Huerto de las Adoratrices» Project*

Following the recommendation of the World Heritage Committee (Decision **26 COM 21 (b) 69**), an initial project for the construction of an auditorium in the centre of the property has been abandoned. A new project for a cultural centre is proposed by the Caja Duero Bank, owner of the site. The intention is to demolish the buildings of the old convent whilst preserving the peripheral wall surrounding the garden and against which four new buildings of three levels (basement, ground floor and first floor) will be built; the central area would be partially occupied by a small auditorium.

In its 2010 report, the State Party indicates that the project has been suspended, but expresses its disagreement with the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies who had considered that the project would have a potential negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property because it would affect the urban fabric and the monuments in the adjacent sector. On the contrary, the State Party considers that the very function of the project would reinforce the cultural dimension of this sector of the Old City and perceives several positive aspects for such a project, including the demolition of more recent constructions which would enhance the bordering monuments.

c) *Plaza de los Bandos underground parking project*

An initial underground parking project was abandoned in 1997. The new project comprises four underground levels, each level covering 2100 m<sup>2</sup> with a total capacity of 390 places.

In its 2010 report, the State Party contests the judgement of the expert mission, based on the principle that the city must remain a vibrant entity and not a museum and therefore, it was important to facilitate the access of users and tourists to the historic centre. The underground parking project has however been suspended in respect of the decision of the World Heritage Committee.

d) *Tourist facilities project in the Vaguada de la Palma area*

The State Party submitted on 12th June 2009 details of the proposed tourist facilities in the Vaguada de la Palma area within the World Heritage property. This is a public open area that follows the natural course of the old Arroyo de los Milagros. The proposals are for a tourist information centre and bus station. The drawings provided show an almost flat roofed building with overhanging eaves. No environmental impact assessment has been provided for the project to assess its impact on outstanding universal value, nor a clear rationale for its justification. It is understood that local residents and others have objected to the plans on the grounds that it will intensify motorised traffic in this part of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that it is not possible to fully evaluate this scheme in isolation from the proposed Management Plan for the property which needs to set out an overall tourism development strategy related to transport and travel arrangements within the overall property. The scheme needs to be understood within this wider context when the appropriateness of its function, location and design could be properly considered and assessed. In the meantime, on visual and traffic grounds, the project appears undesirable in this part of this part of the property.



The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge the progress accomplished in the preparation of the management plan but consider that this plan and any revision of the boundary of the property must be in accordance with an approved Statement of Outstanding Universal Value that indicates exactly the features of Outstanding Universal Value.

As regards future development proposals, in the property and its buffer zone, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also consider that a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should constitute a basis for impact studies to analyse the potential impact of development proposals on the property.

**Draft decision: 34 COM 7B.99**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.122**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party concerning the measures taken for the development of an comprehensive management plan for the property and urges the State Party to complete this plan and to guarantee its full integration into the « Special Plan » for urban management mandated by regional legislation (2002);*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to abandon the «Huerto de las Adoratrices» and the «Plaza de los Bandos» projects, given their potential negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property;*
5. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for examination by the World Heritage Committee, and to ensure that this draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value be fully taken into account in the comprehensive management plan;*
6. *Requests the State Party to refrain from further development of the proposed tourist facilities in the Vaguada de la Palma until the integrated Management Plan has been finalised and approved in conjunction with the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including a detailed report on progress achieved in the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

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

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

### Criteria

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

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**33 COM 7B.123**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

High-rise development in the vicinity of the property.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/383>

### Current conservation issues

On 28 January 2010, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. This addressed the requests of the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) to undertake a comprehensive impact assessment of the proposed development of the Torre Cajasol on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property and its setting, to draft a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for examination by the World Heritage Committee, and to define a buffer zone.

The Committee also requested the State Party to halt any construction works on this project until such a comprehensive impact assessment had been completed and reviewed by ICOMOS. This has not been done.

#### a) *The project of "Torre Cajasol"*

The proposed 39 storey tower (36 above ground) is on the western bank of the Guadalquivir river approximately 600 meters from the boundaries of the Alcazar, which together with the Cathedral and Archivo de Indias, make up the property on the eastern side of the river. It is part of the development of an area known as "Puerto Triana" which extends to 66,500 square meters. The height of the tower is approximately twice the height of the Giralda.

The State Party reports that a national Expert Committee was formed to study the impact of the tower on the World Heritage property. The report of this committee is included in the State Party report.

This Expert Committee saw its roles considering the impact of the tower on the surrounding landscape. Although at the time of inscription only three buildings were inscribed, the outstanding urban complex that reflects the power and influence of Seville in the colonization of America also includes a number of other buildings such as the Torre de Oro, that make up a complex around the river, and this was acknowledged in the 2006 State Party Periodic Report that recommended extending the nominated area towards the river to include the "Torre de Oro" looking over the port of Seville.

The Expert Committee considered that although the proposed tower cannot be said to impact visually on the three components of the property it nevertheless has a potential negative impact on the transitional territory demanding dialogue with the historic city. They recommended that a buffer zone should be drawn up encompassing all the key elements of the historic urban landscape that were associated with colonization. They also recommended that, as a matter of urgency, Special Plans should be drawn up for the three component sites under the General Urban Planning Scheme, 2006.

The Expert Committee also summarized the planning issues and consents. The Tower has permission which was granted before Andalusia's Regional Historical Heritage Act entered into force in 2007. Building work has already started with preparations for sinking foundations and garages in the basement.

*b) Buffer Zone*

The State Party Report includes a proposal for a buffer zone within an area of 205 ha that is linked through historical, heritage and visual reasons with the three components of the property and also includes parts of the river that has shaped the development of the city and parts of the opposite banks. The buffer zone is an area within which the Giralda tower will stand out as a vertical landmark. It is contained within the Conjunto Historico de Sevilla, 1990, which has been declared a Property of Cultural Interest. The proposed buffer zone does not extend to cover the site of the Torre Casajol.

*c) Las Atarazanas*

The State Party, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* provides basic information about proposals for a significant warehouse complex in Gothic-Mudejar style. Its construction dates from the thirteenth century and it has undergone various transformations over the years. In 1993, the ensemble was restored to accommodate cultural activities. There is now a proposed new restoration project put forward by the Caixa Foundation to incorporate the building into a vast cultural complex.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that the impact assessment carried out in relation to the impact of the proposed Torre Casajol on the setting of the World Heritage property correctly identifies the adverse impact the building will have on the relationship between the three components that make up the World Heritage property and their urban context and thus on the Outstanding Universal Value and on the integrity of their setting. They consider that as set out in the 2006 State Party Periodic Report the three components should be linked to others to give them a firmer context. To understand fully the attributes of the property there is a need to understand the way they were linked to the development of the city and particularly with the river. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that it is of the utmost importance that the area that the State Party has now identified as a buffer zone should be protected but that given the configuration of the city tall towers beyond the immediate setting could still have a negative impact on the visual integrity of the ensemble.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.100**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.123**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the views of the Expert Committee set up to assess the impact of the proposed Torre Cajasol on the

*Outstanding Universal Value of the property and that this tower will have a negative impact on the 'transitional' area of the historic city;*

4. *Regrets that the State Party did not halt the construction works on this project as requested by the Committee until the impact assessment has been completed and reviewed by ICOMOS;*
5. *Urges the State Party to consider all possible measures to halt the Torre Casajol project in the light of the adverse impacts the building will have on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
6. *Notes the submission of a minor modification to the World Heritage Committee for the approval of the proposed buffer zone which will be reviewed by ICOMOS;*
7. *Encourages the State Party to submit a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value;*
8. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to halt the project of the Torre Cajasol and to implement the requests set out above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

#### **101. Old Town of Avila with its Extra-Muros Churches (Spain) (C 348bis)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

#### **102. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

Criteria

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 7B.89; 32 COM 7B.110; 33COM 7B.124**

International Assistance

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

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

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

### Previous monitoring missions

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

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

### Illustrative material

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

### Current conservation issues

On 29 January 2010, a detailed state of conservation report was submitted by the State Party, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). The State Party report provides an overview of the drafting process of the management plan, awareness raising campaigns and developments in the urban renewal areas, but provides little information regarding traffic plans and projects including the New Metro Bridge across the Golden Horn. The Committee at its last session proposed to consider possible inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in the absence of substantial progress regarding the construction plans of the new metro bridge across the Golden Horn. The following issues have been addressed in the State Party report:

#### a) *Management Structure*

The State Party reports that on 28 December 2009 the "UNESCO World Heritage Sites Management Directorate" was established in the Ministry of Culture and Tourism to coordinate World Heritage matters and collaborate with relevant authorities for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and the *Operational Guidelines*. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome this initiative to encourage further collaboration between central government and local authorities; it also complies with the recommendations of the 2009 joint reactive monitoring mission. However, little information has been provided regarding the composition and function of this Directorate.

#### b) *Site Management Plan*

The *Istanbul 2010 European Capital of Culture Agency* is financing the drafting of the Management Plan: a four-stage process and a one-year time framework have been established for the Plan to be finalised in December 2010. Several workshops and meetings have been held for its preparation with the participation of Turkish experts.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies commend the preliminary works but underline the urgent need for the finalization of the management plan to provide a proper framework to ensure that constructions and infrastructure projects respect the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property. Without this framework, the property is increasingly under threat due to the dynamic development of traffic and building projects in its core and on the Historic Peninsula.

#### c) *Awareness raising among stakeholders and local community*

The Municipality's Conservation Implementation and Control Bureau (KUDEB) conducted a number of awareness raising activities for conservation professionals, institutions and civil

society including training sessions, publications, films, a quarterly bulletin "Restoration and Conservation Activities", the panel "Conservation, Restoration and Sustainability of Timber Buildings" and seminar "Conservation of Masonry Buildings".

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome these activities. They note that although there is still no broad comprehensive awareness-building programme, the State Party reports that it plans to include awareness raising studies in the Site Management Plan.

d) *Urban renewal areas and Law 5366 for the "Preservation by Renovation and Utilization by Revitalizing of Deteriorated Immovable Historical and Cultural Properties"*

The State Party provides an overview of recent renovation programmes in twelve Urban Renewal Areas, part of them located within the property, three of which include the preservation of the historic fabric in its aims. The Ayvansaray Renewal area renovation project was revised according to the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission and resubmitted to the Regional Conservation Council for approval. It remains difficult to evaluate if all these renewal projects within the framework of Law 5366 respect the conservation of existing historic structures, as requested by the Committee.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the current implementation of Law 5366 constitutes a potential threat to the integrity of the World Heritage areas and the Historic Peninsula.

e) *New Metro Bridge across the Golden Horn*

The State Party, according to the information obtained from the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, reports that following the World Heritage Committee's decision, revised the plans for the Metro Bridge, reducing the 65 m bridge pylons to 55 m which corresponds to the base of the Süleymaniye Mosque. In January 2010 the Regional Conservation Council requested the submission of these new plans for evaluation.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that this represents no substantive progress since the position of the World Heritage Committee is very clear regarding the significant adverse impact of the towering cable-stay structure, even reduced to 55m, on the skyline and setting of the property and the views of the Süleymaniye Mosque, the importance of which is highlighted in justification of both criterion (i) as a unique masterpiece of human genius, and criterion (iv) as providing a top-rank example of a structure of the Ottoman period. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further note that no alternative solution, such as the design of a flat bridge, and the removal of the station from the middle of the bridge, has been seriously reconsidered by the municipality since last year. In addition, the independent Environmental Impact Study of the proposed bridge, based on an assessment of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, including the skyline of the Historic Peninsula, has not been provided, as requested by the Committee and recommended by the 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission. In a separate report received by the World Heritage Centre in January 2010, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality states that "the construction of the Bridge and moving on to the phase of first test drive are planned to be completed by the end of 2010." In addition, the World Heritage Centre has further learnt from Turkish media that 24 steel piles have already arrived on the construction site and that the construction has already started. Furthermore, a meeting between the Turkish Permanent Delegation and World Heritage Centre staff was held on 30 April 2010 on the bridge issue. The lack of an independent impact assessment of the proposed bridge (based on an assessment of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, including the skyline of the Historic Peninsula), as requested by the Committee, was discussed. The Permanent Delegation confirmed on 18 May to the Centre that the Turkish authorities are currently considering to conduct an alternative independent impact assessment for the Haliç metro bridge.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body therefore consider that in view of the absence of significant revision or abandonment of the current Golden Horn Bridge project by

the competent authorities, paragraph 179 of the *Operational Guidelines* concerning inclusion in the List of World Heritage Danger may be considered by the World Heritage Committee.

f) *Transportation Projects*

The State Party reports on the progress of two large scale transportation projects: The Marmaray Rail Tube Tunnel and the Bosphorus Transition Tunnel Project for Motor Vehicles. It informs that a project competition for the Marmaray Main Transfer Point station in Yenikapi aiming at the conservation of the archaeological area will be organised by the Istanbul 2010 European Capital of Culture Agency and that intensive excavation works continue on the site.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the attention paid to archaeological excavations at the affected areas and look forward to receiving the station project details by the State Party for assessment.

The State Party further reports that the Turkish-Korean Collaboration (TKJV) has signed a contract for the Bosphorus Transition Tunnel Project for Motor Vehicles (Eurasia Tunnel) to prepare the "Environmental and Social Assessment" of the project due in spring 2010. This tunnel project aims at unifying the Istanbul-Ankara state road, includes the widening of the Kennedy Avenue close by the core area of Archaeological Park.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain concerned about the impact of such a project on the property and recommend the State Party to include in the proposed "Environmental and Social Assessment" a specific assessment of possible impacts on the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in advance of any work being approved or undertaken. This assessment would be crucial to prevent any adverse impacts on the property due to an increase of traffic into the Historic Peninsula. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies regret that no details of the Traffic Plan have been provided as requested by the Committee.

g) *Ottoman style Timber Houses*

The State Party further reports on the KUDEB activities in training conservation specialists for timber houses and in restoring individual timber houses: 11 were completed and 5 are in process at the time of preparing this document. The historic buildings demolished by KIPTAS in 2007 and 2008 are to be restored using original materials and building techniques; the approval of the reconstruction projects is in process. The programme "Maintenance and Repair Program of Timber Structures" is being conducted by Istanbul 2010 Agency in coordination with KUDEB and with the participation of the National Timber Association.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the activities of KUDEB and the municipalities to finance and technically support the conservation of the timber houses should be further encouraged and commend the joint initiative with the Istanbul 2010 Agency and the National Timber Association. However the World Heritage Centre continues to receive letters regarding the illegal demolition of timber houses and notes that there appears to be little awareness of the obligations to safeguard vernacular architecture or the advantages of doing so for cultural tourism and housing purposes.

h) *Restoration of the Theodosian Walls*

A Theodosian Walls Management Plan is being financed by the Istanbul 2010 European Capital Agency, as well as several restoration projects to be finalised in 2010. 14 buildings were expropriated and 6 buildings were demolished in the Sur-i Sultani area which threatened the integrity of the area according to the State Party report.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that information provided is very limited: neither maps, nor photographs are provided and it remains difficult to assess whether these developments enhance or threaten the integrity of the property. Further information is therefore required in accordance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

i) *Four Seasons Hotel*

The cancellation of the additional building work at the Four Seasons Hotel by a court decision on 24 February 2009 also halted the archaeological excavation works. Decisions of the relevant regional courts and councils are awaited.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the decision to cancel the additional building. However they consider that this delay will put important archaeological remains at risk, due to prolonged exposure to weather conditions. Urgent measures should be taken for the conservation of the archaeological remains.

The State Party has also submitted a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. This will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document *WHC-10/34.COM/8B*).

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies encourage the State Party to pursue its efforts to implement the measures already requested by the World Heritage Committee. They commend the positive developments which have started in cooperation with the Istanbul 2010 European Capital Agency and the funding provided. They further encourage the State Party to urgently finalise the Site Management Plan in the proposed time framework of one year in order to sustain the ongoing positive developments and to avoid illegal demolitions, inappropriate reconstruction and development threatening the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies regret that the proposed bridge has neither been abandoned, nor have alternative designs such as a flat bridge been considered by the authorities as requested by the World Heritage Committee. The threat from the planned Golden Horn Bridge, together with the threats from inappropriate reconstruction and developments, particularly within the framework of Law 5366, all have the potential to impact adversely and irreversibly on the Outstanding Universal Value, and integrity of the property. Therefore the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that paragraph 179(b) of the *Operational Guidelines* is relevant and that the World Heritage Committee might wish to consider inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In case this option is considered, they furthermore propose a Desired state of conservation and corrective measures in the Draft Decision.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.102**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decisions 32 COM 7B.110 and 33 COM 7B.124 adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions respectively,
3. Also recalling the recommendations of the 2009 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, endorsed at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
4. Notes that the State Party has established a “UNESCO World Heritage Sites Management Directorate” in the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and encourages the authorities to detail its roles and responsibilities;



5. Also notes that further progress has been made in the drafting of the Management Plan and urges the State Party to complete the Management Plan within the proposed time framework of one year;
6. Acknowledges the efforts in awareness raising on the scope and value of the World Heritage property among stakeholders and local communities and also encourages the State Party to incorporate these efforts within the framework of the Management Plan;
7. Further notes the efforts of the joint initiative with the Istanbul 2010 Agency and the National Timber Association and KUDEB regarding the preservation of the Ottoman timber houses and reiterates the request to develop an holistic conservation or rehabilitation strategy or programme as part of the overall management plan;
8. Reiterates the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions (2006, 2008, 2009) concerning development projects and expresses its concern that only minor modifications appear to have been made to urban renewal projects proposed within the framework of Law 5366 for the "Preservation by Renovation and Utilization by Revitalisation of deteriorated Immovable Historical and Cultural Properties" to incorporate conservation plans appropriate for the property;
9. Regrets that the State Party has not provided any details of the overall Traffic Plan as requested by the World Heritage Committee, and expresses its concern about the potential impacts of increased traffic on the historic peninsula;
10. Also regrets that details of the Marmaray Rail Tube Tunnel and the Bosphorus Transition Tunnel Project for Motor Vehicle have not been provided as requested, and reiterates its request for details and specific heritage impact assessments for both projects addressing potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
11. Welcomes the decision to cancel the additional building of the Four Season Hotel, but remains concerned about the prolonged exposure to weather conditions of the important archaeological remains and therefore requests the State Party to take up measures for their adequate conservation;
12. Considers that the proposed construction project for a metro bridge with towering cable-stay structures across the Golden Horn has the potential to irreversibly damage the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property, in accordance with Paragraph 179 (b) of the Operational Guidelines;
13. Urges the State Party and the Metropolitan Municipality authorities to immediately abandon the proposed metro bridge project across the Golden Horn and requests the State Party to open discussions with all stakeholders as a matter of urgency, in order to find alternative bridge solutions, excluding towering cable-stay structure and a station in the middle of the bridge, so as to ensure the safeguarding of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and to provide to the World Heritage Centre on an on-going basis, for review by the Advisory Bodies, details of this process, together with a comprehensive assessment of the impact of alternative bridge proposals on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and in particular on the setting of the Süleymaniye Mosque and on the overall skyline of the historic peninsula;
14. **Decides to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger** , with a view to considering the deletion of the property from the World Heritage List at its 35th session in 2011, if plans for the construction of the currently proposed bridge project

are carried out and adopts the following Desired state of conservation and corrective measure, and strongly urges the State Party to implement these measures:

#### *Desired State of Conservation*

- a) *The currently proposed project for the bridge and metro station across the Golden Horn is abandoned and an independent environmental impact assessment is carried out, according to international standards, based on an assessment of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value of the property for any new metro bridge alternatives;*
- b) *A comprehensive management plan is adopted after review by the Advisory Bodies to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session and the 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS joint reactive monitoring mission;*
- c) *A process for rigorous heritage impact assessment is adopted for all large scale projects including transportation and other infrastructure projects, including urban renewal projects, to ensure that they do not adversely impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
- d) *The Ottoman style timber houses and the Theodosian walls, as key vulnerable attributes of the property, are protected and a programme for their conservation and rehabilitation agreed;*
- e) *The retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is adopted;*

#### *Corrective measures*

- a) *Development of alternative proposals for the metro bridge and its station which do not adversely impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and undertaking of an independent heritage impact assessment according to international standards, based on an assessment of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, including the skyline of the historic peninsula for the alternative proposals;*
  - b) *Continued development of an effective and comprehensive management plan to guide decision-making that will sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
  - c) *Development of an effective system of heritage impact assessment for ongoing and future projects at the property in order to assess their impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value including authenticity and integrity of the property;*
  - d) *Development of a comprehensive conservation programme for the Ottoman style timber houses and the Theodosian walls;*
  - e) *Implementation of other recommendations as provided in detail by the 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS joint reactive monitoring mission, endorsed by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session including an effective monitoring system.*
15. Also requests the State Party to provide without delay an alternative proposal for the metro bridge project across the Golden Horn as mentioned above in paragraph 13, and to submit a detailed report on all the above-mentioned issues to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011** for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, in order to review the conditions for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

### **103. Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral, Kiev Pechersk Lavra and Related Monastic Buildings (Ukraine) (C 527 bis)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1990

Criteria

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**32 COM 7B.111; 32 COM 8B.68; 32 COM 8D; 33 COM 7B.125**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: (1998-2009), USD 44720

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

May 1999: ICOMOS expert mission; April 2006: expert mission (Italian Funds-in-Trust); November 2007: World Heritage Centre information meeting for site managers; March 2009: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Urban development pressure

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/527>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 29 January 2010 and supplementary information on 1 February 2010, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).

*a) Management*

A Law "On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of Ukraine on protection of cultural heritage", including specific measures to create an unified system for the management of World Heritage properties, is currently under evaluation by the Ukrainian Parliament. No timetable has been provided.

*b) Catacombs of Kiev Pechersk Lavra*

The World Heritage Committee had expressed concern at the conditions of the Catacombs of Kiev Pechersk Lavra. The State Party reports that the overall state of conservation of the Lavra caves is satisfactory. A system of permanent monitoring of their safety, temperature, etc. has been established. However, the State Party acknowledges an unsatisfactory state of conservation of some unexplored side branches of the cave complexes. A comprehensive study of these areas includes, in particular, a survey, research on the ancient inscriptions and on ancient fresco paintings. A draft programme for the complex rehabilitation of the "Varangian caves" has been established. The State Party also reports that instability in the

section "Baty slaughter", an emergency situation since 2005, has been stabilized and reinforced. A project of restoration work in the National Kyiv-Pechersk Historical and Cultural Reserve, has been prepared within the framework of a 2009 State Programme developed in connection with the 2012 Union of European Football Associations (UEFA) Cup in Ukraine.

*c) Saint-Sophia Cathedral*

The modernization of utility services at St. Sophia Cathedral, restoration of mural painting in the Apostolic Chapel of the Cathedral, restoration of the Zaborovsky Gate and the renovation of the "corps de garde" are being carried out within the framework of the Programme for the preservation of monuments of the National Conservation Area "St. Sophia of Kyiv" for 2003 - 2010, approved by the Cabinet of Ministers.

*d) Urban Planning framework and boundary issues*

Since 2009, a new Urban Master Plan, including a new City Zoning Plan, has been developed. This plan will take into account the boundaries of the World Heritage property and its buffer zones. A stringent regime should be defined for buffer zones. A proposal for an eventual creation of common buffer zone for all components, extended to the Dnieper slopes, is under evaluation. The documentation on the cultural landscape of the right bank Dnieper is under preparation. No timescale provided for these activities. A General Plan for the National Kyiv-Pechersk Historical and Cultural Reserve, one of the components of the property, which is still under elaboration, has to be integral part of a new Urban Master Plan.

*e) Development in Buffer Zone and Setting*

In 2009, the authorities reviewed all new construction or reconstruction project proposals within the boundaries of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone. The information on these proposals will be transmitted to the World Heritage Centre.

On 15 February 2010, the State Party met with ICOMOS representatives on the issue concerning the construction of the complex at 17-23 Honchara Street, located in the buffer zone of this World Heritage property. Following this meeting, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS have been informed that, despite the World Heritage Committee's decision (Decision **33 COM 7B.125**) concerning the state of conservation of this World Heritage property, construction works are ongoing at the site in an accelerated manner.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are deeply concerned about the impact that such constructions could have on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property, and strongly recommend the State Party to implement the World Heritage Committee's decision concerning this property.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS recommend to carefully examine the state of conservation of this property, with a view to consider, in the absence of substantial progress by 2011, to inscribe the World Heritage property of *Kiev: Saint Sophia Cathedral and related monastic building, Kiev-Pechersk*, Ukraine, on the List of the World Heritage in Danger.

**Draft Decision:        34 COM 7B.103**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,

2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.125**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Acknowledges the satisfactory condition of the key monuments of the National Conservation Area "Saint Sophia of Kyiv", but expresses its concern that other monuments and the catacombs at the Lavra site remain in a critical condition;
4. Notes that a complex rehabilitation programme for the "Varangian caves" is being prepared and requests the State Party to submit a copy for review;
5. Deeply regrets that no moratorium has been put in place on a number of projects until an Urban Master Plan has considered appropriate uses for these sites, and reiterates its requests to the State Party to halt these projects in the light of their lack of conformity with regulations and their potential adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property:
  - a) Buildings on the territory around the Arsenal and the earth fortification following the international competition,
  - b) A hotel complex around Saint Spas of Berestove Church,
  - c) A hotel and residential complex on the land of the former military factories near the Arsenal,
  - d) The complex at 17-23 Honchara Street,
  - e) High-rise buildings that could compromise the panorama of the historical monastic landscape along the Dnieper;
6. Urges the State Party to adopt the Law "On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of Ukraine on protection of cultural heritage" and also requests the State Party to approve urgently a new City Urban Master Plan, including a Conservation Master Plan for the property and its buffer zone;
7. Also urges the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the draft integrated management plan of the property for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
8. Also reiterate its request to the State Party to consider extending the eastern boundary of the buffer zone of the Saint Sophia site to include Maidant Nezalejnosti Square as an important part of the urban structure, and to initiate a study on visual perspectives of the property in the wider context of the monastic riverside landscape;
9. Further requests the State Party to transmit to the World Heritage Centre, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, a description of any intention to undertake or to authorize major restoration or new construction projects which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
10. Requests furthermore the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the overall state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's decisions;
11. Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the recommendations set out in paragraphs above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

## 104. L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C 865)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1998

### Criteria

(ii) (v)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**31 COM 7B.120; 32 COM 8B.69; 33 COM 7B.126**

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

2004: ICOMOS-German World Heritage Foundation mission; March 2010: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) New constructions within the historic centre;
- b) Lack of valid detailed planning documents;
- c) Inadequate infrastructure including the sewage system

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/865>

### Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2010, a state of conservation report was submitted by the State Party. The report did not address directly the issues outlined in Decision **33 COM 7B.126** adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). The World Heritage Centre received a petition from representatives of the city's civil society requesting to prevent the construction of a 7 storey building on the site of the former Franciscan monastery's garden and park. A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre took place from 1 to 6 March 2010.

In its report the State Party covers the following issues:

#### a) *Main factors affecting the property*

The State Party reports that the main factors affecting the property are:

- Development pressures;
- Danger of loss of the visual integrity of the city due to the development pressures within the property, its buffer zone and beyond its limits;
- Deformation of buildings due to the geological condition of the soil;
- Intensive deterioration of decorative elements due to atmospheric pollution.

*b) Projects which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property*

A comprehensive programme of preservation of historical buildings in L'viv was carried out by the State Party from 1998 to 2007. A draft State Programme of restoration and regeneration of the historic buildings of L'viv was developed in 2008 and submitted to the relevant authorities for review. The State Party's report mentions some restoration projects, such as the Armenian Cathedral and residential buildings at 3 and 23 Rynok Square. The construction on the site of the former Franciscan monastery's garden and park was not mentioned either by the State Party or by the mission in its report.

The State Party's report mentioned the financial assistance received for the development and restoration of the Historic Centre of L'viv, the establishment of a monitoring system for the monuments, and the project "Shared Heritage".

The joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission expressed its concern about the overall state of conservation of the property, and in particular of the considerable threat to the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property due to inappropriate methods used regarding the conversion of historic buildings and the absence of dwelling rehabilitation standards.

*c) Management and Urban Master Plans*

The State Party reports that a strategic management plan for 2009-2015, when completed, will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre. The Urban Master Plan is expected to enter into force in summer 2010.

The State Party also mentions that the UNESCO summer school volunteers completed an inventory of historic buildings in L'viv. In 2007-2008, three restoration and stone conservation training summer schools were organised.

*d) Tourism pressures*

The State Party report notes the increased number of tourists to L'viv, the "Cultural Capital" of Ukraine in 2009. The development of additional tourist infrastructure in the city is expected for the UEFA (Union of European Football Associations) Euro 2012 finals.

*e) Monitoring and research*

The State Party's report mentions several monitoring and researches conducted, such as the monitoring of temperature changes and humidity; geodesic monitoring and tracking of deformation of buildings; archaeological survey on any ground excavation; engineering and geological analysis of soil in the historic city, and research of the structural stability of historic buildings. Awareness of the importance of the visual panorama has been raised by means of a project involving the placement of coloured balloons over planned construction sites at the relevant height. Photographs were then taken from important viewpoints in order to assess the likely impact of the planned construction.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note, with deep concern, serious changes in the urban fabric and the considerable threat to the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property due to the inappropriate rehabilitation methods resulting in a deteriorating of living-standards, the replacement of residences by the hotels, the loss of inhabitants, a substantial visual impact of some developments, as reported by the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission of March 2010.

Recognizing the enormous challenges faced by the State Party and the supporting work on sustainable development being undertaken by different agencies, including the European Commission and Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the completion of the management plan will

provide a platform that should allow the State Party to obtain further support from the international community for conservation and rehabilitation.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.104**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.126**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Notes the results and recommendations of the March 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and requests the State Party to take them into account;
4. Also notes the work carried out by the State Party on the strategic management plan and also requests the State Party to submit it to the World Heritage Centre in three copies;
5. Expresses its deep concern regarding the overall state of conservation of the property, and in particular, serious changes to the urban fabric and considerable threat to the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property;
6. Urges the State Party to immediately adopt all necessary measures aiming to ensure the safeguarding of the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property, including guidelines for the restoration and conservation of the urban fabric ;
7. Also urges the State Party and the Municipality authorities to immediately halt any development projects, and in particular at the Citadel and construction at the former Franciscan Monastery, which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property, and to inform the World Heritage Centre, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, on any intention to undertake or to authorize such projects;
8. Calls upon the international community to consider supporting the conservation and rehabilitation of the urban fabric;
9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including the results of monitoring and survey of the urban fabric, the strategic management plan and the urban master plan as approved, report on the use of the historic buildings and monuments, for examination by the World Heritage Committee, **with a view to considering, in absence of substantial progress, to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 35th session in 2011.**



## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2000

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**32 COM 7B.119**

International Assistance

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

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

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

Previous monitoring missions

August 2002: UNESCO and international expert mission.

In the framework of the JFIT project: November 2007: World Heritage Centre preparatory mission; February – March 2009: World Heritage Centre technical assessment mission; November 2009 World Heritage Centre/Quito Office follow-up mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a Management Plan for the site;
- b) Lack of coordinated conservation policies and interventions between the National Government and the Municipality of Tiwanaku;
- c) Need for the designation of a National counterpart for the JFIT project and a site manager at local level;
- d) Lack of governance.

Illustrative material

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

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

#### Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre received the state of conservation report from the State Party on 8 February 2010. The report describes the background of institutional changes undergone in the country since 2008, including the change of status of the Vice Ministry of Culture to the Ministry of Cultures, the authority in charge of the property through the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and the Archaeology Unit, under the Vice Ministry of Interculturalism. The State Party also reports several changes that affected the operational level and coordination at the site level.

A World Heritage Centre technical assessment follow-up mission, carried out in March 2009 within the framework of the Japanese Funds-in-Trust (JFIT) project, recommended stopping the ongoing excavations in the Akapana Pyramid due to the poor state of its drainage system and significant structural problems. The World Heritage Centre requested the submission of specific technical information regarding the archaeological excavation plan for 2009 as well

as technical studies of certain areas of the Pyramid; unfortunately the World Heritage Centre received none of these studies.

The excavation works continued under the Municipality's supervision even after the National Unit of Archaeology (UNAR) of the Ministry of Cultures had been forced to leave the property.

The report indicates that in July 2009, upon the intervention of the Municipal Government, UNAR stopped the excavations and works carried out at the property, resulting in a loss of the coordinated relations between the Municipality of Tiwanaku and the Ministry of Cultures and therefore a lack of official technical supervision from the Ministry at the property. The Municipality hired archaeologists with unsuitable expertise to conduct the required conservation measures and to continue the interventions.

In September 2009, after obtaining information from the UNESCO Office in Quito, the responsible entity for the implementation of the JFIT project, the World Heritage Centre insisted on the need to halt the excavations and to improve the conservation conditions of the museums. It requested the Government to guarantee an official national counterpart at the property as a matter of urgency. According to the state of conservation report, the unofficial activities carried out by the Municipal Government include interventions on the Akapana Pyramid (archaeological digging for drainages in the eastern area and excavations and research in the southern area and at the top). Interventions on the Putuni structure have also been undertaken, but no technically comprehensive information was submitted.

During the visit of the Minister of Cultures to UNESCO Headquarters in October 2009 on the occasion of the General Assembly of States Parties, the World Heritage Centre met the Minister in order to find solutions to the situation. Subsequently, in November 2009, a follow-up technical assessment mission was carried out to re-evaluate the situation and the World Heritage Centre further requested the State Party to guarantee the conditions for the project to be implemented.

Several commitments were agreed upon, and two new specific studies for the Pyramid were considered necessary and urgent. These studies are being carried out, thanks to a reallocation of budget of the JFIT project. The State Party's commitments included the nomination of a site manager and a focal point to coordinate the project with UNESCO. In December 2009, a counterpart of the Bolivian Government was assigned; unfortunately in February 2010 this person resigned, leaving the project with no coordinating officer with the State Party once again.

The World Heritage Centre has been informed that a recently approved Municipal Ordinance (N°311/2009) states that any intervention or project at the site has to be approved by authorization of the Municipality. This situation presents a risk, as it leaves the official counterpart of UNESCO, the Ministry of Cultures, with no technical capacity for action at the property. The report submitted by the State Party indicates that this measure is considered completely unconstitutional. It also indicates that the coordinated implementation of the management and conservation plan for the site through 2010 will be conducive to favourable scenarios for collaborative endeavours.

The state of conservation report points out that a private company has finalized works at the Lithic Museum, and the Ministry of Cultures has made observations regarding the fabric and museography. Nevertheless, no precise information on the observations made by the Ministry has been included. The state of conservation of the Lithic and Ceramic Museums is still a matter of concern due to the serious damages to the archaeological objects as a result of humidity and drainage problems.

a) *Implementation of the "Project for the preservation and conservation of Tiwanaku and the Akapana Pyramid" funded by the Japanese Funds-in-Trust (JFIT)*

Since the official launching of the project at the beginning of 2009, the constant change of authorities has hindered the foreseen implementation. Since 2009 there has been one Vice

Minister of Cultures (who became Minister), two Vice Ministers of Interculturality, four Directors of Heritage, and two Ministers of Culture. UNAR has had four Directors, including a three-month period with no person in charge. Recent information indicates that, at the request of the new Minister, the police are carrying out an investigation at UNAR and an audit is being administrated.

In spite of the institutional difficulties, a number of activities from the first year have been put in place. The recommendations from the missions carried out to the property have strongly advised the discontinuation of scheduled activities pending a firm commitment from the State Party to improve the current situation, to guarantee the appropriate follow-up for the project and to accomplish the agreed objectives.

As explained before, urgent action on the Akapana Pyramid was strongly encouraged on repeated occasions and stability studies were commissioned. The November 2009 mission stated the urgency of conducting tomography and topographic studies of the Pyramid to set up the base line for future conservation measures after the inappropriate archaeological interventions carried out on the site. The JFIT project has assumed the costs for developing the studies.

After the tomographic and topographic studies have been finalized and their recommendations have been submitted and analysed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, an international expert meeting is proposed to draft regulations on archaeological interventions according to international standards and in accordance to the assessment of the Advisory Bodies and other concerned entities.

*b) Other conservation issues*

At the end of 2009 a substance similar to oil damaged some of the emblematic pieces of the site, Puerta del Sol and monolith Fraile, a conservation treatment procured by the unskilled staff hired by the Municipality. No technical information related to the intervention was submitted.

The report contains information on the coordination measures taken by the Ministry of Cultures and other concerned institutions during the Presidential investiture on 22 January 2009. According to the report, no damages to the state of conservation of the site were recorded but no precise information on measures taken was provided. Through other sources, the World Heritage Centre was informed that about 40 000 attendants were present and activities such as food selling, installation of public bathrooms and the use of stone elements as seats in the protected area had taken place.

*c) New information received*

During her visit to Paris in March 2010, the Minister of Cultures of Bolivia committed to work on addressing the concerns raised by the World Heritage Centre in relation to the conservation of the property, in particular: the stability of the Akapana Pyramid, the conservation of emblematic steles and the Gate of the Sun, the state of deterioration of the museums and the conservation of their archaeological collections, the lack of an archaeological plan of excavations and the management system. It was agreed that a national counterpart at the national and local levels would be designated. To date, the situation remains the same as in November 2009.

The Minister of Cultures has also informed the World Heritage Centre that the Committee for the Research, Administration and Management of the Archaeological site of Tiwanaku (CIAGSAT), the previous entity for the management of the site, has been dissolved. The Minister is preparing a Presidential Decree for the creation of a new entity in charge of the administration of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS remain deeply concerned about the lack of adequate and efficient institutional arrangements, legal frameworks and technical capacity to guarantee the conservation of the property in spite of the continued declarations of

commitment by the State Party. The disrupted relations between the Municipality and the Ministry, resulting in the lack of governance of the property and non operational management arrangements, is causing negative impacts for the preservation of the property and the implementation of conservation projects. In addition, the lack of a buffer zone and land use plans at the municipal level constitute a potential threat to the outstanding universal value, integrity and authenticity of the property.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.105**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.119**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Urges the State Party to take the appropriate measures to guarantee the implementation of the “Project for the Conservation and Preservation of Tiwanaku and the Akapana Pyramid” by implementing the commitments agreed upon in November 2009:*
  - a) *To halt any archaeological interventions on the Akapana Pyramid until the recommendations of tomographic and topographic studies have been submitted and analysed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies,*
  - b) *To establish a moratorium on any archaeological excavations until a national authority has been established for the property,*
  - c) *To continue the development of the management plan and to set up and make operational institutional arrangements, legal frameworks and technical capacities for the implementation of conservation measures,*
  - d) *To designate a site manager and official counterpart at national level,*
  - e) *To guarantee the integrated conservation of the archaeological movable heritage at the museums,*
  - f) *To establish a buffer zone for the property to enhance the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, including its integrity and authenticity;*
4. *Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies informed about projects in the planning phase or under execution that could overlap or contradict the actions foreseen by the Japanese Funds-in-Trust (JFIT) project according to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
5. *Strongly encourages the State Party to organize in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the JFIT project an international meeting to finalize the regulations for archaeological interventions and conservation measures in coordination with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, as well as any other relevant bodies, taking into account international standards for conservation;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the progress in the implementation of agreed measures and objectives;*

7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above mentioned activities, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

## 106. Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

### Criteria

(i) (iv)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

**27 COM 7B.85; 28 COM 15B.108; 33 COM 7B.133**

### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 42,000 for conservation, culture and symposiums

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous Monitoring Missions

November 2001: UNESCO/ICOMOS mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Urban pressure that may affect the original city plan (*Plano Piloto*) that warranted inscription in the World Heritage List;
- b) Lack of a Master Plan.

### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/445>

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 5 February 2010. The report provides information on the activities implemented by the Superintendence of *Instituto Do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional (IPHAN)* in relation to the control and supervision of the property. It also submitted technical reports on projects as requested by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **33 COM 7B.133**.

#### a) *Federal District's Territorial Development Planning*

The State Party reported that the main challenge of this planning is to define principles and mechanisms to safeguard and preserve Brasilia's Urban Plan Compound area. The Complementary Law no. 803/2009, approved by Federal District Legislative, April 2009), establishes the Compound Urban Zone (ZUCT) in addition to defining limits and creating guidelines for this ZUCT. The establishment of buffer zones come under a different planning tool, the Urban Historical site preservation plan; there are additional means to declare controlled use urban zones to protect the inscribed area. In addition, Brasilia's Urbanistic Compound Preservation Plan has been finalised and there is a project in place to protect areas that contribute to maintaining the horizontal line of the city.

The State Party reports that the study for the delimitation of the buffer zone is being developed with requested support from the Geographical Services Directory and the Army's Geographical Information and Image Centre. It is not clear whether this will extend to the wider setting that was said to be protected in last year's report. The State Party also states that this study will be presented in the first semester of 2010, subject to review by IPHAN.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note on the information provided by the State Party and encourage the State Party to continue its efforts in articulating all planning documents to strengthen preservation and maintenance of the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They reiterate their request to the State Party to submit the proposed new boundaries for the buffer zone, proper cartography and related regulations for examination by the World Heritage Committee.

b) *Management Plan – Brasilia's Urbanistic Compound Preservation Plan*

The Urbanistic Compound Preservation Plan has been submitted by the State Party (printed only and in Portuguese). In last year's State Party Report this was stated to be considered as the management plan for the property.

c) *Roads W3 and VLT- Light Vehicles on rails*

In addition to what is mentioned in the report, the State Party submitted a technical document on the projected infrastructure works for Roads W3 and VLT. It indicated that these projects concur with the guidelines established in the Territorial Development and Planning document and have been reviewed by technically competent national bodies.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the projected works are comprehensive and technical information illustrates how efforts have been made to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They encourage the State Party to submit additional studies requested by IPHAN for the creation of underground parking spaces and new public spaces for the establishment of squares for examination and review prior to implementation.

d) *Orla Project*

The State Party reports that activities have resumed to implement this project albeit on a reduced scale than originally proposed. Three stages are foreseen for the implantation of qualified public spaces to reinstate the connection between the lake and the Federal District population area. The technical report for this project was included.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies encourage the State Party to implement recommendations included in the technical studies to maintain the qualities of the area.

e) *Southern local commerce areas regulations*

The State Party reported that Law – Southern Local Areas Trade Regulations (Lei dos Puxadinhos / Complementary Law no. 766/2008) was created to establish regulatory measures for the occupation of the Southern Local Commerce and occupations of spaces between blocks. Although the Law is in place, enforcement continues to depend on the Inspecting Agency, and improvements are needed to actively implement the Law.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome regulations that address gaps in the existing frameworks and urges the State Party to identify appropriate strategies to enforce their implementation.

f) *Vila Planalto*

The State Party submitted an action plan for this section of the city with includes provisions for its management and the review of desired usage and occupation. The Plan was developed by the Federal District Document and supervised by the heritage authority (IPHAN-DF).

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recognize the dynamism of Brasilia and encourage the State Party to consider the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in decision-making regarding future developments and finalize the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value within the framework of the Retrospective Inventory for Latin America and the Caribbean.

g) *Other Conservation Issues*

The State Party reports that since 2006, IPHAN has been conducting necessary restoration work and a rigorous inspection process (such as the Brasil Cathedral, Alvorada Palace, Planalto Palace etc).

Technical evaluations are ongoing for the Plataforma Rodoviaria and the Teatro Nacional.

The Northern Cultural Sector project is currently in an evaluation phase and is awaiting a response to requested adjustments. No clarification was submitted for this project.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party has developed a number of planning tools to deal with the urban development affecting the original city plan. They encourage the State Party to ensure that these planning tools can be implemented in an integrated manner and that mechanisms are adopted to ensure their effectiveness .

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.106**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.133**, adopted at its 33th session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the actions being taken for the protection of the property and on the proposed projects and encourages the State Party to continue its efforts in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
4. *Requests the State Party to finalize the delimitation of the buffer zone and submit the proposed new boundaries, including appropriate cartography and the legal framework, to the World Heritage Centre, for examination by the World Heritage Committee;*
5. *Also requests, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to submit detailed information and technical studies on planned interventions with special attention on land use, transportation systems and new urban interventions, for consideration and review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, prior to approval and implementation;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 December 2010**, the draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to be analysed by the Advisory Bodies;*
7. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the*

*implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

### **107. Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia) (C 285)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation and complementary information received late)

### **108. Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1990

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

**30 COM 7B.94; 31 COM 7B.125; 33 COM 7B.135**

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 50,000 for Emergency measures at the *Palacio Diego de Herrera* in Santo Domingo and 24,207 USD for a study on Cultural Tourism in the Historic Centre of Santo Domingo (conservation).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1993, 1995, 1998; August 2001: ICOMOS monitoring mission; Dec 2009: World Heritage Centre site visit; December 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Undefined and unregulated buffer zone leading to urban development pressure and inadequate control of land use;
- b) Pressures derived from tourism;
- c) Inadequate and inefficient management and conservation arrangements (including legislation, regulatory measures, technical capacity for conservation and service infrastructure)
- d) Lack of interpretation and presentation of the property;
- e) Natural vulnerability to earthquakes and hurricanes;
- f) Deterioration of historic structures derived from natural and social factors (including environmental pollution and lack of sensitisation of local residents);
- g) Urban development project Sans Souci.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/526>



### Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre received the state of conservation report of the property on 2 February 2010. The report addresses the actions taken in response to the decisions made by the World Heritage Committee and includes additional information on conservation projects implemented at the property. The State Party also submitted information on the Sans Souci project as requested.

From 1 to 6 December 2009, a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out at the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). The mission report is available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM>

#### a) *Legislative and regulatory frameworks*

The State Party reports that the draft project for the Law for the protection, safeguard and development of cultural heritage and the regulations for archaeological investigations have been submitted for consultation among governmental and non-governmental organizations for their review. These two projects are also on hold given that they will need be integrated to new provisions that are foreseen when the new Constitution of the Dominican Republic will be promulgated by the Executive and Legislative powers (foreseen for January 2010).

The Strategic Plan for the Integral Revitalization of the Colonial City of Santo Domingo (referred to as the Plan Lombardi) has been administratively approved by the Municipality of the National District in 2008 and has been gradually implemented by the entities in charge. The presentation before the Municipal Council is in preparation for the official approval. As for the operation of the Steering Committee for the Colonial City, the State Party reports that, in spite of the regulations set forth, the entity is not fully functioning yet, although activities have been implemented in a coordinated manner as proposed by the Integrated Revitalization Plan (Lombardi Plan).

The mission noted that, notwithstanding the lack of official and complete approval, the Plan is in practice used as a reference for planning, decision-making and enforcement of guidelines. It underscored the positive steps taken by the Municipality of the National District of Santo Domingo (which includes the historic centre) by creating a Direction for Built Cultural Heritage, and office for the executive management of the historic centre and an office for the operational coordination of the historic centre and their effective collaboration with the National Directorate for Monumental Heritage. The latter has also established mechanisms to streamline communication with other institutions at the national level for the rehabilitation of the Colonial City. The mission also noted that the institutions have the management capacity, technical ability and clarity for the definition of objectives and actions plans for the conservation and management of the property. Nevertheless the mission noted that it could be necessary to revise the conformation of the Steering Committee to improve the decision making process.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the newly created institutional arrangements and commend the State Party on the steps taken to coordinate all actions undertaken for the conservation of the property, particularly in enhancing collaboration mechanisms between national and municipal authorities and promoting wider social participation. They encourage to State Party to enhance current capacities by increasing the number of technical staff to address the needs of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain concerned about the delay in the approval of the final procedures to enable the Steering Committee (created in 2005) to function and the delay on the official approval of the Integral Revitalization of the Colonial City of Santo Domingo. They consider the State Party should take appropriate measures to guarantee their approval and implementation.

b) *State of conservation of historic monuments*

The State Party reports that in 2009 interventions were implemented for the conservation of monuments and monumental spaces, both for conservation and maintenance and for the recovery of the urban image. These projects had the community involved and budgets have been allocated to continue to work at the property. It also reports that the inventory and cataloguing of historic monuments, with adequate cartography, has been finalized and will be presented at the Municipal Council in 2010 for its approval and official adoption.

The State Party also reports on a project financed by the Spanish Cooperation Agency to promote the economic and urban revitalization of Santa Barbara through the improvement of sanitary and habitation conditions, the recovery of public and heritage spaces, the revitalization of commercial activities and services. Progress has been made on the finalization of the assessment, the education programme focused on solid waste management, monitoring of quality of the environment, studies to improve water systems and a proposal to address visual pollution. Assessments have also been completed for the colonial forts at the neighbourhood and proposals have been made for their recovery and adequate use. Inventories for tangible and intangible heritage, systematized in the Geographic Information System will be the basis for the definition of a development plan in coordination with the socioeconomic study.

Finally, a proposal has been made to restrict vehicular traffic at Las Damas street. This will mitigate impacts on the oldest street at the historic centre and promote the revitalization of local activities. The report also mentions that preliminary studies are being conducted to rehabilitate the El Conde and Mella Avenue as traditional commercial areas.

The mission noted that the overall conservation status of the Colonial city is acceptable. It evaluated interventions carried out and considered them to be adequate and respectful of heritage values. It highlighted that investment on tourist facilities, hotels and dining venues, which have no impact on the historic centre and that recovery, and restoration projects in public spaces have appropriate designs that meet both the residents and the tourists' needs. It also underscored that advertising is very controlled and does not represent a problem for visual pollution. However, it noted that parking has yet to be addressed and some urban development actions are still not fully controlled.

c) *Buffer zone*

The State Party notes that the proposal for buffer zones has been analysed in consideration to the existence of two territorial jurisdictions, the Municipality of the National District and the Municipality of Santo Domingo East. Modifications have been introduced in the proposal in consideration to the environmental characteristics and the places that will serve as limits. General regulations have been proposed for different sectors, recommending their review to be amplified and approved by each Municipality.

The State Party included information on the different sectors and the zones they will comprise as well as preliminary regulations for each.

The mission reviewed the proposal for the buffer zone and defined additional considerations that would benefit the conservation of the property. It noted that the Municipality of the National District has regulations in place that are respectful of the values of the property (for the north, south and west zones) in spite of interventions of the past and the pressures from real estate speculation, a situation that will be controlled upon establishing the new buffer zone. However, the Municipality of Santo Domingo East has approved unacceptable norms, particularly allowing the construction of buildings more than 50 levels high at the other side of the Ozama River that could have a mainly perceptive impact on the protection of the surroundings of the property. It considers the East zone at high risk from the development foreseen that could jeopardise the landscape relationship between the colonial city and the rest of the city and the seafront.

It noted two particularly vulnerable areas: the stretch of *Avenida España*, above the current marina, between the cloverleaf junction and the buildings of *Molinos Dominicanos*, and the stretch from the area of the current Sans Souci Terminal towards *Punta Torrecilla*. At both of these, constructions levels shouldn't exceed 3-4 levels so as to not compromise the natural landscape.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made in defining the buffer zone but reiterate their serious concern regarding the lack of coordination between the two Municipalities on this regard. They also consider that the State Party should consider as a matter of urgency drafting new regulations to halt the future developments that could potentially threaten the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property.

d) *Sans Souci and other development projects*

The State Party submitted information regarding the project in October 2009 including the Real Estate Development Project, the study on the impact of the Sans Souci project on the Colonial City, and the Sans Souci Master Plan. No information was received on studies pertaining to environmental or archaeological impacts or on the state of construction permits, legal requisites met and the timetable for implementation.

The state of conservation report states that the project is currently in the phase of requesting permits and has already received the approval from the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources and waiting for the approval for land use to be emitted by the Department of Urban Planning at the Municipality of Santo Domingo East.

The mission comprehensively examined the Sans Souci project as requested by the Committee. It notes that Sans Souci is not a single project and is constituted by three well-defined components: cruise port, tourism marina and the real estate project.

The cruise port is already in use and port terminals were built by rehabilitating the existing Don Diego Terminal; the mission notes that the infrastructure is compatible with the Colonial City and the natural landscape of the river. It also highlighted that the current number of visitors (12 000 per month) is not having an impact on the historic centre and constitute a type of tourism that benefits the city. The mission considers they will not constitute a concern. However, it notes that other areas should be promoted to other sectors that can also benefit from the distribution of the visitation benefits.

As for the Marina Project, it is the last development foreseen in the different stages and has not been fully developed nor is there certainty it will. The mission considers that the project needs to be evaluated once developed to assess infrastructure proposals, dimensions of the intervention, and mitigation measures for environmental impact, among others.

In regard to the real estate project, the mission considers that it constitutes a major threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property because of the urbanization proposal at an area currently used as a Navy Base and the typology and density of use foreseen in the project, including a corporate building 50 stories high and eleven skyscrapers 30-40 stories high to be located approximately 600-800 meters from the southeast angle of the Colonial City. The Sans Souci Co. will only be responsible for urbanization works (streets and infrastructure) and 1 or 2 of the foreseen towers, the rest will be developed by investors so there are no guarantees for the control of the quality of architectural designs. The mission notes that the threat resides in the real estate project breaking the value of Santo Domingo as a group with attributes that follow an urban grid pattern of low and similar height. The homogeneity and volumetric coherence of the city is due to the respect of this characteristic at least at the surrounding areas. There is also value in the relationship between the centre and the natural surroundings and the character as a city port with a strong connection between the sea, the river estuary and the eastern bank which has maintained the relationship between the colonial urban nucleus and the left bank of the Ozama river.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the findings of the mission and reiterate their concern on the Sans Souci real estate development project at the vicinity of the property, particularly in light of the analysis made about the potential threat to the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

e) *Other issues*

The State Party also reported on a proposal to address the visual pollution caused by aerial cables. It mentions that a process has started among private and public entities for a project to bury cables. At this first stage, responsibilities, international aid and service providers have been identified. It also noted that work has also been carried out for the recovery of marshes along the Ozama river in response to dispositions made by the RAMSAR Convention and that an outreach and awareness raising programme has been implemented. Finally, it also reports that the Commission for emergencies at the historic centre started its work in 2006 and established a first risk management plan. There is an operations centre at the National Direction for Monumental Heritage and communications equipments have been received as a donation. A detailed description of the activities undertaken by the Commission has been included.

In the framework of the Periodic Reporting exercise for the Region, the “Workshop on the preparation for the Retrospective Inventory, retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the properties included on the World Heritage List and an introduction to the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting for the Latin America and Caribbean Region” took place in November 2009 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. The focal point for Dominican Republic participated and was trained on how to produce the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by **31 July 2010**.

To conclude, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recognise the efforts made by the State Party in improving the efficiency and management capacity for the property, in particular the coordination of activities for its conservation, which is reflected in the satisfactory state of historic buildings and the definition of projects to address areas of concern. However, they remain deeply concerned about the planning regulations that have been approved by the Municipality of East Santo Domingo and their potentially detrimental effects on the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property. They suggest that the State Party should take into account the recommendations from the mission and implement them, otherwise the Committee might consider it appropriate to include the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. They particularly note the major threat that the Sans Souci real estate project poses for the property and the irreversible impacts on the perceptive relationship between the Colonial City and the most significant surrounding urban and natural landscapes. They are also concerned about the delays in the approval of the Revitalization Plan and the delays in the functioning of the Steering Committee.

**Draft Decision:      34 COM 7B.108**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.135**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Notes the results of the December 2009 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and endorses its recommendations;

4. Recognizes the efforts made by the State Party in improving the management and conservation arrangements of the property and urges it to finalise the process for approving the Strategic Plan for the Integral Revitalization of the Colonial City of Santo Domingo and the Steering Committee and to secure the necessary resources for the operation of the management system currently in place;
5. Expresses its deep concern about the potential developments planned at the vicinity of the property and also urges the State Party to:
  - a) Stop the proposed Sans Souci real estate development project and consider, in collaboration with the heritage authorities, alternative designs that take into account the conservation of the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines,
  - b) Submit new designs and technical specifications for consideration and review by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS prior to approval and implementation,
  - c) Halt future developments foreseen in the buffer zone, mainly affecting the area of Santo Domingo East, that could impact adversely on the Outstanding Universal Value,
  - d) Approve the proposed buffer zone and related regulatory frameworks, with the amendments agreed upon during the reactive monitoring mission to guarantee the control of new developments and review existing regulations for new construction for the Municipality of Santo Domingo to limit the height of buildings,
  - e) Finalise the approval process for the new Law for the protection, safeguard and development of cultural heritage and the regulations for archaeological investigations as soon as the text of the new Constitution has been approved;
6. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the recommendations set out in paragraphs 4 and 5 above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

## 109. City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1978

Criteria  
(ii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
**32 COM 7B.121; 33 COM 7B.136**

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

March 2009: joint WHC /ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- (a) Development pressures which impact the authenticity of the site;
- (b) Weaknesses in the decision making process regarding conservation.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/2>

Current conservation issues

On 8 February 2010, the World Heritage Centre received a state of conservation report submitted by the State Party, detailing the progress made in implementing Decision **33 COM 7B.136** adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) as well as the recommendations made by the Joint WHC/ICOMOS Expert Mission in March 2009, as follows:

a) *Reconstruction of the Church Tower Monumental Complex Compañía de Jesús of Quito*

The State Party has reported that the World Heritage Committee's request to help with the works has been communicated to the relevant parties, in accordance with Decision **33 COM 7B.136**. However the report further stated that the *Compañía de Jesús* is "interested in developing a project that considers the intervention of the whole Jesuit Complex and to fundamentally include the bell tower, the study is also to install a conventual hotel and Jesuit Museum". The State Party indicated that preliminary information of this project was to be submitted in April 2010.

b) *Multisectorial evaluation of the architectural complex :*

The State Party recorded the signing of an agreement between the Municipality of Quito and the *Compañía de Jesús* to work on the evaluation of the Jesuit Complex and also in establishing the attributes that contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The objectives of this agreement are : (1) to coordinate actions to preserve the physical and historical integrity of the Building of the *Compañía de Jesús*; and (2) to set up a high level technical team to conduct the necessary integral study, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, that will allow historical buildings of the *Compañía de Jesús* to be used as a church tower, a hotel and a museum, and included within the existing ensemble.

c) *The use of the structure as a bell tower:*

The State Party has indicated that an alternative to the previous proposals will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre as soon as studies are concluded in the second semester of 2010.

c) *Tourism operation and related security measures*

The State Party reports that the terms of reference for contracting the touristic operations studies is being developed by the Municipality of Quito, and has indicated that the final report by the contracting party will be concluded September 2010, which will then be submitted to the World Heritage Centre. There is no indication as to the role of the National Institute for Cultural Heritage (INPC) in this regard.

d) *Submission of information as per Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines*

Studies for future interventions started in December 2009 will be completed in August 2010 by the Commission. When this is finished, the State Party has indicated that it will be sent to the World Heritage Centre. No documentation has been submitted regarding the decision making process or calendar for planned future interventions.

e) *Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

From 26 to 28 November 2009 the “Workshop on the preparation of the Retrospective Inventory and Retrospective statement of Outstanding Universal Value (of the properties included on the World Heritage List) and an introduction to the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting for the Latin America and Caribbean Region” took place in Buenos Aires, Argentina. The participants (of which Ecuador was represented) were trained on how to develop the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to be submitted by 31 July 2010.

The INPC in collaboration with the Municipality of Quito and FONSAL have signed an agreement to develop the Retrospective Inventory and the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

f) *Definition of the boundaries of the property and related legal frameworks*

The State Party reported that it initiated the actualization and definition of limits in December 2009, and this information will be concluded in August 2010. No relevant legal framework has been submitted.

g) *National and local responsibilities at the property*

The State Party gave very little information on this matter and reported that it is presently reviewing its legal and administrative framework, one of which is the modification of the Culture Law which will establish the basis for the new national culture system. Approval for this Law has been extended to February 2010. No reference has been made as to how the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* could be affected.

h) *Principles and regulations for interventions on on built heritage*

The state of conservation report stated that ordinances will be developed as part of the report on the Retrospective Inventory. The State Party has informed through its report, that these will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre when completed. No established timeframe for completion has been indicated. There is also no mention of the reactive monitoring mission’s recommendation regarding the formulation of a conservation plan for the religious ensembles of Quito.

i) *Communication with the World Heritage Committee*

The State Party has informed that they will follow established communication mechanisms between the State Party and UNESCO - that of working through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the State Party’s Delegation to UNESCO. No information was included for defining the decision making process on World Heritage matters at the property at the local and national levels.

k) *Other Conservation Issues*

The State Party has not elaborated on recommendations made by the 2009 reactive monitoring mission with regards to the Legislative Palace. There is also no further information on the ‘Tren Ligero’ public transportation project. No information was received on the inventory of built cultural heritage.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that any interventions should be assessed in relation to their potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. For this reason the multisector evaluation of the architectural complex and the evaluation of its attributes should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review alongside the draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value as a basis for future decision making.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies understand that the works have been suspended until the study of the Jesuit Complex has been finalized. No substantial advances

were developed in response to the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission in particular to the decision making process at the property.

**Draft Decision: 34 COM 7B.109**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.136**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Acknowledges the suspension of reconstruction works in the Tower of the Compañía de Jesús and awaits the submission of the new proposal to restore the use of the bell tower;
4. Also acknowledges that the State Party will conclude definitions to the limits of the inscribed property and buffer zone, and that the appropriate cartography and legal framework for protection will be submitted for approval within the framework of the Retrospective Inventory for the Latin America and Caribbean Region;
5. Requests the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 2009 reactive monitoring mission and submit as a priority:
  - a) A clear definition of the national and local responsibilities for the World Heritage City of Quito in the decision making process,
  - b) The review of the legal and administrative framework, particularly modifications to the Cultural Law and how they will impact the implementation of the World Heritage Convention,
  - c) The touristic studies on the operation of the Monument Complex to ensure that international standards and security measures are in place;
6. Also requests the State Party to ensure that the comprehensive evaluation of the values and the related attributes of the Jesuit Complex and how they contribute to the integrity and authenticity of the property is developed alongside the drafting of a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value;
7. Encourages the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies the following information:
  - a) The development of a conservation plan for the religious ensembles of Quito, and to conduct an inventory of built cultural heritage within the inscribed property,
  - b) In accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, technical documentation on the Tren Ligero public transportation project, including an environmental impact assessment to consider the potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property ;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations as well as a timetable of planned activities for 2011, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.



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

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

**111. Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

**112. Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission report)

**113. Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

**114. Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2000

Criteria  
(i) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
31 COM 7B.123; 32 COM 7B.127; 33 COM 7B.142

#### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 75000 for emergency assistance in 2001 – Restoration of Cathedral of Arequipa

#### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

#### Previous Monitoring Missions

February 2000: ICOMOS Expert Mission; April/May 2008: UNESCO-ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission

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

- a) Lack of a Disaster Preparedness Plan
- b) Ongoing planned development projects which impact the historic centre, such as the planned construction of the Chilina Bridge
- c) Illegal demolitions involving historical buildings

#### Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1016>

#### Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre received a state of conservation report on 2 February 2010. The report provides a brief summary of the property and responses to the World Heritage Committee's decisions at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions.

##### a) *Buffer zone*

The State Party reports that actions have been undertaken to declare the Chilina valley and its prehispanic terraces as a protected area. Actions include the development of the declaration files one to recognise the area as an environmental reserve and a second one geared toward the recognition as an archaeological landscape. This measure will help aid in the inclusion of the Valley as part of the buffer zone for the historic centre.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS welcome the step taken towards enhancing the conservation of the historic centre and its setting when first reported. It is important to finalise the process to establish the legislative framework so that regulatory measures can be fully operational to address pressing concerns at the area.

##### b) *Strengthening of institutional frameworks*

The report provides the background on the process that has been implemented to set management arrangements and the current responsibilities and governance for the property. The State Party reports that the Management Plan and the Master Plan for the historic centre have been finalized and over 56 projects have been implemented for the conservation of historic buildings and public spaces. The Plans have not been submitted and is not clear when they have been officially adopted. In addition, several regulatory instruments have been discussed at the municipal level to support protection of heritage places. Notwithstanding, there are still challenges that need to be faced including real estate speculation and limited awareness in some sectors about the importance of historic buildings. The existing arrangements have promoted a management model that includes broad participation and open and transparent decision-making processes. Nevertheless it is not clear if there is secure funding for staff and to implement future activities.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS take note of the progress made by the State Party in regard to the institutional arrangements; they encourage it to continue its work towards securing the financial, technical and human resources to effectively operate.

##### c) *Regulatory measures for the protection of the property and the control of demolitions*

The State Party reports that no significant demolitions occurred in 2009, only minor occurrences were reported and this affected elements with no architectural values. It also reports that these derived in sanctions to infringers of regulatory measures currently in place. They report that these sanctioning processes have diminished in relation to 2008. Progress can be attributed to actions implemented at all levels to raise awareness on the significance of the place and with direct action with property owners to promote conservation.

The Management Unit of the Municipality in coordination with the INC (Instituto Nacional de Cultura), has launched a proactive inventory process to register 150 heritage buildings currently unregistered which reinforces the already existing Law 28296, demanding owners to register their historic properties at the INC.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the information provided and reiterate the importance of having adequate capacity to respond to the number of interventions that occur at the property. They also encourage the State Party to continue its efforts on awareness raising as means to enhancing social responsibility in the conservation of the property.

d) *Risk Preparedness Plan*

The state of conservation report includes a revised draft of the initial proposal for a Risk Management Plan which includes a preliminary risk map that identifies vulnerable areas. Advances have been made in relation to the elaboration of the diagnosis of the threats to archaeological heritage.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge progress made but reiterate their concern that this plan has not been finalised, as requested since 2003 by the World Heritage Committee, in light of the vulnerability of the property.

e) *Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

In the framework of the Periodic Reporting exercise for the Region, the “Workshop on the preparation Retrospective Inventory, retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the properties included on the World Heritage List and an introduction to the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting for the Latin America and Caribbean Region” took place in November 2009 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. The focal point for Arequipa participated and was trained on how to produce the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by **31 July 2010**.

f) *Other issues: Construction of the Chilina Bridge*

In March 2009 the UNESCO office in Lima received information concerning the project to build a bridge that would affect the Chilina valley and the property. Information highlighted the concerns about the project, including the lack of provisions for articulating other transportation concerns, its lack of integration in urban development plans and lack of technical studies, in particular the Environmental Impact Assessment and the impact on areas already identified as threatened by the Reactive Monitoring mission carried out in 2008. This was also underscored in light of the Chilina Valley being declared as a protected area for the conservation of the Yanahuara, Cayma and Cerro Colorado. Subsequent information submitted to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies indicated that in July 2009 it was decided by the Regional Government to reformulate the project and to create a technical commission to articulate it to provisions made in the urban development plan. However, the location of the bridge itself was not put under question.

On 13 July and in September 2009, the World Heritage Centre requested to the State Party additional technical information on the construction of the Chilina Bridge. The State Party submitted the requested information consisting of technical plans and projects for the bridge and the Environmental Impact Assessment commissioned by the Regional Government of Arequipa and carried out by SGM Ingenieros EIRL that were received by the World Heritage Centre in October 2009. The latter however only focuses on the Chilina Bridge, one of the

components of the large scale development of infrastructure and does not include a comprehensive impact assessment on the landscape qualities which are currently intended to be protected as an essential component that sustains the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The National Institute of Culture in Arequipa considered the project would affect agricultural areas in the district of Cerro Colorado and the *andenes* (prehispanic terraces) and landscapes of the Chilina valley in the districts of Yanahuara and Cayma, which are considered cultural heritage and contradict the efforts made by the Municipality of Arequipa started work to delimit and declare the Chilina Valley as an environmental reserve and as national cultural heritage to deter further urban development.

In 22 March 2010, the World Heritage Centre requested additional information to the State Party as the project appears to have been modified. Upon receipt of the demanded information, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will evaluate it to ascertain the potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, the integrity and authenticity of the property.

To conclude, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recognise the efforts made by the State Party in establishing functioning institutional arrangements and in strengthening legislative and regulatory frameworks. Demolitions in the protected area continue even if they have decreased, the insufficiency of resources to comprehensively address issues at the property is a concern. They also reiterate the pressing need to finalise and put in place a comprehensive disaster preparedness plan that will need to take into account different vulnerability factors.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also underscore the potential threat that projected infrastructure works could entail for the property. No clear advances on other recommendations of the 2008 reactive monitoring mission regarding traffic solutions, the creation of a World Heritage working group, and the submission of an International Assistance request for developing a community participation programme based on the progress of Los Tambos project.

**Draft Decision:        34 COM 7B.114**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-10/34.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.142**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Regrets that no substantial advances have been made in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS joint reactive monitoring mission;
4. Takes note of the progress made by the State Party in setting functioning institutional arrangements and encourages it to secure the resources required for their sustained operation;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies the following information:
  - a) *The finalized Master Plan and Management Plan,*

- b) *An advanced report of the registration and cataloguing of built heritage in the property;*
6. *Acknowledges the efforts made to enhance the protection of the property by declaring the Chilina Valley and the Pre-hispanic terraces as a protected area and urges the State Party to fully implement regulatory measures to prevent further urban sprawl and impacts on the setting;*
  7. *Also regrets that the State Party did not submit a finalised Risk Preparedness plan as requested by the World Heritage Committee since 2003 and reiterates its request to complete the process and submit the plan for review by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS;*
  8. *Also requests the State Party to submit updated information on the construction of the Chilina bridge and projected infrastructure works, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines to the World Heritage Centre for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and also urges the State Party to stop infrastructure works until the potential impact of these works on the Outstanding Universal Value, including integrity and authenticity of the property can be ascertained;*
  9. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, 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 35th session in 2011.*

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

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

#### **116. Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500bis)**

See Document *WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)