



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

35 COM

Distribution Limited

WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add

Paris, 27 May 2011

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-fifth session

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters

19-29 June 2011

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/35COM/>

Table of content

REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	4
NATURAL PROPERTIES	4
AFRICA	4
3. Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis)	4
5. Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N 1162)	7
7. Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156)	11
8. Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas (Zimbabwe) (N 302)	15
ASIA-PACIFIC	20
10. Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154)	20
11. The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) (N 798)	23
13. Kaziranga National Park (India) (N 337)	25
14. Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)	28
15. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)	32
16. Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)	36
18. Central Highlands of Sri Lanka (Sri Lanka) (N 1203)	41
20. Ha Long Bay (Vietnam) (N 672bis)	44
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	48
21. Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)	48
22. Lagoons of New Caledonia: Reef Diversity and Associated Ecosystems (France) (N 1115)	52
23. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)	56
26. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768rev)	60
27. Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685bis)	62
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	67
28. Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1032)	67
29. Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205bis)	69
30. Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1)	73
31. Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)	77
34. Manu National Park (Peru) (N 402)	82
35. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161)	87
CULTURAL PROPERTIES	90
AFRICA	90
42. Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26)	90

ARAB STATES.....	91
46. Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193)	91
47. Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565)	93
48. Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89).....	95
49. Petra (Jordan) (C 326).....	97
51. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)	101
52. Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab) (Lebanon) (C 850)	103
53. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)	105
54. Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 287)	107
57. Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) (C 1073)	109
60. Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) (C 385).....	112
ASIA-PACIFIC	115
61. The Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) (C 322).....	115
62. Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia) (C 1224rev)	117
69. Prambanan Temples (Indonesia) (C 642)	117
72. Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 481).....	120
73. Melaka and George Town, Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca (Malaysia) (C 1223).....	124
78. Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451)	127
79. Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan) (C 602 rev)	129
81. Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam) (C 678).....	131
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	135
87. Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria) (C 217).....	135
96. Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata (Italy) (C 829).....	140
99. Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994).....	143
103. Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation) (C 544)	148
104. Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540)	153
107. Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632).....	156
110. Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev).....	158
111. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)	159
118. Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150).....	165
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	169
119. Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia) (C 567 rev).....	169
120. City of Potosi (Bolivia) (C 420).....	172

125. National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180).....	174
133. City of Cuzco (Peru) (C 273)	177
135. Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (C 747)	180

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

3. Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

Criteria

(viii) (x)

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 35,300. 2000: USD 25,300 (conservation) for a management plan project Sibiloi/Central Island National Parks World Heritage Site Management Plan; 2001: USD 10,000 (preparatory) for Finalizing the nomination files "Lake Turkana National Parks" (Sibiloi/Central Island National Parks (Extension) and South Island National Park, and Rift Valley Lakes Reserve.

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/801>

Current conservation problems

In March 2011, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received information on a major hydro-electric dam project (GIBE III) on the Omo River in Ethiopia that is likely to affect both Lake Turkana, situated downstream in neighbouring Kenya, and the cultural landscape of the Lower Omo Valley in Ethiopia. This information included a letter of concern from International Rivers and Friends of Lake Turkana, and a report entitled 'Assessment of Hydrological Impacts of Ethiopia's Omo Basin on Kenya's Lake Turkana Water Levels' prepared for the African Development Bank. In a letter dated 11 March 2011 addressed to the State Party of Ethiopia, the World Heritage Centre expressed its concern about this proposed construction, and requested additional details on the GIBE III dam project as well as a copy of its Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The State Party of Kenya was also informed. On 27 April 2011, the State Party of Ethiopia responded to the World Heritage Centre stating that impact assessments have been conducted taking into account the potential impacts of the project in relation to the World Heritage Convention, and that precautionary measures

have been put in place, and will continue to be implemented, to avert potential adverse effects. However, no relevant documents, such as the requested EIA, were provided in conjunction with the State Party letter, and no information on the precautionary measures was provided.

IUCN further received information that the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China (ICBC) and the Exim Bank of China's approved in July 2010 the required funding for a major portion of the GIBE III dam's cost.

a) *Likely impacts of the GIBE III dam*

Preparatory construction work on the GIBE III dam located on the Omo River in Ethiopia has been ongoing since 2006. GIBE III is expected to be the tallest dam in Africa and the fourth tallest in the world, with a height of 240 m and a reservoir with a surface area of 200 km². Given that Lake Turkana depends on the Omo River for almost 90% of its water inflow and much of its nutrients, the potential adverse downstream impacts of this dam are significant. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that two EIAs have been prepared for GIBE III proposal, including i) the 2006 '*Gibe III Hydroelectric Project Environmental Impact Assessment*', and ii) the 2008 '*Gibe III Hydroelectric Project: Environmental Impact Assessment - Additional Study on Downstream Impact*.' While neither EIA has been submitted to the World Heritage Committee for review, the African Development Bank's evaluation of these documents is reviewed below.

The African Development Bank's (ADB) '*Assessment of Hydrological Impacts of Ethiopia's Omo Basin on Kenya's Lake Turkana Water Levels*', in which was released in April 2010, notes that the filling of the GIBE III's very large reservoir will require several years and will "...deprive the lake of 85% of its normal annual inflow in one year...", and cause the lake's water level to drop significantly. In particular, the ADB study notes that the filling of the dam's reservoir is likely to "...dry up Ferguson's Gulf, the most productive fishing area of the lake." The African Development Bank hydrology study also notes that a number of the project's potential impacts have not yet been quantified, including the likely impact of the dam's reservoir, which will capture sediment transported by the river, leading to erosion, changes in water quality, and reduced water tables, and large-scale potential water seepage losses through the reservoir. This study states the even greater hydrological changes could result from plans to exploit the Omo River for irrigation, which could permanently reduce flows into the property by 30% or more.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that in August and July of 2010, the African Development Bank, the World Bank and the European Investment Bank withdrew their funding considerations for the GIBE III dam. At the same time, the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China (ICBC) and the Exim Bank of China reportedly approved financing covering a major portion of the dam's cost.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the direct and indirect impacts of the GIBE III dam on the property's hydrology are likely to result in a significant decline in Lake Turkana's freshwater aquatic species and associated biological systems, which are the basis for its inscription on the List of World Heritage under criterion (x). Lake Turkana – which is a serial property made up of Sibiloi, Central, and South Island National Parks - is a major breeding ground for the Nile crocodile, hippopotamus, a variety of snake and fish species, and a key stopover point for migrant waterfowl. Changes in the annual flooding influx of the Omo River in particular could affect fish spawning, which would have serious consequences on the Lake's food chain and ecology. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that the physical changes described above could also affect the pastoral and agro-pastoral economies throughout the Lake Turkana region that are reliant on lake's waters for drinking water, fishing and grazing.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note that two dams have already been built on the Omo River further upstream from the GIBE III site, GIBE I and GIBE II, and that two additional large dams are planned downstream, GIBE IV and GIBE V. These last two

schemes are reportedly under study. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN emphasize that they consider that all major dam projects affecting World Heritage properties, whether located within a property or situated outside its boundaries so as to adversely affect its Outstanding Universal Value, should undergo thorough environmental and social impact assessments in line with the international best practice principles, comply with the World Commission on Dams (WCD) guidelines regarding options assessment, public participation, environmental flows, compliance, and benefit sharing, and be submitted to the World Heritage Committee for review and consideration prior to granting of approval, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the African Development Bank's evaluation of the GIBE III proposal, '*Assessment of Hydrological Impacts of Ethiopia's Omo Basin on Kenya's Lake Turkana Water Levels*' (April 2010), concludes that the GIBE III dam would significantly alter the property's hydrological regime and likely result in a significant drop in the Lake's water levels, cessation of the current seasonal flooding pattern, losses of nutrient and mineral-rich sediments due to the upstream reservoir, rising salinity and the disruption of the lake's chemical balance, among other impacts that have yet to be quantified.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the GIBE III is likely to significantly alter Lake Turkana's fragile hydrological regime, and threaten its aquatic species and associated biological systems, which are the basis of its inscription on the List of World Heritage under criterion (x) and therefore threaten the property's Outstanding Universal Value, in line with Paragraph 180(b) (ii) of the *Operational Guidelines*. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party of Ethiopia to immediately halt construction on this dam, in line with Article 6 of the *Convention*. The State Party of Ethiopia should also be requested by the Committee to submit all assessments for the planned GIBE IV and GIBE V dams and irrigation projects on the Omo River.

Given the complexity of this issue, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee request both States Parties of Kenya and Ethiopia to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to review the likely impacts of the GIBE III dam on Lake Turkana, and to also request them to provide detailed information on all hydro-electric development and large-scale irrigation plans in the Omo region.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.3

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Expresses its utmost concern about the proposed construction of the GIBE III dam on the Omo River in Ethiopia and its likely impacts on Lake Turkana, which is located downstream in neighbouring Kenya and draws almost 90% of its inflow from the above river;
3. Takes note of the African Development Bank's April 2010 study of the GIBE III proposal, "*Assessment of Hydrological Impacts of Ethiopia's Omo Basin on Kenya's Lake Turkana Water Levels*", which concludes that the construction and operation of the dam is likely to result in a significant drop in the Lake's water levels, cessation of the current seasonal flooding pattern, losses of nutrient and mineral-rich sediments due

to the upstream reservoir, rising salinity and the disruption of the lake's chemical balance, among other impacts that have yet to be quantified;

4. Considers that the GIBE III dam is likely to significantly alter Lake Turkana's fragile hydrological regime, and threaten its aquatic species and associated biological systems, which are the basis of its inscription on the List of World Heritage under criterion (x), and that this development may pose an imminent danger to the property's Outstanding Universal Value, in line with Paragraph 180(b) (ii) of the Operational Guidelines;
5. Urges the State Party of Ethiopia to immediately halt all construction on the GIBE III dam in line with Article 6 of the Convention requiring State Parties not to take any deliberate measures which might damage directly or indirectly the cultural and natural heritage located on the territory of another State Party, and to submit all assessments for this proposal to the World Heritage Centre, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
6. Also expresses its concern about the potential cumulative impacts of the proposed GIBE IV and GIBE V dams and large-scale irrigation plans on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, and requests the State Party of Ethiopia to submit assessments for all proposed dams and associated irrigation plans on the Omo River;
7. Also requests the States Parties of Kenya and Ethiopia to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to review the impacts of the GIBE III dam on the Outstanding Universal Value of Lake Turkana, and to provide detailed information on plans for other hydro-electric developments and associated large-scale irrigation in the Omo region;
8. Encourages all financial institutions supporting the GIBE III dam to put on hold their financial support until the World Heritage Committee reviews this issue at its 36th session in 2012, and to take account of the Committee's decisions when deciding whether to provide such funding;
9. Further requests the States Parties of Ethiopia and Kenya to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the course of action taken in response to this decision for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012, **with a view to considering, in light of the mission's review of the likely impacts of the GIBE III dam on Lake Turkana, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2005

Criteria
(viii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 8B.4; 32 COM 7B.2 ; 33 COM 7B.5

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

April 2008 and September 2010: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

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

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1162>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report gives a clear overview of the implementation of the 2008 reactive monitoring mission recommendations. From 10 to 14 September 2010, a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by the State Party at the World Heritage Committee's 33rd session (Seville, 2009). The mission report is available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>.

a) *Effective protection and management of the property*

The State Party recalls that while the South African World Heritage Convention Act (No 49 of 1999) requires every property inscribed on the World Heritage List to be proclaimed as a World Heritage Site under national legislation, Vredefort Dome's proclamation was delayed due to formal objections from a number of local land owners. However, the State Party envisages that this proclamation will be completed by April 2011. The State Party also reports that the establishment of an integrated management office for the property and appointment of staff will take place alongside its proclamation under national legislation. It also notes that the appointment of management staff is ongoing and that some office infrastructure has already been put in place, which will be transferred to the future Management Authority once it is established.

As requested in Decision **33 COM 7B.5**, the mission advised the State Party, jointly with a number of stakeholders, on: (i) the development of an Action Plan to ensure that effective protection and management is rapidly put in place; and (ii) the definition of legal boundaries for the property's three satellite serial sites. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that these integrity issues were originally raised by IUCN at the time of inscription. The mission took part in formal stakeholder meetings where all parties, including three land owner groups, a tourism group and a government group, agreed that the property should be proclaimed. The mission also met with the mediator who was recruited by the Government to facilitate the proclamation process with consultation of the land owners associations. The mission further developed a Statement of Advice to the State Party considering the views it heard from the local stakeholders. This Statement was a contribution to the State Party's Action Plan, which will guide the urgent implementation of effective management at Vredefort Dome. The mission concluded that while at the present time the boundaries of the three satellite sites are clear under the *Convention*, they are not optimal in relation to the management of the property and should be re-defined in law, in collaboration with relevant stakeholders.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that while the State Party has achieved significant progress in implementing the 2008 mission recommendations, there is a need to urgently finalise the proclamation of the property under national legislation, establish a Management Authority and ensure on-ground management. Following actions proposed by the mission are to be considered in priority: (i) clearly define the Management Authority's accountabilities and responsibilities, and revise and adopt the draft Integrated Management Plan (in line with the 2010 mission Advice Note to the State Party); (ii) provide clear planning control guidance to address unapproved tourism developments, and (iii) define the legal boundaries for the property's three satellite serial sites, and ensure that tourism impacts on key vulnerable geological localities within the property are minimised.

b) *Unapproved developments and tourism management*

The State Party reports that the North West Provincial Government has passed a Land Use Management Act that now regulates a wide range of activities, including socio-economic and heritage impacts of proposed development projects. It also recalls that an exhibition centre for Vredefort Dome, just outside the boundaries of the property, is almost completed and should provide both needed space and human resources for the site.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that while the Land Use Management Act and the exhibition centre are positive steps, it will be important to coordinate the management of tourism developments between the two provinces (North West and Free State) that share jurisdiction of the property, and to provide official World Heritage presentation areas for visitors. The joint mission concluded that unapproved tourism developments and unmanaged visitor use could pose a threat to the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), including its rural landscape setting. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain concerned about the accelerated rate of tourism development and recall that as awareness and promotion of the property increase, so will the interest by land owners to invest in tourism. In the absence of approved planning guidance and a management plan, these developments will remain a threat to the integrity of the property. They are of the opinion that unapproved developments and tourism management should be urgently addressed through the implementation of the four priority actions outlined above in section a).

c) *Other conservation issues*

The State Party reports a number of other conservation issues affecting the property, including the pollution of the Vaal River and agricultural practices in the areas surrounding the property. Concerning the Vaal River, the State Party notes that a recent study found that most of its tributaries downstream of the Vaal Dam are in a critical state of ecological decline. It states that in order to address this issue, the Ngwathe Municipality has recently refurbished the Parys Wastewater Treatment Works, which has reportedly stopped sewage overflows into the river. The State Party also reports that it is developing an Environmental Management Framework (EMF) for Vredefort Dome and its surrounding areas in order to address any unsuitable farming practices.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the opinion that there is cause for concern over the critical state of the Vaal River and its tributaries and note that the joint mission found evidence of partially treated sewage entering the river at the Parys Wastewater Treatment Works, implying that its refurbishment must have been very recent. They consider that the high levels of pollution are likely to cause dieback of streamside vegetation and could affect the rural landscape setting of the property, which forms part of its OUV. They are of the view that once the permanent Management Authority is established, this issue is addressed in collaboration with relevant stakeholders and that, in view of the ongoing development of irrigation-intensive pecan nut farming, the State Party should pay particular attention to the

hydrology of the area within the EMF, and ensure sustainable use of ground and surface water, as this will also be an important factor in maintaining the rural landscape setting of the property, which forms part of its OUV.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that while the State Party has made progress in establishing legal protection and effective management for the property, there is an urgent need to finalize the proclamation of Vredefort Dome's World Heritage status under national legislation, establish a Management Authority, and implement the priority actions outlined in paragraph 4 of the draft decision below.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.5

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.5**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Commends the State Party for the progress achieved in implementing the 2008 mission recommendations;*
4. *Takes note of the efforts undertaken by the State Party to finalize the proclamation of the World Heritage status under national legislation, with the help of a Mediator and requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *Urgently finalize this process, and submit the proclamation to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible,*
 - b) *Establish a Management Authority, and*
 - c) *Ensure on-ground management;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to urgently implement the following additional priority actions:*
 - a) *Clearly define the Management Authority's accountabilities and responsibilities and revise and adopt the draft Integrated Management Plan, in line with the 2010 mission Advice Note to the State Party,*
 - b) *Provide clear planning control guidance to address unapproved tourism developments,*
 - c) *Define the legal boundaries and clearly demarcate them on the ground, for the property's three satellite serial sites, including through a minor boundary modification, and ensure that tourism impacts on key vulnerable geological localities within the property are minimised, and*
 - d) *Initiate studies and targeted actions to ensure the sustainable use of ground and surface water, as this is an important factor in maintaining the rural landscape setting of the property, which forms part of its Outstanding Universal Value;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to*

implement the recommendations of the 2008 and 2010 reactive monitoring missions, and in particular the progress achieved in proclaiming Vredefort Dome's World Heritage status under national legislation, in establishing the Management Authority, and in re-defining the boundaries of the satellite component sites of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

7. 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 ; 34 COM 7B.5

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 42,000 for 2 international assistances: USD 12,000, conservation, additional contribution for the purchase of a film-van (512) ; 1989: USD 30,000, conservation, purchase of a film-van (511)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

On 2 February 2011, the State Party submitted a detailed report on the state of conservation of Serengeti National Park. From 29 November to 8 December 2010, a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission was organized to the property in accordance with Decision **34 COM 7B.5**. The mission looked at the implications of the proposed North Road, which would bisect the northern part of the Serengeti, on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property as well as other conservation and management issues affecting the property. The mission report is available online at: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>.

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

The mission noted that there is a large consensus in the scientific community that the road will adversely affect the wildebeest migration and could endanger the ecosystems and

wildlife populations of the park. The mission considers that the road will also impact the aesthetic values and wilderness character and increase the management and conservation challenges of the property.

The mission considered that the possible mitigation measures which were presented, including the option of not paving the stretch through the property, are clearly insufficient to mitigate possible negative impact of the proposed North Road alignment on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. The mission further noted that no cost-benefit analysis of the road project seems to have been conducted, taking into account the importance of tourism for the local, national and regional economy. The mission also expressed concern that the national legislation and regulations for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) have not been fully implemented and that only limited stakeholder consultation took place regarding its environmental and social impacts.

Based on the findings of the mission and the well documented potential threats of the road, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the proposed road will clearly affect the OUV of the property. They further consider that given the very likely impact on the OUV and its potential negative economic impacts in terms of a decline in tourism, the precautionary principle should be applied to the decision-making on this issue, and that the proposed alignment through the northern part of the property should not be supported. They consider that alternative alignments to the proposed North Road, including the southern route and upgrading of existing roads to the district capitals of Mugumu and Loliondo, which would not entail crossing through the north of the property, should be carefully considered.

The State Party report notes that the EIA for the road has been completed and is open for review. However, at the time of writing of this report, the World Heritage Centre has not yet received a copy of the report. The EIA report is however available on an NGO website (www.savetheserengeti.org). The EIA report predicts very heavy traffic loads once the road is built of up to 3,000 vehicles a day by 2035, equivalent to 1 vehicle every 15 seconds in 2030 (based on the assumption of day traffic only). The EIA confirms that the road will lead to important and significant negative impacts including a disruption of the migration which could lead to the loss of the unique value of Serengeti, threats to endangered species, pressure on the conservation areas including Serengeti and Ngorongoro, increased road kills, habitat loss, and increased pressure from invasive species. The report specifically notes that “...changes in the migration patterns and the naturalness of Serengeti will lead it to be declassified as a World Heritage site.” In spite of this, the mitigation plan foresees only one measure to mitigate the loss of the unique value of Serengeti, namely “increased research on the migration”. The report mentions the southern route as a potential alternative, but this alternative is not reviewed as it is considered outside the scope of the study. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the EIA clearly demonstrates that the proposed road project will have a significant negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and does not propose any effective mitigation action. Therefore, the proposed alignment should not be approved in the light of the commitments taken by the State Party under the Convention.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further recommend a comprehensive Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SEA) of the development of the northern Tanzania road network be commissioned to better understand the environmental, economic and social implications of all the possible alternatives, including the southern alignment which is not considered in the EIA. They note potential donor support has been offered to the State Party to undertake such an approach.

b) *Other conservation issues*

The State Party reports on a number of other conservation issues, which were also reviewed by the mission.

Both the State Party report and the mission point out that poaching pressure has been increasing sharply over the last 3 years, in particular elephant poaching. In addition, one of

the recently reintroduced black rhinos was poached in December 2010. The mission was informed that anti-poaching efforts are hampered by resource constraints and as a result of other competing demands and noted that there is a need to rapidly respond to the mounting poaching pressure.

The mission considered that substantial progress was made in addressing the issue of water management in the Mara Basin in cooperation with the State Party of Kenya.

The mission was also concerned about the emergence of new and aggressive alien invasive species in the Serengeti ecosystem and considered that while the park authorities have so far been able to control invasive species, the emergence of these new invasive species might become an important future management challenge, which will need additional resources.

The mission also reviewed a number of other conservation issues, including the increasing human – wildlife conflicts, fire management, the annexation of Speke Bay, water scarcity issues, proposals to upgrade the Naabi – Seronera – Ndabaka road and tourist development, which are discussed in detail in the mission report and in the State Party report. The State Party report notes its intention to request assistance from the World Heritage Centre to survey water resources in the property.

On the issue of the management of the property, the mission considered that the General Management Plan could serve as a model for other parks in the country as well as for other World Heritage sites but regretted that no comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system is in place to assess the effectiveness of its implementation of the GMP. The mission expressed concern that resources available for its implementation remain insufficient, especially in the light of the mounting pressures on the property.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN underscore the conclusion of the mission that the OUV of the property is for the time being maintained but notes a number of growing threats to the integrity of property including, poaching, human-wildlife conflict, water scarcity, invasive species and management constraints. They welcome the efforts deployed by the State Party to put in place strategies and actions to contain these threats but consider that it is imperative to urgently carry out a number of actions to ensure that these threats and management issues will not impact the future integrity of the property. The mission developed a number of specific recommendations to address this, which are included in the draft decision.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate that the proposed North Road would have significant and potentially irreversible negative effects on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and therefore consider that a decision to build the north road would constitute a clear case for inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in accordance with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.7

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.5**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),

3. *Reiterates its utmost concern about the proposed North Road which would dissect the northern wilderness area of the Serengeti over 53 km, and would result in irreversible damage to the property's Outstanding Universal Value, and urges the State Party to abandon the North Road alignment and consider alternative alignments;*
4. *Considers that a decision to build the road would constitute a clear case for inscribing Serengeti National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in accordance with paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines;*
5. *Requests the State Party to undertake a comprehensive Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SEA) of the development of the northern Tanzania road network in order to better understand the environmental, economic and social implications of all the possible alternatives, including the southern alignment;*
6. *Commends the States Parties of Tanzania and Kenya for the progress achieved in addressing the issue of water management in the Mara Basin, and encourages the Lake Victoria Basin commission to ensure the full implementation of the Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan for the Sustainable Management of the Mara River Basin;*
7. *Notes with concern the reports of a significant increase in rhinoceros and elephant poaching within the property as well as in other properties in Tanzania and eastern and southern Africa, and also requests the State Party, in cooperation with relevant States Parties in the region, to develop national and regional approaches to address this threat;*
8. *Takes note of the conclusion of the mission that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is for the time being maintained but notes a number of growing threats to the integrity of property including, poaching, human-wildlife conflict, water scarcity, invasive species, fires and management constraints;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to implement the following urgent actions as recommended by the 2010 World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission in order to ensure that these threats and management issues will not impact the future integrity of the property:*
 - a) *Allocate more resources to anti-poaching efforts, especially in light of the increasing poaching pressure on rhinoceros and elephants,*
 - b) *Intensify efforts to develop alternative livelihoods to help stem subsistence and commercial poaching,*
 - c) *Upscale the current efforts to manage the problem of human-wildlife conflicts, particularly conflict with elephants, through community-based methods,*
 - d) *Work with all relevant institutions and organizations, including those in Kenya, to control the spread of alien invasive species in the Serengeti-Mara ecosystem,*
 - e) *Carry out a detailed hydrological survey to determine the maximum carrying capacity of water use in the property and develop a comprehensive plan to address water shortage issues,*
 - f) *Engage the local communities, currently residing in the Speke Gulf area, in an open dialogue to find options that would minimize the costs and increase the benefits of the proposed plan to secure the area for wildlife use,*
 - g) *Carefully evaluate the options for improving the road from Naabi Hill to Seronera, in close cooperation with Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority, taking into consideration all potentially damaging environmental impacts, before considering a decision to tarmac the road,*

- h) Strengthen the funding base for the implementation of the General Management Plan (including the newly developed fire management plan) and improve its monitoring,
 - i) Revive the Serengeti Ecosystem Forum to enhance collaboration and coordination between Tanzania National Parks, the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority, the Wildlife Division, local communities and other relevant stakeholders in the Serengeti-Mara ecosystem to collectively combat the numerous threats to the ecosystem;
10. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, in particular on the status of the North Road proposal as well as progress on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2010 mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1984

Criteria

(vii) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

34 COM 7B.7

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20.000 for 1 international assistance in 1990, conservation, contribution to the preparation of conservation and management guidelines (516)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Mining
- b) Tourism development

Illustration material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/302>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party of Zimbabwe. Although a joint report was also requested, there was no input to the report from the neighbouring State Party of Zambia. From 9-15 January 2011, a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the property, as requested

by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). The mission looked into the potential impact of reported mining and tourism infrastructure developments and reviewed briefly other conservation issues in and around the property. The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>.

a) *Mining*

The mission confirmed that exploration permits were granted in the past for mineral exploration in the Lower Zambezi National Park (LZNP) and the Chiawa Game Management Area (CGMA) in Zambia for copper, uranium and gold. While these areas are not part of the property, the Committee expressed concern in the past that such mining operations could affect the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the World Heritage property situated in Zimbabwe, across the Zambezi River. The State Party of Zimbabwe reports that the State Party of Zambia has decided not to approve these proposed mining operations. While at present, there are no active mining or exploration in these areas that might impinge upon the property, the mission notes that there are permits for uranium mining developments in areas situated 100 to 200 km upstream from Mana Pools, by Dennison Mines near Siavonga (upstream of Chirundu in the Zambezi Valley on the edge of Lake Kariba) and by the African Energy Corporation at Gwembe (further west) and Siavonga areas as well as near Chirundu (Gwabe and Njame).

The mission considers that regulations related to mining in Zambian Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) managed protected areas (CGMA and LZNP) should be complied with and the compliance monitored by ZAWA and special regulations and requirements developed to ensure that overburden and drainage from the mine activities can, in no way, enter the drainage systems that lead to the Zambezi River and affect the overall river system. The Zambezi River waters should be monitored at strategic points to ensure that any appearances of pollutants related to the mining operations are detected and the mining operations charged with removing same and the sources thereof.

Furthermore, the mission recommends that mining outside of ZAWA areas but in the catchment of the Lower Zambezi must be required to be extra sensitive to water issues, runoff and sub-surface water disposal, and precautionary measures taken to ensure that no mining pollution of the Lower Zambezi Rivers waters will take place. There should be regular monitoring for pollutants originating from mining operations in the Zambezi upstream of the property. The mission recommends that the significance of exploration and mining in the Lower Zambezi catchment to the World Heritage site in Zimbabwe should be the subject of an analysis in terms of drainage, river flows and possibilities for pollution.

The mission also recalls the World Heritage Committee's clear position that mineral exploration and mining in World Heritage Sites is incompatible with World Heritage status and that any mining taking place in areas adjacent to the property should ensure that the OUV of the property is not impacted. This position has been endorsed by the International Council for Mining and Metals (ICMM).

b) *Tourism development*

The State Party of Zimbabwe reports that there are currently no pressures from tourism developments within the property. However, there is a proposal by Protea Hotels to build a large tourist facility in the eastern (least developed) area of the CGMA in Zambia, near the river bank directly facing the property. The initial proposal was for a set of buildings to accommodate 144 beds, and led to a number of objections from a grouping of Zimbabwean tourism operators, from the Zambezi Society, and from a Zambian tour operator. The mission notes that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) did not assess the potential impacts of the proposal on the property's OUV. The mission was also informed that this initial proposal was not permitted to go ahead but that a revised set of requirements had been given to the Protea Hotels developers for a facility that is smaller and less visible from the river. The

mission notes, however, that since the issuance of these conditions, the Protea Hotel Group may be reconsidering the project and may not go ahead with it.

The mission recommends that controls on levels of tourism and other uses of facilities should be strictly maintained and monitored to reduce traffic and disturbance in the CGMA and impacts on local people, biodiversity and the World Heritage site across the Zambezi River - in adherence to ZAWA, Environmental Council of Zambia (ECZ) and other regulations. The principles of low density but high quality tourism with minimal impact on the biodiversity should continue as a leading policy for all protected areas of the Zambezi Valley in eastern Zambia and Zimbabwe (National Parks, the World Heritage property, game management and other wildlife areas), given the unique nature and importance of this riverine system in tropical Africa.

c) *Management and transboundary cooperation*

The State Party reports that the draft management plan for Mana Pools NP does not cover the entire World Heritage property (it currently excludes the Chewore and Sapi areas), and has not yet been finalised due to pending decisions regarding planned tourism infrastructure developments. The mission recommends that the draft management plan be finalised and extended to the entire property in consultation with all relevant stakeholders and submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review. The State Party report notes that the lack of financial resources and field equipment (vehicles, field patrol equipment) is seriously hampering management activities such as monitoring, conservation work, fire management and the maintenance of road infrastructure. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN wish to draw the Committee's attention to the lack of adequate resources to manage the property, which, if not addressed, could affect the OUV of the property.

The State Party also reports that plans are underway to designate the property and the Lower Zambezi NP in Zambia as a Transfrontier Conservation Area, which is expected to strengthen the transboundary management of the entire area and harmonize regulations related to fishing, tourism, river traffic, hunting and wildlife management. The mission was informed that a draft Memorandum of Understanding has been developed, but that approval of the respective management plans for Mana Pools NP and Lower Zambezi NP is necessary to progress this initiative. The mission recommends that efforts be increased to develop a joint management plan for the Lower Zambezi valley, informed by a process of Strategic Environmental Assessment, assessing environmental and socio-economic parameters, including the potential impacts of mineral exploration and mining in the Lower Zambezi catchment on the property. The mission also recommends that the Zambian authorities consider nominating the adjacent Lower Zambezi National Park in order to eventually constitute a joint (trans-boundary) inscription on the World Heritage List, in line with the World Heritage Committee's recommendation at the time of the property's inscription on the World Heritage List.

d) *Status of wildlife populations*

The mission notes that based on the available monitoring reports from the Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (ZPWMA) and World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), it appears that regular wildlife monitoring was undertaken until 2005 but has not been maintained; although specific surveys on Nile Crocodiles (2007) and Lions (2009) have been reported. The mission notes that it is possible that poaching figures may be lowered due to the reported low monitoring capacity.

The States Parties note that while there is no serious poaching within the property, commercial poaching of black rhinoceros (*Diceros bicornis*) occurred in the past. With the relocation of the ten remaining rhinos to an Intensive Protection Zone in 1994, the species disappeared from the property. The mission notes that the 2009 IUCN report on the status of African and Asian rhinos indicates that while black and white rhino numbers were stable between 2000 and 2007, a marked decline had been observed since 2007 due to poaching, with 235 illegally killed rhinos between 2006 and 2009. The mission notes that estimates for

elephant and buffalo populations from the 2003 African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) aerial survey of large herbivores in the Zambezi heartland are 10,654 buffalos and 10,586 elephants, which are similar to the figures provided at the time of inscription in 1983, and in reports obtained from ZPWMA for 1995. A survey for the Nile crocodile in 2007 obtained an estimate of 627 adults between Ruchomechi and Kanyemba. Surveys of the hippo population indicate a population growth between 1.5 and 4.5% since 1968, with current estimates around 3,000 for the Mana Pools shoreline. However, all survey data predate Zimbabwe socio-economic crisis since 2007, so it was not possible for the mission to determine if this impacted the populations.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that at the time of its inscription in 1984, the property (particularly Chewore Safari Area) contained one of the numerically most significant populations of black rhinoceros in Africa. They recommend that a feasibility study for a possible reintroduction of black rhinoceros is conducted. In addition they note the importance of conducting a new survey of key wildlife species to assert that the populations have not been impacted since the 2007 economic crisis and that regular wildlife monitoring is reinstated.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that the OUV of the property is currently being maintained. They note that the property's OUV also relies on the condition that the waters of the Zambezi River in its eastern stretches in Zambia and Zimbabwe are kept free from the downstream impacts of mining. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the importance of the UNESCO/IUCN mission's recommendations that the State Party of Zimbabwe, with the cooperation of the State Party of Zambia, ensures that any individual mining exploration and exploitation project in the Lower Zambezi Catchment is subject to the highest standards of environmental assessment. This should also include an assessment of the potential impacts on the property's OUV, and undertake a strategic analysis of the potential impacts of mineral exploration and mining in the Lower Zambezi catchment area, in terms of drainage, river flows and possibilities for pollution, on the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN finally note that a large tourist and conference facility could compromise the property's wilderness values, which form part of its OUV, and welcome the decision by the State Party of Zambia not to permit the implementation of the project. They consider that any development, even when smaller and set further away from the river banks should be subject to an EIA which should include an assessment of the facility's potential impacts on the property's OUV, in accordance with Article 6 of the *Convention*.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.8

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.7**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Welcomes the decision of the State Party of Zambia not to approve the proposed mining operations in Chiawa Game Management Area and Lower Zambezi National Park nor the original proposal for a tourist and conference facility in the Chiawa Game*

Management Area across the river from the property, which could have impacted the property's Outstanding Universal Value;

4. Notes that mining exploration is on-going in other parts of the Lower Zambezi Catchment, and considers that mining exploration and exploitation in the catchment could adversely affect the property if not strictly regulated;
5. Encourages the State Party of Zambia to consider nominating the adjacent Lower Zambezi National Park in order to eventually constitute a joint trans-boundary inscription on the World Heritage List, in line with the World Heritage Committee's recommendation at the time of inscription;
6. Requests the State Party of Zambia to :
 - a) Ensure that any redesigned tourist and conference facility in the Chiawa Game Management Area across the river from the property be subject to a new Environmental Impact Assessment which should include assessment of the property's Outstanding Universal Value, in accordance with Article 6 of the Convention,
 - b) Submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on progress in implementing the mission recommendations concerning mineral exploration and mining and tourism development and on the status of the mining activities and tourism developments which could affect the property;
7. Also requests the State Party of Zimbabwe to :
 - a) Conduct a new survey of key wildlife species to assert that the populations have not been impacted since the 2007 economic crisis, to re-instate regular wildlife monitoring and to conduct a feasibility study for a possible reintroduction programme of black rhinoceros, which disappeared from the property due to commercial poaching in the 1980's,
 - b) Submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress in implementing the mission recommendations;
8. Further requests both States Parties of Zambia and Zimbabwe to :
 - a) Inform the World Heritage Centre of any planned developments in, or adjacent to, the property, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to conduct environmental assessments for any such planned developments and submit the results to the World Heritage Centre,
 - b) Implement the recommendations of the joint reactive monitoring mission, with particular attention to the recommendations concerning mineral exploration and mining and tourism development.

ASIA-PACIFIC

10. Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1981

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions
23 COM XB.23, 24 COM VIII.24, 28 COM 15B.14

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
1998: State of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area (1998, D. R. Wachenfield, J. K. Oliver, J. I. Morrissey)

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
Costal development, fishing, tourism

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/154>

Current conservation issues

While no State Party report was requested by the World Heritage Committee for this property, the recent approval of a Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Processing Plant on Curtis Island within the property on 22 October 2010 led the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to request that this issue be considered by the Committee at its 35th session due to the potential impacts of this proposal on the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). The World Heritage Centre requested additional information on this issue in a letter dated 17 November 2010. The State Party provided additional information on the approval of an LNG plant within the property and recent extreme weather events in letters dated 17 December 2010 and 21 February 2011. The State Party also provided additional information on the management and protection of the property and the issues noted above in a letter dated 8 April 2011.

a) *Development of a Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Processing Plant on Curtis Island*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN received reports in August 2009 concerning proposals for the development of an LNG processing plant on the south extremity of Curtis Island. The area is within the property, and was zoned as "rural". In 2008, the local government re-zoned the lands in question as "Industry Precinct". Curtis Island is located approximately 3-5km from major industrial port facilities of Gladstone (which lie outside, but immediately adjacent to the property). The information provided by the State Party acknowledges that these proposals, if they were to proceed, could have a significant impact on the property, and would therefore be subject to rigorous environmental assessments in line with the State Party's Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (1999) (EPBC). The State

Party had previously expressed its intention to inform the World Heritage Committee of the results of this Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The Curtis Island LNG plant was approved by the federal government on 22 October 2010 after the completion of the EIA without the opportunity for the World Heritage Committee to first consider its results.

The State Party, in its letter of 17 December 2010, explains that the approval of the proposed development of LNG plant on Curtis Island, granted to Santos Limited and PETRONAS Australia Pty Limited, is subject to a number of conditions to mitigate the project's likely environmental impacts. Besides strict environmental safeguard measures, these conditions also require Santos and PETRONAS to offset direct impacts from the LNG plant by securing the long-term conservation of an area of at least five times the size of the plant, preferably located within the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN notes that conserving an area that is already part of the property does not compensate for the potential negative impacts on the property. They note that the executive summary of the online Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) provided by the State Party appears to make contradictory statements. On the one hand, it concludes that the proposed LNG plant is not expected to have significant negative effects on the area's heritage values, but on the other hand, it also concludes that there will be direct impacts on subtidal soft bottom communities, saltpan, saltmarsh, seagrass, mangrove and intertidal habitats, as well as potential direct and indirect impacts on whales, dolphins, turtles and dugong.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that there is a link between these values and the OUV of the property. They therefore consider that the LNG plant could represent a clear potential threat to the property's OUV, due to its expected direct impacts on coastal and marine habitats and species, as well as the potential direct and indirect impacts from increased maritime traffic. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN therefore strongly recommend that the development of the LNG plant be halted until the World Heritage Committee has had the opportunity to consider the EIA and inform the State Party on its conclusions. The complete EIA consists of almost 13,500 pages, and is currently being reviewed by IUCN.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall the Committee's position that exploration and development of oil and gas should not take place within World Heritage properties, as recognised in leading industry commitments to not explore for, or develop, oil and gas resources in natural World Heritage properties.

b) *Extreme climatic events*

From late December 2010 to early February 2011, the state of Queensland experienced extreme weather, which resulted in large-scale flooding. In the supplementary information it provided on 21 February 2011, the State Party reported that flood water from Fitzroy River spread into the property to a distance of 65 km off-shore. The flood plume contains freshwater and contaminants, all of which can have detrimental effects on important marine habitats, which contribute to the property's OUV. The State Party also reported that the category 5 tropical cyclone Yasi, which hit the coast of Queensland in February 2011, caused destruction of corals, as well as having impacted other coastal ecosystems in approximately thirteen percent of the property. Indirect impacts on green turtles and dugongs due to the loss of seagrass are also likely. The State Party is in the process of assessing the damage in the affected areas, but notes that the full extent of this damage will not be known for some time. The State Party expresses its commitment to developing and implementing strategies to improve the property's resilience and its ability to adapt to the impacts of climate change, including the Reef Water Quality Protection Plan and the Climate Change Action Plan. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that options be explored for the development and implementation of a restoration programme to support the recovery of damaged marine and coastal habitats, and note that the restoration of the habitats is likely to take a number of years.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall the World Heritage Committee's clear position in relation to oil and gas exploration and exploitation, that these activities are incompatible with World Heritage status. They consider that the Liquefied Natural Gas facility approved on Curtis Island within the property could represent a clear potential danger to the property's OUV and integrity, as defined in paragraph 180(b)(ii) of the *Operational Guidelines*. Therefore, they strongly recommend the immediate halting of the development of the LNG plant until the World Heritage Committee considers this issue at its 36th session. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note the impacts of recent large-scale flooding and Cyclone Yasi on the property, and consider that the World Heritage Committee should welcome the State Party's commitment to improve the property's resilience and its ability to adapt to climate change following these extreme weather events.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.9

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Notes with concern the approval of a Liquefied Natural Gas plant on Curtis Island within the property, which could represent a potential danger to the property's Outstanding Universal Value and integrity as defined in Paragraph 180(b)(ii) of the Operational Guidelines, and recalls its position that oil and gas exploration and exploitation are incompatible with World Heritage status, in line with leading industry commitments to not develop oil and gas resources in World Heritage properties;*
3. *Urges the State Party to halt the development of Liquefied Natural Gas plant within the property, until the results of the proposal's Environmental Impact Assessment are reviewed at its 36th session in 2012, and encourages the State Party to consider identifying alternative locations for these facilities outside the property;*
4. *Welcomes the State Party's commitment to improve the property's resilience and its ability to adapt to climate change following the extreme weather events that have adversely affected its Outstanding Universal Value;*
5. *Requests the State Party to report to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, on the course of action taken in response to this decision, and on the recovery of areas damaged by recent extreme weather events, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

11. The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) (N 798)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.10 ; 33 COM 7B.12

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 75,000 post cyclone emergency assistance.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

USD 32,590 from Switzerland following a Special Appeal by the Sector for External Relations of UNESCO.

Previous monitoring missions

2007: World Heritage Centre mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Loss of monitoring capacity due to cyclone damage

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/798>

Current conservation issues

On 31 March 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides concise comments on the implementation of the Committee recommendations adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).

a) *Repair of damage caused by cyclone Sidr*

In November 2007, Bangladesh was hit by cyclone Sidr, which passed directly over the eastern component of the property, causing severe damage to the environment and park infrastructure. The State Party reports that work to restore damaged or destroyed infrastructure is currently on-going, and that the UNESCO funded project "Support to Essential Management Capacity in the Sundarbans WH Site following the passage of cyclone Sidr" is in its final stage. It also reports that under said project, besides the procurement of boats and building of staff housing in phase I, tiger darting equipment has been purchased and the Kochikhali jetty and Kokilmoni patrol post have been repaired. The State Party notes that wildlife sanctuary management training for the property's staff will be given soon. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the Bangladesh Tiger Action Plan (BTAP), a governmental policy level document, states that resources and infrastructure are insufficient for carrying out effective patrolling of the property. Although not provided by the State Party, the BTAP 2009-2017 contains relevant information about the conservation and management of the property, as the vast majority of Bangladesh' tiger population is restricted to the Sundarbans Reserve Forest, which includes the property. The BTAP notes that some guard posts do not have boats, and that others have slow boats and inadequate budget for maintenance or fuel. It also notes that drinking water, food supplies and medical facilities are limited, and that no budget is set aside to cope with emergency situations, such as cyclones.

b) *Ecological monitoring and climate change*

The State Party reports that its Forest Department is starting the project “Sundarbans Environmental and Livelihoods Security” (SEALS), which includes logistic support for ecological monitoring and documenting the impact of climate change on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. This 5-year - 10-million euro project begun in January 2011. The State Party provides no further detail. The BTAP also states that the expansion of the coastal greenbelt through mangrove afforestation is part of the Bangladesh Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan. The BTAP identifies potential impacts from climate change through sea-level rise, increased cyclone frequency and altered fresh-water flow into the property.

c) *Other conservation issues – resource extraction and poaching*

The State Party reports that unauthorised resource extraction and any sort of illegal activities are strictly controlled within the property. The BTAP notes that the increasing human population surrounding the Sundarbans Reserve Forest depends on the forest for their survival and has few alternative livelihood options. It states that the most immediate threat to the Sundarbans Reserve Forest is unsustainable harvesting of timber and non-timber forest products. It also notes poaching of tiger and prey species occurs, though it is unclear to what extent. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that, although it is unclear to what extent resource extraction and poaching affect the wildlife sanctuaries that make up the property, the damage caused by cyclone Sidr is likely to have increased the property’s vulnerability to these threats. They are concerned that, as long as resources and infrastructure are inadequate to efficiently patrol the property, it will be a major challenge to protect it against these and other illegal activities.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that while infrastructure restoration is ongoing following the destruction caused by cyclone Sidr in 2007, progress appears to be slow. There is a need to continue restoration works and improve management capacity and resources, in order to address potential threats from poaching, resource extraction and other illegal activities. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that the Sundarbans Environmental and Livelihoods Security project includes logistic support for ecological monitoring and documenting the impact of climate change on the OUV of the property, as requested in Decision **33 COM 7B.12**.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.11

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.12**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the initiation of the Sundarbans Environmental and Livelihoods Security project, which includes support for ecological monitoring and documenting the impacts of climate change on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and welcomes the State Party’s commitment to expand its coastal greenbelt zone through mangrove afforestation as a mitigation measure to climate change;*

4. *Also notes that in the absence of ecological monitoring data for the property, it is not possible to assess the status of its Outstanding Universal Value, and requests the State Party to submit the results of the ecological monitoring programme to the World Heritage Centre for review, as soon as these become available;*
5. *Further notes that inadequate resources and infrastructure are likely to limit the effective protection of the property against potential threats from poaching, resource extraction and other illegal activities, and invites the State Party to submit an International Assistance request to further support the ongoing restoration of infrastructure and the procurement of management resources;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2013, a report on the state of conservation of the property, and progress achieved with regards to post-cyclone restoration, as well as of the results from the ecological monitoring programme.*

13. Kaziranga National Park (India) (N 337)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1985

Criteria
(ix) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
26 COM 21B.10; 32 COM 7B.12; 33 COM 7B.13

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 100,000 (Technical co-operation, 1997 and 1998)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount provided to the property: The property has benefited from the UNF funded World Heritage India programme from 2008. The project interventions cover the following main areas: enhance management effectiveness and build staff capacity; increase the involvement of local communities in the management of the World Heritage site and promote their sustainable development; and raise awareness through communications and advocacy.

Previous monitoring missions
1997: World Heritage Centre mission; February 2002: IUCN mission; February 2008: joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Poaching of rhinos;
- b) Development of a railway adjacent to the property;
- c) Proposed upgrading of National Highway 37 adjacent to the property;
- d) Insufficient infrastructure, budget and staffing.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/337>

Current conservation problems

The State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) and thus, limited information is available on the current state of previously identified threats to the property. The following report is based on information received by IUCN.

a) *Poaching*

IUCN has received reports that poaching is largely under control, and that the property contains healthy populations of rhino and tiger. It has also received reports that the park authorities have increased efforts to prevent poaching, including intensive patrolling, recruitment of additional forest guards, procurement of new communication equipment, counter operations against poachers and the use of informants from local communities to apprehend transgressors. The reports received by IUCN note that a Government Notification of 14 July 2010 provides all forest officers in Assam immunity from prosecution without prior sanction for use of firearms in carrying out their duty of forest and wildlife protection, which is a significant step to prevent poaching and boost staff morale.

b) *Upgrading of National Highway 37*

IUCN received reports that the National Highway Authority has abandoned the proposal to upgrade the NH 37, which runs along the southern boundary of the property, and already forms a partial barrier to an important wildlife migration route between the property and the Karbi Anglong Hills. The reports received by IUCN note that the National Highway Authority is considering a new alignment for the highway expansion, which will detour the property along an existing road on the northern bank of the Brahmaputra River. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the World Heritage Committee, at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), requested the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a report on the question of the approval and location of the alternative route to the highway NH37. They consider that a report from the State Party is needed on this issue, in order to confirm the reports received by IUCN that the highway expansion will circumvent the property.

c) *Invasive species*

The reports received by IUCN note that spread of invasive species, particularly Mimosa, remains a concern, and that the efficacy of the efforts undertaken, including manual uprooting and controlled burning, have yet to be assessed. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that a monitoring and management system needs to be developed in order to address this threat.

d) *Tourism*

The reports received by IUCN also note that tourist facilities around the park are in high demand, due to the large number of tourists that visit the property every year, and that the State Government has established a committee of relevant stakeholders to discuss and evaluate tourism developments in the park. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the above committee take into account the recommendations of IUCN's report "*Sustainable tourism in natural World Heritage: priorities for action*". They consider that any tourism developments within or around the park should be strictly controlled in order to avoid adverse impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), in cooperation with the District Administration.

e) *Other conservation issues – dams*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the 2007 Enhancing Our Heritage Management Effectiveness report noted plans by the Governments of India and Assam to develop dams on the Brahmaputra River. They note that the annual flooding of the property is an integral part of the ecosystem processes taking place within the property, and that any construction of dams on the Brahmaputra River could have a considerable direct negative impact on the OUV of the property in relation to criterion (ix). They emphasize that the State

Party should inform the World Heritage Centre of any plans of developments that could impact the property's OUV, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and submit Environmental Impact Assessments of such plans to the World Heritage Centre prior to taking a final decision.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note reports that poaching is largely under control and that the highway expansion will circumvent the property. They consider that a report from the State Party is needed in order to confirm these statements. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre time series data of key wildlife populations as well as poaching records, and to conduct regular monitoring of key wildlife populations to confirm and monitor the status of this threat. They also recommend that the State Party should submit to the World Heritage Centre a report on the approval and location of the alternative highway expansion that avoids the property, including a map, and confirm that the proposed upgrading of the section of highway NH37 that runs along the southern boundary of the property has been permanently abandoned. They are of the view that a monitoring and management system should be developed and implemented to address the threat of invasive species. They recall that the 2007 Enhancing Our Heritage Management Effectiveness report noted plans by the Governments of India and Assam to develop dams on the Brahmaputra River, and recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre of any planned developments that could negatively impact the property's OUV, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, as well as submit Environmental Impact Assessments of such plans to the World Heritage Centre prior to taking a final decision.

Draft Decision: **35 COM 7B.13**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.13**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property nor an Environmental Impact Assessment of the alternatives to the proposed upgrading of the highway NH37, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session;
4. Notes reports received by IUCN that:
 - a) *The park authorities have increased efforts to prevent poaching, and that poaching is now largely under control,*
 - b) *The National Highway Authority has abandoned the proposal to upgrade highway NH37, which runs along the southern boundary of the property, and is considering a new alignment which will circumvent the property along an existing road on the northern bank of the Brahmaputra River;*
5. Requests the State Party to develop and implement a monitoring and management system to address the issue of invasive species;

6. *Urges the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre of any planned developments that could negatively impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, including dams, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and to submit Environmental Impact Assessments of such plans to the World Heritage Centre prior to taking a final decision;*
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 report on i) the question of the approval and alignment of the alternative highway expansion that avoids the property, ii) any plans regarding dam construction that may affect the property and iii) time series data of key wildlife populations and poaching records, as well as the other issues raised above.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1985

Criteria
(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.17; 32 COM 7B.13; 33 COM 7B.14

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 80,000 (Enhancing our Heritage project on management effectiveness assessment). The property has benefited from the UNF funded World Heritage India programme from 2008 (enhance management effectiveness and build staff capacity; increase the involvement of local communities in the management of the property and promote their sustainable development; and raise awareness through communications and advocacy).

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/340>

Current conservation problems

On 15 April 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property to the World Heritage Centre. The report provides information on progress achieved in the execution of projects addressing water shortage, eradication of invasive species,

collaboration with local communities and stakeholders for the management of the property, as well as a number of other conservation issues.

a) *Water shortage*

The State Party reports on progress achieved in the execution of the Chiksana Canal Extension project, the Govardhan Drain project, and the Dholpur – Bharatpur drinking water project. It notes that the Chiksana Canal has been extended for 3.6 km into the property, potentially providing 50 million cubic feet (mcft) of water annually to the property during the rainy season. It also notes that work on the Govardhan Drain has started and is expected to be completed within six months (although it does not indicate whether this will be in time for the 2011 monsoon which begins around June). When complete it will provide another 300 mcft of water annually to the property. The State Party further notes that the Dholpur – Bharatpur drinking water project is nearing completion, and that water is expected to be made available to the property by June 2011. This project, which was initiated in 1999, was initially expected to provide 310 mcft of water to the property every year during the first phase of its operation until the year 2010, and thereafter 62.5 mcft annually. It is unclear whether this commitment will extend beyond 2010 as a result of the delay in the implementation of the project.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the property needs an annual inflow of 550 mcft of water for complete flooding, and that 350 mcft is considered the minimum requirement. They consider that the urgent completion of the Govardhan Drain and the Dholpur – Bharatpur drinking water project will be a major step towards guaranteeing the property's water supply to an adequate level in poor monsoon years. They also note reports received by IUCN that in September 2010, 710 mcft of water was released from the Panchana dam, located 100 km from Keoladeo National Park, of which 272 mcft reached the property, and consider that release of water from the Panchana dam should be continued annually. They further note that failure to restore adequate water supply appears to have adversely affected the property's bird populations which are the basis for its inscription on the List of World Heritage, as reported in point c) below. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that if the above water management infrastructure projects are not rapidly finalised, the property may soon meet the requirements for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

b) *Invasive species and collaboration with local communities*

The joint 2008 World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission noted that approximately 10 km² (of a total of 11 km²) of the invasive plant *Prosopis juliflora* had been removed by local communities, who were permitted to use the up-rooted plants for firewood and fence posts. The State Party reports that as a result of this policy, the wetland areas invaded by *Prosopis* have recovered. It notes that a systematic plan for the regular monitoring and removal of *Prosopis* has been formulated with the involvement of district administration and local communities. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that based on the vegetation map provided by the State Party, *Prosopis juliflora* still appears to be well established within the property. They consider that the implementation of the plan for regular removal of *Prosopis* with the involvement of local communities will be an important contribution to controlling this threat.

The State Party notes that in addition to the removal of *Prosopis*, local communities are involved in the management of the property in a number of different ways, including in prevention of offences, education, and grassland management, which also meets the villagers' demand for thatching material. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome these initiatives to increase the involvement of local communities in the property's management, as recommended by the 2008 mission.

c) *Ecological monitoring programme*

In conformity with Decision **33 COM 7B.14**, the State Party provides time series data of the annual bird count conducted at the property since 2009, though details on the methodology used were not provided. Although the species record differs between years, and appears to be focussed mainly on migratory species, it indicates that bird populations in the property fluctuate significantly and appear to be declining. The data indicate that of the 364 bird species mentioned in the IUCN evaluation document at the time of the property's inscription on the List of World Heritage, only 72 were recorded in 2011, and that total bird numbers fluctuated from 33,904 in 2009, to 934 in 2010 and 8,168 in 2011. The State Party notes that it has initiated preliminary steps to set up a breeding centre for Siberian crane in the property, which has not been reported at the property since 2002.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the negative results of the recent bird counts and the apparent sharp decline in the property's migratory bird populations, particularly in light of reports received by IUCN that until 1990 the numbers of birds that flocked at the property may have exceeded 100,000. Time series data on bird populations since the time of inscription, including a description of the survey methodologies used, is urgently needed to adequately assess the state of the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). IUCN notes moreover that it has received reports that a recent vegetation survey, conducted by the Tourism and Wildlife Society of India, found that 34 plant species that constitute the basis of the migratory bird populations foodchain are threatened within the property, and that six of these plant species are believed to have gone locally extinct. They consider that a detailed ecological monitoring programme, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), including of bird populations, is necessary to effectively monitor the OUV of the property and to develop management responses to the ongoing degradation of its values.

d) *Other conservation issues – management effectiveness and feral cattle and dogs*

The State Party notes that a management plan for the property for the period of 2009-2013 has been prepared in consultation with stakeholders, but a copy of this has not been provided. During its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) the Committee recommended that the State Party give more attention to the conservation of satellite wetlands outside the boundary of the property that are used by both migratory and resident birds, which were identified during the 2007 World Heritage Centre/IUCN/UNF "Enhancing our Heritage" project on management effectiveness assessment. These wetlands play an important support role in maintaining the integrity of the property. The State Party provides a list of 27 satellite wetlands at a distance from 35 to 180 km from the property, and reports on a number of activities undertaken under the Integrated Development of Wildlife Habitats project, which is aimed at their long-term conservation.

IUCN has received reports that, in addition to the existing problem of large numbers of feral cattle in the property competing with other herbivores (already identified at the time of inscription), feral dogs are competing for food with golden jackals. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that a more proactive approach may be necessary to manage the cattle and control the feral dog population in the property.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the additional delays for the completion of the Govardhan Drain and the Dholpur – Bharatpur drinking water project since the Committee's 33rd session (Seville, 2009). They emphasize that their urgent completion and operation is vital to the protection of the property's OUV, and consider that, in addition, the release of water from the Panchana dam to the property should be continued annually. They also note

that inadequate water supply is likely to be linked to the observed decline in the property's bird populations, which are the basis for its inscription on the World Heritage List, as the results of the recent bird counts seem to indicate. However, they consider that there is a need for more reliable time series data of bird numbers since the inscription of the property, in order to better assess the status and trend of its bird populations. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that continued lack of adequate water supply is likely to result in a further decrease in the property's bird populations and could result in its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in accordance with Paragraph 180 (a) (i) of the *Operational Guidelines*. They also consider that a detailed ecological monitoring programme is necessary to monitor the property's OUV, in order to determine whether the implementation of the water supply projects succeeds in restoring the property's OUV. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the formulation of a plan for regular monitoring and removal of *Prosopis* with community involvement. They also note that the new management plan of the property was not provided.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.14

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.14**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Welcomes the State Party's initiatives to increase the involvement of local communities in the management of the property, and commends the State Party for its efforts to ensure the long-term conservation of satellite wetlands, in line with the recommendations of the 2008 reactive monitoring mission;*
4. *Notes with serious concern that the completion of the Govardhan Drain and the Dholpur – Bharatpur drinking water project has been further delayed since its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), requests the State Party to ensure the completion of these projects urgently, and urges the State Party to continue the release of water from the Panchana dam to the property annually;*
5. *Notes that failure to urgently restore adequate water supply to the property could adversely affect the wetland bird populations for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List and could create soon conditions where the property meets the requirements for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in accordance with Paragraph 180 (a) (i) of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to provide accurate time series data on the property's bird populations since its inscription on the List of World Heritage, including a description of the survey methodologies used, in order to assess the status and trend of these populations;*
7. *Also urges the State Party to develop and implement a detailed ecological monitoring programme to monitor the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in order to ensure that the reinstatement of the property's water supply results in the restoration of its Outstanding Universal Value;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to provide the World Heritage Centre with three printed and one electronic copy of the draft revised management plan or management system;*

9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including a report on progress achieved in restoring adequate water supply to the property, as well as a detailed ecological monitoring report, for examination by the Committee at its 36th session in 2012, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

Criteria

(viii) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.18; 32COM 7B.15; 34 COM 7B.13

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 41,400 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; 2011: 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.
- i)

Illustration material

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

Current conservation issues

From 24 January to 3 February 2011, a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the property. The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>. On 1 February 2011, a report was submitted by the State Party on the state of conservation of the property. The report provides a summary of the International Workshop on Effective Management of Lorentz National Park World Heritage Site, held on 29 November 2010 as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), which was attended by

representatives from relevant offices from central and local governments, as well as UNESCO, international NGOs, Freeport and local communities.

a) *Infrastructure development*

The State Party report notes that the road construction between Wamena and Yuguru is aimed at connecting several isolated regencies, and that there is no alternative option than to cross the property, including the Lake Habema region. The report as well as the mission acknowledges that currently most of the transportation in the province is carried out by air. However, since air transport is very expensive for transportation of goods and local community use, the Provincial Government of Papua is determined to continue road construction to accelerate development programs to improve people's welfare. Also, the 2010 International Workshop concluded that infrastructure development, such as roads within the property, is unavoidable as this is in line with the growth rate of Papua's development in general. However the joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission found the ecosystem in the Lake Habema region seriously damaged by road construction.

The mission notes that the roads being constructed in the Lake Habema region are among the provincial government's priority projects to implement its integrated transport programme. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the monitoring mission received information that, following an interdepartmental meeting on 1 April 2011, the Directorate of Highways of the Ministry of Public Works has instructed its regional office in Papua to cease road development in the Lake Habema region until the Ministry of Forestry issues a permit. The mission recommends that the State Party ensure the immediate cessation of road construction in the property, and immediately commence the rehabilitation of constructed roads. It also recommends that the State Party commission a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the integrated transport programme for Papua as it relates to the property, which should identify the least environmentally damaging transport options, including alternatives to road building. It further recommends that the State Party undertake Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) of any future projects which are likely to affect the values and integrity of the property.

b) *Forest die-back*

The State Party acknowledges that the road construction facilitates the spread of *Phytophthora fungus* which has the potential to damage and destroy highly sensitive sub-alpine *Nothofagus* forests. It reports that investigation and action to address forest die-back will expectedly be conducted in 2011-2012. The mission also notes that forest die-back downslope of the road appears to have stabilised somewhat, but that it now appears to be occurring upslope of the road as well, with unknown causes.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN support the mission recommendation that the State Party develop management guidelines to contain the spread of die-back disease, which should be provided to all relevant stakeholders undertaking activities within the property.

c) *Management issues*

The State Party reports that the 2010 International Workshop identified a number of management issues, including a lack of implementation of the management policy, local government decentralization, unclear boundaries between regencies, limited communication between stakeholders, lack of World Heritage regulations, limited management capacity, and insufficient detail in the management plan regarding zonation, community traditional rights and use of local/traditional knowledge. The State Party notes that the Provincial Government of Papua has developed ten new regencies within the area of the property. It also reports that a Multi Stakeholders Collaboration Team for the property was created in 2009 with members from nine of these regencies, which in March 2010 held a workshop, which was attended by representatives from provincial and regency governments, NGOs and communities, and which aimed to determine the draft zonation of the property to support the development of the management plan.

The joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission notes that both the provincial and the regency governments are responsible for forest management and conservation within their jurisdiction and that furthermore, the customary owners of the land encompassed by the property do not recognize any sovereignty over the land other than their own. The mission also notes that these overlapping jurisdictions generate tensions which constitute an escalating threat to the management of the property, to the extent that the Lorentz National Park Bureau is virtually powerless to oppose development pressures from provincial and local governments. It further notes that there is a lack of consultation between the Lorentz National Park Bureau and the customary owners of the land, which reportedly results in the customary owners entering into arrangements with provincial and regency governments and their contractors who undertake works in the property contrary to national legislation. Furthermore, the mission reports that the park staff has limited knowledge or experience of contemporary protected area management, that the park budget indicates that most resources are allocated to infrastructure development and operation, rather than direct management activities, and that the zonation plan for the property is overly complex.

The mission recommends that the State Party urgently seek external assistance to build staff management capacity. It also recommends that the State Party undertake a community outreach programme to raise local people's awareness and understanding of the values and benefits of the property. Furthermore, it recommends that the State Party review the property's budget and resource allocation to ensure that these address the major threats to its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), as well as review the property's management and zonation plans, using protection of OUV as the primary basis for zone allocation.

d) *Other conservation issues – illegal logging, illegal fishing and poaching*

The State Party notes that road construction could lead to increased illegal logging in the park, but that it lacks accurate and reliable data on the current status of this threat. It reports that timber collection occurs related to traditional use by local communities, and that the Lorentz National Park Bureau cooperates with the local communities to reduce timber collection. The mission acknowledges that it found no evidence of large-scale logging operations. It also notes that licenses for the transport of timber are not issued unless the applicant owns land in the Forest Conversion Zone outside the property.

The State Party reports that the Lorentz National Park Bureau lacks the ability to control the marine area of the property, as it does not own a boat. It notes that in the mainland of the property, traditional hunting and fishing for subsistence of local communities occurs. With regards to poaching, the mission notes a media report that a shipment of 11,000 pig-nosed tortoises was intercepted in the Asmat region. It recommends that the State Party undertake a community outreach programme to raise awareness and improve understanding of the existence, values and benefits of the property, which will assist in detecting future poaching activities.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the worrying lack of progress in halting road construction within the property and forest-die back, and consider that if urgent and effective action is not taken to address these and other ongoing threats to the property, Lorentz National Park is likely to face a gradual irreversible loss of its OUV. They consider that there is an urgent need to ensure the cessation of road construction in the property, and to immediately commence the rehabilitation of constructed roads, including reinstatement and stabilisation of soil profiles and revegetation of disturbed areas. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to commission a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the integrated transport programme for Papua Province as it relates to the property in order to identify the least environmentally damaging transport options for the alpine region of the property, including alternatives to road building. They also recommend that the World Heritage Committee urge the State Party to i) develop management guidelines to contain the spread of die-back disease, which should be provided to all relevant

stakeholders undertaking activities within the property; ii) to develop and implement a strategy to engage customary owners in park management decision-making processes, iii) to review the budgeting for the property in order to ensure that resources are directed to address the major threats to its OUV, as well as iv) to review the draft management plan and zonation plan using protection of OUV as the primary basis for zone allocation.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.15

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.13**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction that an International Workshop on effective management of the property was held in November 2010 as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session, and encourages the State Party to implement the workshop's recommendations;*
4. *Expresses its grave concern that road construction within the property has not ceased as repeatedly requested by the World Heritage Committee, that forest die-back continues to adversely affect the property, and that, in the absence of urgent and effective action, the property is likely to face a gradual irreversible loss of its Outstanding Universal Value;*
5. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to cease all road construction in the Lake Habema region and rehabilitate recently constructed roads, and urges the State Party to commission a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the integrated transport programme for Papua Province as it relates to the property, in order to identify the least environmentally damaging transport options for the alpine region of the property, including alternatives to road building;*
6. *Notes the State Party's commitment to investigate and address forest die-back, and also urges it to develop management guidelines for all relevant stakeholders undertaking activities within the property to contain the spread of the die-back disease;*
7. *Requests the State Party to fully implement the 2008 and 2011 mission recommendations, and to prioritise the following:*
 - a) *Develop and implement a strategy to engage customary owners in park management decision-making processes,*
 - b) *Review the budgeting for the property in order to ensure that resources are directed to address the major threats to its Outstanding Universal Value,*
 - c) *Review the draft management plan and zonation plan using protection of Outstanding Universal Value as the primary basis for zone allocation,*
 - d) *Build the capacity of park staff to manage complex ecological, technical and sociological issues;*
8. *Also encourages the State Party to submit an International Assistance request to support the implementation of the above recommendations related to the management effectiveness of the property;*

9. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress achieved in implementing the recommendations of the 2008 and 2011 missions and the international workshop, as well as a copy of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the integrated transport programme for Papua Province, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

16. Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2004

Criteria
(vii) (ix) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 7B.14; 33 COM 7B.15; 34 COM 7B.14

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 96,600: USD 66,600 for Emergency Assistance (2005); USD 30,000 for an International Conference on Tropical Forests in Sumatra (1997).

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; USD 35,000 Rapid Response Facility grant (2007).

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; April 2011: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Road construction
- b) Agricultural encroachment
- c) Illegal logging
- d) Poaching
- e) Institutional and governance weaknesses

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

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, providing information on progress in the implementation of recommendations adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). From 7 to 16 April 2011, a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by Decision **34 COM 7 B.14** (the fourth reactive monitoring mission since 2006). At the time of writing this document, the mission report was not yet finalised. Once completed, the mission report will be made available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>. An oral presentation of the mission's outcomes will therefore be made to the World Heritage Committee. Based on the mission

results, a revised draft decision may also be prepared by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN.

The serial property consists of three components, namely Gunung Leuser National Park (GLNP), Kerinci Seblat National Park (KSNP) and Bukit Barisan Selatan National Park (BBSNP), all of which face similar conservation issues.

a) *Road construction*

The State Party notes that in response to severe earthquakes in West Sumatra in 2009 several emergency roads were built through KSNP for the distribution of food and goods, many of which were subsequently closed down as the situation improved. A ministerial decree (S.52/Menhut-IV/2010) was adopted in February 2010 urging protected area authorities in Indonesia to prevent illegal road construction within their jurisdictions. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received reports, documented in the press, that despite the adoption of this decree, discussions among local governments and stakeholders continue on financing and building four proposed roads through the park's core zones, for local economic development needs and as evacuation routes in case of natural disasters. These reports suggest that there are existing roads that could meet these needs, but that these are not maintained in good condition. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the proposed roads would significantly fragment Sumatran tiger habitat, one of the property's key flagship species which forms part of its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) under criterion (x). They recall that the World Heritage Committee in Decision **34 COM 7B.14** had requested the State Party to immediately halt all road construction plans in KSNP, and consider that these road proposals pose a major threat to the property and represent a potential danger to its OUV, including the conditions of integrity, in line with Paragraph 180(b)(ii) of the *Operational Guidelines*. On 9 May 2011, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party and urged the authorities to provide the Centre with all relevant documents and the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the proposed road developments within KSNP.

The State Party reports that in BBSNP, the Ministry of Forestry has permitted the improvement of the roads from Sukabumi to Suoh and from Way Heni to Way Hayu, provided that the park authority and the local government can develop agreements on their control and use, including the building of guard posts and the relocation of any settlements along this road, in order to avoid further negative impacts on wildlife. The nature of these improvements is unclear and should be clarified. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the Way Heni – Sukaraja road continues to adversely affect wildlife, particularly rhinos, and the ecological connectivity between the Northern and Southern portions of the property.

The State Party does not mention any plans for road development in GLNP. However, IUCN has received reports which suggest that the Ladia Galaska road development project, located outside the property, would have a significant impact on the larger Leuser Ecosystem, would present a potential danger to the long-term survival of several of the property's flagship species, including orangutan, tigers, and elephants, which form part of its OUV under criterion (x).

b) *Agricultural expansion*

The use of satellite imagery has permitted the State Party, in collaboration with UNESCO Jakarta, to determine the deforestation rate in the property caused by illegal logging and encroachment (1200 ha/yr for BBSNP, 2000 ha/yr for KSNP, and 625 ha/yr for GLNP). However, the State Party does not provide time-series satellite imagery of the property for 2006-2010, as requested by the Committee in Decision **34 COM 7 B.14**. The State Party notes that the Directorate General of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation (PHKA) has formed an Indonesia-wide Anti-Encroachment Task Force (Kelompok Kerja Penanganan

Perambahan, KKPP), which has mapped encroachment areas in GLNP and will do so for the other two components of the property.

IUCN has received NGO reports that agricultural expansion of plantation crops (cocoa, rubber, and oil palm) around GLNP occurs mostly in the lowland forests where most Sumatran orangutans are found. IUCN has also received reports that there appear to be proposals for Commercial Forest Plantations (Hutan Tanaman Industry, HTI) in the Rimba Karya Indah area of the Batang Ulu watershed which has been identified as key watershed forest and important tiger habitat, and which is enclosed on three sides by KSNP. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that, as noted above in section (a), much of the critically important habitat for some key species is located outside the inscribed GLNP, in the surrounding Leuser Ecosystem. They strongly encourage the inclusion of these high biodiversity areas in the property in order to better reflect the OUV for which the property was inscribed, as recommended by IUCN in its evaluation at the time of inscription. They also suggest the inclusion of the Rimba Karya Indah area enclosed by KSNP. The State Party does not provide any information on the establishment of an appropriate buffer zone to secure the conservation of the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Decision **34 COM 7B.14**). They consider that there remains an urgent need to establish through law an appropriate buffer zone for the entire property.

c) *Institutional coordination mechanism*

The State Party report notes a number of initiatives to improve cooperation between park managers and other stakeholders in the management of the different components of the property, based on the 2007 Emergency Action Plan (EAP). The State Party gives several examples of the successes achieved under these initiatives, including the signing of Memoradums of Understanding with several institutions to regulate water use in KSNP, the establishment of a community group to assist park rangers in monitoring illegal activities in BBSNP, and the relocation of political refugees from GLNP to South Sumatra Province. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall the World Heritage Committee's recommendation that a clear insitutional coordination mechanism should be developed to ensure that the large number of activities that are not within the park's mandate and which are beyond its legal competence are addressed. The initiatives noted above, though welcome, do not comprise such a coordination mechanism.

d) *Monitoring system*

The State Party reports that regular biological monitoring is undertaken in collaboration with NGOs. It also notes that satellite imagery is used for larger-scale monitoring of the forest ecosystem, which revealed that approximately 7000 ha of forest in BBSNP has been severely impacted by the invasive species *Meremia peltata*. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall the World Heritage Committee's recommendation that an effective and prioritized monitoring system should be developed and implemented to assess the status and trends of key factors affecting the OUV of the property, including encroachment, illegal logging, poaching, wildlife trade, invasive species, and any anticipated climate change impacts in all components of the property.

e) *Law enforcement*

The State Party notes that the park authorities have taken several steps to improve law enforcement in the property, including regular patrolling, prosecuting transgressors, building park staff's law enforcement capacity, and providing adequate tools and training for park rangers to implement law enforcement. Besides these efforts, park authorities also conduct preventive activities by developing collaboration with stakeholders and environmental education and awareness programmes, among others.

f) *Establishment of new provinces, districts and sub-districts*

The State Party notes that, in accordance with the central government's decentralization programme, local governments throughout Indonesia are establishing new districts. The

State Party also notes that newly established districts often ignore the existence of protected areas and seek to develop their economies through the exploitation of natural resources. The State Party reports that in the provinces surrounding KSNP, 14 new districts were created, some of which overlap with the property. It states that this situation encourages park authorities to more intensively disseminate conservation information and develop collaboration with stakeholders, which is expected to generate more support for protected area management. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the establishment of new districts further complicates the management of the property and increases development threats, including from road construction. They recall the World Heritage Committee's recommendation that the establishment of new provinces, districts and sub-districts should be halted to reduce both the administrative complexity of the property's management and the multiple development threats.

g) *Ecosystem based restoration plan and community development programmes*

The State Party report notes that the park authorities have restored degraded lands by planting indigenous plant species. So far, 20.75 ha of GLNP, 1500 ha of BBSNP and 150 ha of KSNP have been planted, and another 6000 ha of BBSNP are scheduled for restoration in 2011, especially in former encroachment areas. The State Party also notes that it is in the process of developing a Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) programme for two national parks, and that if their implementation is successful, similar programmes will be developed for the components of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the State Party should expedite the development of a REDD programme in the property as an approach to addressing the multiple threats to its OUV. IUCN recalls its suggestion that the State Party make provision within REDD and the Forest Investment Programme (FIP) on conserving the property's forest ecosystem, and notes its willingness to assist the State Party in designing and implementing an effective programme in this regard.

The State Party notes that community development programmes are conducted in all three components of the property, with the objective of improving livelihoods, decreasing dependence on and raising awareness of the property's biodiversity.

h) *Illegal mining*

The State Party reports that no illegal mining has so far occurred in KSNP and GLNP, but that small scale illegal mining of sand was found in BBSNP. IUCN has received NGO reports that with declining revenues from oil and gas production in Aceh Province, the provincial government is under increasing pressure to expand the mining sector. These reports note that there are plans for coal mining development in the hill forests inland of the Tripa swamps, which are part of the Leuser Ecosystem and adjacent to the property. The exact location of this proposed development should be clarified in relation to potential impacts on the property's OUV.

i) *Poaching*

The State Party report does not provide information on poaching incidents, but the World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received reports that two elephants were shot by poachers in April 2011.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recognize the efforts being made by the State Party to implement the World Heritage Committee's recommendations, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). Despite some progress, the property continues to face serious threats including road construction proposals in several of its components, notably Kerinci Seblat National Park (KSNP), and high levels of encroachment. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the World Heritage Committee had requested the State Party to immediately

halt all road construction plans in KSNP. They highlight that these road proposals and the high levels of encroachment are a serious threat to the property and represent both a potential and ascertained danger to its OUV in line with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*, as confirmed by the findings of three monitoring missions since 2006. Given that the property clearly meets the relevant criteria in the *Operational Guidelines*, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee inscribe the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra on the List of World Heritage in Danger and reiterate its encouragement to the State Party to fully support this inscription as its purpose is to strengthen international cooperation efforts and promote rapid conservation action to safeguard the property. They also recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to accompany the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger by a one-year programme to develop a plan of action, facilitated through International Assistance, which should include exploration of options to seek support from the international community including key donors to the property and surrounding areas.

They note that the results of the 2011 World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission report will be presented orally to the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee and that a revised draft decision may also be prepared by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to reflect its recommendations and the proposed corrective measures.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note reports of planned coal mining adjacent to Gunung Leuser National Park (GLNP). They recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to provide additional information on this mining proposal to the World Heritage Centre, including a map showing its exact location and an EIA of its likely impacts on the property's OUV, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.16

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.14**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Notes with appreciation the State Party's efforts to implement the World Heritage Committee's recommendations adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), and encourages the State Party to continue and further intensify these efforts;
4. Expresses its utmost concern that road development plans and agricultural encroachment continue to pose a major threat to the property, and considers that these threats represent both a potential and ascertained danger to its Outstanding Universal Value in line with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines, as confirmed by three monitoring missions since 2006;
5. Requests the State Party to immediately halt all road development plans within the property, rehabilitate existing roads, and conduct a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the cumulative effects of all road development plans in the Bukit Barisan mountain range area, where the serial property is located, in order to identify transport options for the region that do not adversely impact the property's Outstanding Universal Value, including improved maintenance of existing legal roads, and to submit this assessment to the World Heritage Centre for review;

6. **Decides to inscribe the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;**
7. Takes note that a proposed set of correctives measures is being developed following the 2011 World Heritage Centre/IUCN joint reactive monitoring mission, in collaboration with the State Party, taking account of the corrective measures already agreed for the property at the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee;
8. Also requests the State Party to provide additional information on the coal mining proposal adjacent to Gunung Leuser National Park to the World Heritage Centre, including a map showing its exact location and an Environmental Impact Assessment of its likely impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
9. Invites the State Party to apply for International Assistance in order to develop an action plan that would enable the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and calls upon the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to provide technical support to the development of this action plan;
10. Further requests the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a 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 at its 36th session in 2012;
11. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including confirmation that all road development proposals within the property have been halted, and on the progress achieved in addressing the other points raised above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

18. Central Highlands of Sri Lanka (Sri Lanka) (N 1203)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2010

Criteria
(ix) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
34 COM 8B.9

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1203>

Current conservation issues

As of 5 May 2011, the State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property which was requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), and thus limited information is available regarding the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's recommendations.

a) *Management framework*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the World Heritage Committee, at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), requested the State Party to establish an overall management framework for the serial property, as well as completed and effective management plans for each of the component parts of the property and a fully effective management and monitoring framework for tourism, within twelve months of the property's inscription on the List of World Heritage. They also recall that the State Party had included an explanatory note in the nomination which stated that a revised management system would be developed and implemented within two years of the property's inscription. They consider that the World Heritage Committee request has not been complied with, and that, without a progress report from the State Party, it is impossible to assess whether the proposed time frame of two years for the development and implementation of a revised management system is realistic. They also consider that an overall management system for the serial property should be developed and implemented as a priority, in order to meet the requirements set out in the *Operational Guidelines*, as well as completed and effective management plans for each of the component parts of the property.

b) *Boundaries and buffer zones*

At its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to establish, within 12 months of the property's inscription and in consultation with local stakeholders, effectively functioning buffer zones for the property in order to ensure its protection from threats arising from outside its boundaries. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that, in its evaluation of the property, IUCN had identified the need to better delineate the entire boundary of all three components in the field. They note that there are no indications of progress in the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's request, nor in the delineation of boundaries in the field.

c) *Other conservation issues – threats identified at the time of the property's inscription*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that a number of existing and potential threats identified during IUCN's evaluation of the property (including illicit gem mining, invasive species, forest die-back, tourism pressure and cardamom cultivation) were being addressed by the State Party. The World Heritage Centre received additional reports of such activities taking place, particularly in the Knuckles Conservation Forest. A letter was sent to the State Party on 17 December 2010, requesting information on these reports, but no response was received. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that, without a progress report from the State Party, and in the absence of any response to letters to the State Party, it is impossible to assess the current status of these threats.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee express its regret that no evidence of progress has been demonstrated in the implementation of its recommendations, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), including the principal requirement to submit a report to the Committee. They consider that an overall management system for the serial property should be developed and implemented as a priority, in order to meet the requirements set out in the *Operational Guidelines*, as well as completed and effective management plans for each of the component parts of the property. They note that the delineation of the entire boundary of all three components in the field needs to be improved and effectively functioning buffer zones established.

IUCN notes that the Advisory Bodies had recommended referral of the property to allow these aspects to be addressed prior to inscription, and the World Heritage Committee took the decision to inscribe the property following the clear reassurance from the State Party to the World Heritage Committee that these matters would be addressed. IUCN also notes that this is a clear illustration of the importance of the referral option within the World Heritage Committee's decision taking options, and the workload and credibility issues that may result when properties that do not fully meet the requirements of the *Operational Guidelines* are inscribed.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.18

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 8B.9**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription of the property at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) ;
4. Notes with regret that there appears to have been limited progress in the implementation of the recommendations adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session, despite the clear undertaking of the State Party to fulfil the requests of the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription on the World Heritage List;
5. Reiterates its request that the State Party establish, as a priority:
 - a) An overall management framework for the serial property, as required in the Operational Guidelines, as well as completed and effective management plans for each of the component parts of the property,
 - b) Effectively functioning buffer zones for each of the components of the property, in consultation with local stakeholders, to ensure the protection of the property from threats arising outside its boundaries,
 - c) A fully effective management and monitoring framework for tourism;
6. Requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the draft revised management system and management plans mentioned above for review by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN;

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 report on the current status of existing and new threats to the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

20. Ha Long Bay (Vietnam) (N 672bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994; extended in 2000

Criteria

(vii) (viii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.13; 30 COM 7B.17; 33 COM 7B.20

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property (up to 2008): USD 113,395 for management planning support, equipment and training

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property (recently): USD 100,000 under the Youth Volunteers for Cultural Heritage Preservation project (2003-2006); USD 519,000 for Cua Van Floating Cultural Centre, a component of the Ha Long Ecomuseum (funded by the Government of Norway, for the period of 2003-2006).

Previous monitoring missions

January 2003 and December 2006: UNESCO/IUCN mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Population growth;
- b) Increased tourism pressure and development;
- c) Urban and industrial development;
- d) Lack of financial and technical resources;
- e) Absence of an integrated planning approach.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/672>

Current conservation problems

On 5 April 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides an overview of a large number of ongoing projects within and adjacent to the property as well as the State Party's response to Decision **33 COM 7B.20**, adopted at the World Heritage Committee's 33rd session (Seville, 2009). This Decision particularly requested the State Party to provide information on the landfill and other major developments taking place outside the boundaries of the property, but which could have an adverse effects on it Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

a) *Urban and industrial development*

The State Party reports that the land filling projects around Ha Long City have mostly been completed. The construction of the coastal road from Lan Be Clock Post to Bai Tho Mountain is reported to be in its last phase. The State Party notes that Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) were approved and their recommendations implemented. However, it does not provide these EIAs or specific information on the impacts of these developments on the property's OUV, as requested by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **33 COM 7B.20**, including the Cai Lan Port expansion and the Cam Pha Cement Plant. The State Party also notes that measures are being taken to address pollution from commercial and domestic waste and wastewater, but that these are difficult to implement due to the legislative framework of the property and surrounding area. Reports received by IUCN indicate that the property's values are under serious pressure from urban and industrial development. Coastal waters, particularly around big cities and towns such as Ha Long, Cam Pha and Van Don, are reported to be affected by pollution from unsafe waste and wastewater disposal from residential areas, industrial activities, and site clearance for construction and transportation. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that an integrated planning approach is needed to address the continuing pressures on the property from urban and industrial development, and recall the World Heritage Committee's request in Decision **33 COM 7B.20** that no development having a significant direct or indirect impact on the OUV of the property take place.

b) *Tourism management*

The State Party reports that it is investing in the maintenance and upgrading of tourism facilities, as well as expanding tourism activities to the buffer zone in Bai Tu Long Bay, in order to develop existing and new forms of tourism and minimize tourism pressure on the property. However, the progress in addressing tourism pressures is reported to be very slow. The State Party also notes that some education, information and communication (EIC) campaigns aimed at raising communities' awareness of heritage protection have been carried out. IUCN has received reports that current tourism activities are focused around a few central visitor sites within the property, that most boat tours use only four of the ten recognized very crowded circuits through the bay, and that there are a number of other tourism management issues related to presentation of the property's values and the quality of tourism experience.

The State Party reports that the future of the Cua Van Cultural Centre (CVCC) is being carefully assessed, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). The State Party notes that no new infrastructure developments are planned, and that a plan for the sustainable operation of CVCC is being developed to ensure that any activities undertaken do not negatively impact the OUV of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that it is unclear whether this includes an assessment of a possible relocation of the CVCC to a less sensitive location in the buffer zone of the property, as recommended by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the State Party's continued efforts to develop tourism while minimizing tourism pressure on the property, and recommend that it consider options to disperse visitors throughout the property in order to reduce visitor pressure and associated potential impacts on the property's OUV.

c) *Fishing and aquaculture*

The State Party reports that the Quang Ninh Provincial People's Committee has approved a programme on protection and development of fishery resources, aiming to restore, regenerate and develop fishery resources in the province, protect ecosystems and raise communities' awareness of the importance of protecting fishery resources. Part of this programme is the development of regulated aquaculture areas. The State Party provides few details on the effective implementation of this programme. However, IUCN notes that it has

received reports that aquaculture may not have been developed in the designated areas as planned, which could lead to potential impacts on the property.

d) *Absence of an integrated planning approach*

In relation to the Committee's request to further reinforce the Ha Long Bay Management Board (HLBMD), the State Party reports on the outcomes of the Ha Long Bay Management Department Institutional Strengthening Project, which include the organization of several staff training courses, workshops and study tours. It notes that a comprehensive management plan for the property was developed for the period 2010-2015, which is appended to its report. The State Party states that this plan will support the implementation of the 2020 Master Plan. The management plan includes objectives for scientific research, supervision and inspection of socio-economic activities, and the application of science and technologies to the investment in infrastructure and technical development. The State Party reports that the plan foresees the cooperation and collaboration between the HLBMD and other relevant provincial departments, as well as Ha Long City People's Committee. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the management plan is an important step towards adopting an integrated management approach, but note that it is unclear how it complements the 2020 Master Plan.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the OUV of the property has been under continuing pressure due to tourism, fishing and other activities within its boundaries, and from major economic development projects and landfill activities in the areas surrounding the property. They note that no new infrastructure development is planned at the Cua Van Cultural Centre, and recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to submit the plan for its sustainable operation to the World Heritage Centre. While the State Party has made significant efforts to address the multiple pressures affecting the property, urban and industrial developments and tourism pressures, in particular, continue to negatively affect its values. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that without effectively implementing an integrated planning approach, it will be extremely difficult to successfully address threats resulting from these multiple development and population pressures. They note that the 2020 Master Plan for the property is an important step towards adopting an integrated planning approach, and that its implementation should be accelerated. They also note that the State Party has yet to undertake a Management Effectiveness Evaluation (MEE) for the property, as requested in Decision **33 COM 7B.20**, and recommend that the World Heritage Committee reiterate its request that the State Party complete an MEE in line with the 'Enhancing our Heritage' toolkit and take measures to implement the management recommendations resulting from this assessment. They also note that the State Party does not provide EIAs or specific information on the impacts of the landfill and other major developments taking place outside the boundaries of the property on its OUV, as requested by the World Heritage Committee. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee urge the State Party to comply with this request.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.20

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.20**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),

3. *Notes that the State Party is developing a plan for the sustainable use of the Cua Van Cultural Centre, and requests the State Party to submit this plan to the World Heritage Centre;*
4. *Also notes the efforts made by the State Party to address the multiple development and population pressures affecting the property, but remains concerned that these continue to negatively affect its Outstanding Universal Value;*
5. *Further notes that without an integrated planning approach, it will be extremely difficult to successfully address these multiple pressures over the long-term, and therefore also requests the State Party to accelerate the effective implementation of the 2020 Master Plan for the property;*
6. *Reiterates its request that the State Party to undertake a Management Effectiveness Evaluation for the property, in line with the 'Enhancing our Heritage' tool kit, in order to inform the management of the multiple pressures affecting the property's Outstanding Universal Value, including tourism, urban and industrial development, fishing and aquaculture among others, and to take measures to implement the management recommendations resulting from this assessment, and reiterates its invitation to the State Party to consider requesting International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund to support this evaluation;*
7. *Also reiterates its request that the State Party provide Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) on the impacts of the landfill and other major developments taking place outside and within the boundaries of the property on its Outstanding Universal Value;*
8. *Encourages the State Party to consider options for better management of visitors whilst enhancing visitor's quality experience, including options to disperse visitors throughout the property in order to reduce visitor pressure, and to improve signage and presentation of the property's Outstanding Universal Value at key visitor locations;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including an update on the outcome of the Management Effectiveness Evaluation for the property and copies of EIAs on the impacts of the landfill and other major developments taking place outside and within the boundaries of the property on its Outstanding Universal Value, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

21. Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1983, extension in 2010

Criteria
(vii) (viii) (ix)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 8B.15; 33 COM 7B.21; 34 COM 7B.19; 34 COM 8B.5

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

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount provided to the property: 2010: financial support from the Participation Programme of UNESCO for development of a strategy for sustainable tourism

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 25 January 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides information on the status of tourism developments in the Bansko ski zone as well as other threats, and includes a summary of the State Party response to NGO concerns regarding inappropriate developments within the property that resulted in an infringement procedure initiated by the European Commission, in line with Decision **34 COM 8B.5**.

a) *Developments in the Bansko tourism zone*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that two construction projects in the Chalin Valog area of the Bansko ski area located in the buffer zone were approved in 2007, namely: i) construction of a four-seat ski lift; and ii) construction of an engineering facility (tunnel) passing through the ski run at an elevation of 1185 to 1190 m. NGO concerns related to these projects resulted in the initiation of an infringement procedure by the European Commission. The State Party reports that the construction of the ski lift replaces an existing ski drag, and falls within the provisions of the Territorial Arrangement Plan (TAP). The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the 2004 management plan, which remains in effect until August 2014, prohibits the construction of new ski facilities in the national park, except those approved under the 2000 TAP for the Bansko ski zone. However, they note that the

replacement of a ski drag with a four-seat ski lift significantly increases the capacity of the existing facility, which is likely to result in increased tourism pressure and impact the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

The State Party notes that in 2010 two additional development proposals were approved in the Bansko ski area located within the property's buffer zone, namely: i) the replacement of an existing four-seat ski lift with a six-seat ski lift from Banderishka poljana to Kolarski pat; and ii) the replacement of two existing ski drags with a four-seat lift at Platoto. The World Heritage Centre requested additional information on these new developments in a letter dated 28 March 2011. In its response dated 11 April 2011, the State Party notes that the existing ski drags at Platoto and the replacement of the Banderishka polyana – Kolarski pat ski lift were foreseen in the TAP, is motivated by safety concerns, and were therefore granted permission. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the approval of these developments and that the proposals are not a like-for-like replacement of the lifts purely for safety reasons, but include an upgrade in their capacity that is likely to exacerbate tourism pressures and impact the OUV of the property. They also note that, from the available documentation, it is unclear whether the capacity upgrades of ski lifts approved in 2010 are provided for in the TAP, and that those could be considered as further developments of ski facilities within the property's buffer zone. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the forthcoming mission to the property should examine this issue and make a recommendation on whether the property meets the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in line with Committee Decision **34 COM 7B.19** and Paragraph 180(b)(ii) of the *Operational Guidelines*.

b) *Ecologically sustainable tourism*

In 2010, the State Party received financial support from the UNESCO Participatory Programme for the development of a strategy for sustainable tourism. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note these positive developments and encourage the State Party to continue to explore and enhance options for ecologically sustainable tourism.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that a maximum of 7800 skiers are permitted in the Bansko ski zone under the management plan, while the specialized Bulgarian media and NGO reports provide information that Bansko's tourism accommodation capacity is between 12,000 and 20,000 beds, which appears to be significantly higher than the capacity of ski facilities. This situation is reported to fuel the development of ski lifts and ski runs in Bansko ski zone. They have also received information, from the Bulgarian media and NGOs, that in February 2011, Bulgarian companies and the municipalities of Bansko and Razlog re-announced plans for large-scale developments of ski facilities and the need for amendments in the management plan to allow new constructions within the property. In its letter dated 11 April 2011, the State Party notes that no additional development projects have been submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Water. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the Committee in Decision **34 COM 7B.19** urged the State Party to ensure that the new management plan does not allow further ski development or construction of other facilities within the property and its buffer zone, nor extension of the tourism zone into the property.

c) *Adequacy of staff and financial resources*

The State Party report provides a summary of the property's budget between 2004 – 2010. From this summary it is clear that the financial resources provided by the state budget remain fairly constant. However, the level of funding for management and restoration activities in the property fluctuates considerably and was significantly reduced in 2010. This reduction is attributed to the current economical crisis and associated tightened financial policies. In its report, the State Party notes that it is a potential beneficiary of several EU programmes, and that it envisages applying for funds from these sources. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the State Party be encouraged to restore management funding to 2009 levels.

d) *Other conservation issues*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note with satisfaction the State Party's report that in 2010 there were few reported cases of illegal logging, poaching and use of non-timber natural resources, and that these activities appear to be well controlled.

With regard to off-piste skiing and the use of snow mobiles and All Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) off designated tracks, the State Party reports a growing number of violations, which it is addressing by awareness raising campaigns, and by increasing patrols in winter time. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the State Party should be requested to ensure that off-piste skiing and the use of snow mobiles and ATVs is strictly controlled to minimize the impacts of these activities on the property's OUV.

IUCN notes that it has received reports that the operator of Bansko ski zone uses chemicals in the production of artificial snow, which is in violation of the management plan for Pirin National Park, which includes the Bansko ski zone. This has apparently resulted in nitrogen and nitrate levels which significantly exceed the approved standards. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN wish to draw the Committee's attention on the need to immediately halt the use of chemicals.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the OUV of the property has been repeatedly and significantly impacted by the development of ski facilities and ski runs. When the property was extended in 2010 (Decision **34 COM 8 B.5**), the Bansko and Dobrinishte tourism zones were excluded from the property and included instead in a new buffer zone. The World Heritage Committee requested that the State Party abandon any further ski development within the property and its buffer zone, and also decided that any further development of ski facilities, ski runs, or associated infrastructure would result in the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger (Decision **34 COM 7B.19**).

However, in 2010 the State Party approved the replacement and capacity upgrade of two ski lifts in the Bansko ski area within the property's buffer zone; namely the Banderishka poljana to Kolarski pat and the Platoto ski lifts. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the approved developments are not a like-for-like replacement, but include a clear capacity upgrade that is likely to add to tourism pressures and impact the OUV of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that it is unclear whether the capacity upgrade of ski lifts approved in 2010 are provided for under the TAP. These developments could constitute a further development of ski facilities within the property's buffer zone. They therefore recommend that the forthcoming joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission examine this issue and make a recommendation on the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in line with Committee Decision **34 COM 7B.19** and Paragraph 180(b)(ii) of the *Operational Guidelines*. Environmental Impact Assessments for the above and any future developments should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, including an assessment of the proposals' potential direct, indirect and cumulative impact on the property's OUV, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also recommend that the Committee reiterate its request to the State Party to ensure that the new management plan does not allow further ski development or construction of other facilities within the property and its buffer zone, nor extension of the tourism zone into the property. They further recommend that the Committee also request the State Party to commission an independent assessment of the capacity of the buffer zone in relation to its role in protecting the property's OUV.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.21

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decisions **34 COM 7B.19** and **34 COM 8B.5**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Also recalling that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been repeatedly and significantly impacted by the development of ski facilities and ski runs within the property and its buffer zone,
4. Expresses serious concern about the recent approval of the replacement and capacity upgrade of two ski facilities in the property's buffer zone, and recalls its Decision, taken at its 34th session following the 2009 evaluation mission to the property, that any additional development of ski facilities, 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;
5. Urges the State Party to halt further ski developments in the buffer zone until the World Heritage Committee can consider these at its 36th session in 2012 on the basis of the report of the forthcoming World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property, and requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Committee of any new planned developments, and to provide Environmental Impact Assessment for all development proposals in the property and its buffer zone, including an assessment of the proposals' potential direct, indirect and cumulative impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
6. Reiterates its request to the State Party to ensure that the new management plan does not allow further ski development or construction of other facilities within the property and its buffer zone, nor extension of the tourism zone into the property;
7. Encourages the State Party to commission an independent assessment of the capacity of the property and its buffer zone in order to set clear usage limits for the Bansko ski zone;
8. Also requests the forthcoming World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property to determine whether the recent capacity upgrades of ski facilities in the property's buffer zone are foreseen in the Territorial Arrangement Plan (TAP) and make a recommendation on the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and further requests the State Party to provide the mission with an English translation of the TAP;
9. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including confirmation that all inappropriate developments have been halted, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

22. Lagoons of New Caledonia: Reef Diversity and Associated Ecosystems (France) (N 1115)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2008

Criteria
(vii) (ix) (x)

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 8B.10

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
The following potential threats were identified by IUCN at the time of inscription of the property.

- a) Mining
- b) Fishing and aquaculture
- c) Tourism
- d) Climate change

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1115>

Current conservation problems

From 20 February to 3 March 2011, an IUCN monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008). The mission was requested to follow up on some of the recommendations made by the Committee at the time of inscription. The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>. The mission assessed progress in the implementation of co-management plans, the enforcement of newly adapted fisheries regulations and the environmental performance and impact of mining activities in the buffer zones of the serial property. No report on the state of conservation of the property was requested by the Committee.

a) *Co-management and zoning*

The mission notes that co-management committees have been established for most components or their subzones. However, so far only one of these co-management committees has finalized its management plan. The mission reports that the main weaknesses of some of the existing co-management committees relate to their limited capacity and resources to enforce fisheries and water quality regulations and to respond to incursions. A general challenge to the management of the property is the on-going evolution of governance arrangements and specific regulations, legislation and customary management practices. Since the inscription of the property, new protected areas have been designated, and increased levels of protection for other areas within the property are being discussed with the various co-management committees. Areas under Kanak customary tenure, which are subject to traditional management regimes, have been mapped in many areas, with taboo areas providing a key focus for the designation of a zoning scheme for the property. The mission notes that, besides areas designated as marine reserves, no-take zones have not yet been officially designated. Traditional Kanak taboo areas are not

necessarily strict no-take zones, but may be seasonal or species specific no-take zones. The boundaries of the property and regulations are communicated to all users through marine charts and maps available online, in public places and through the tide tables available from municipalities and at all large boat docking/ anchoring areas.

The mission recommends that the members of co-management committees should receive technical, financial and administrative support for the implementation of relevant decisions and recommendations and the enforcement of legislations. It considers that the State Party and in particular the authorities in New Caledonia should facilitate the finalization and implementation of the co-management plans, and evaluate effectiveness of participatory governance and management responsiveness, including enforcement of regulations. The mission also recommends that the authorities in New Caledonia strengthen effective coordination and communication between all stakeholders, particularly co-management committees and their members. The establishment of a Conservatory of Natural Spaces (CEN – Conservatoire des Espaces Naturels), which was under consideration at the time of the mission and which will include representatives from all levels of elected government, customary groups and NGOs, is expected to address this recommendation and enhance coordinated management of the entire serial property, in accordance with Paragraph 114 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

b) *Monitoring and fisheries regulations*

The mission notes that since the property's inscription many efforts have been made to increase knowledge of the baseline status of the property, develop indicators and increase monitoring, surveillance and enforcement of regulations. It reports that the capacity to do so is limited in the more remote components of the property, but that customary management practices in these components are strong, and that commercial fishermen contribute to monitoring activities. The newly adopted fisheries regulations impose catch limits, fishing gear restrictions, species specific or seasonal closures and recognise species specific taboo areas. However, the mission notes that fisheries knowledge is mostly limited to reporting of registered commercial vessels and most accurate for export species. It also notes that efforts are underway to increase understanding of the recreational and subsistence fisheries, which some studies suggest are larger than the commercial fisheries in terms of total catch. In Province Sud, which has responsibility of two components of the serial property, the multi-stakeholder environmental observatory OEIL contributes to research, surveillance and information dissemination. The mission recommends that similar facilities should be available for the property as a whole. It considers that monitoring indicators, which are currently mostly ecological, should address all aspects of management effectiveness, including participatory management and management responsiveness.

c) *Environmental performance and impact of mining activities*

The mission reports that current mining activities in the vicinity of the property could potentially impact three of the six components of the serial property. Since the inscription of the property the marine and terrestrial buffer zones of the Grand Lagon Sud component were subject to two pollution events related to nickel mining activities. It notes that monitoring by the mining company, OEIL and the independent research organization IRD, indicate that the affected areas are recovering from these pollution events. Since the property's inscription, mining regulations and practices have been developed and implemented to increase environmental performance and reduce risks to the property. It notes that the New Caledonian Mining Code prescribes mitigation measures to mitigate the impacts of mining activities, and that abandoned mines are being restored using indigenous plant species. Some mining companies, such as SLN and Vale INCO, are members of co-management committees.

The mission notes that permits have been granted to a mining company GEOVIC to explore for cobalt in mineral sands, which are largely located in coastal and estuarine areas and vulnerable river banks. According to information on the Web

(<http://www.eplp.asso.nc/site/?p=2351>), some of the exploration licenses are close to the Zone Côtière Ouest and Grand Lagon Sud (particularly the Aiguille de Prony) components of the property. A number of NGOs have raised concerns about the risks that these exploration activities could pose to the property as a result of increased sediment transport, release of heavy metals and reduced water quality.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that exploration and mining of cobalt in mineral sands adjacent to the property could have significant adverse impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They recall that, in line with the policy statement by the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM), no mining activities should be allowed adjacent to World Heritage properties if these affect a property's Outstanding Universal Value. They recommend that the Committee request the State Party to submit Environmental Impact Assessments for these proposals to the World Heritage Centre prior to taking a decision on whether to permit these activities, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

d) *Other conservation issues – water quality, visitor management and climate change*

The mission notes that some areas in the marine and terrestrial buffer zones of the property are affected by high turbidity and elevated rates of sediment deposition in rivers, estuaries and coastal areas. Co-management committees and NGOs have raised concerns that small parts of the property are also affected. The rehabilitation of abandoned mines and the revegetation of watersheds help to address these concerns.

The mission further notes that the property would benefit from local level consideration of climate change mitigation and adaptation needs given the vulnerability of coral reefs and coastal communities to climate change. It recommends that the State Party ensure that the Provinces and co-management committees have adequate resources and capacity to incorporate appropriate climate change considerations in the management of the property with particular attention to planning, monitoring and disaster risk reduction.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the efforts of the State Party and the authorities in New Caledonia to improve the management of the property through the establishment of co-management committees and the Conservatory of Natural Areas (CEN – Conservatoire des Espaces Naturels). They consider that the CEN should enhance coordination and collaboration between co-management committees, as well as enhance the coordinated management of the entire serial property. They recommend that authorities in New Caledonia ensure that the members of co-management committees receive technical, financial and administrative support for the implementation of relevant decisions and recommendations and the enforcement of legislations, and that they facilitate the finalization and implementation of the co-management plans, as well as evaluate the effectiveness of participatory governance and management responsiveness.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World heritage Committee expresses its serious concern about the permits granted to GEOVIC to explore for cobalt in mineral sands in areas adjacent to the property, and consider that exploration and mining in these areas could have significant negative impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value. They recommend that the Committee request the State Party to submit Environmental Impact Assessments for these proposals to the World Heritage Centre prior to taking a decision on whether to permit these activities.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.22

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 8B.10**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Welcomes the efforts of the State Party, in particular the authorities in New Caledonia, customary owners, NGOs and other stakeholders to improve the management of the property, through the establishment of co-management committees and the Conservatory of Natural Areas (CEN);
4. Expresses its serious concern about the permits granted to the mining company GEOVIC to explore for cobalt in mineral sands in areas adjacent to the property, considers that exploration and mining in these areas could have significant adverse impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, and recalls that mining activities adjacent to World Heritage properties are incompatible with World Heritage status if these affect their Outstanding Universal Value;
5. Requests the State Party to submit Environmental Impact Assessments for the proposed exploration and possible exploitation of cobalt sands to the World Heritage Centre, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, prior to taking a decision on whether to permit these activities;
6. Also requests the State Party to implement the recommendations from the 2011 IUCN monitoring mission, in particular:
 - a) Maintain technical, financial and administrative support for the operation and members of the co-management committees to implement relevant decisions and recommendations and enforce legislations,
 - b) Facilitate the finalization and implementation of the co-management plans, and incorporate appropriate climate change considerations with particular attention to planning, monitoring and disaster risk reduction,
 - c) Evaluate effectiveness of participatory governance and management responsiveness,
 - d) Ensure timely response to threats identified and concerns raised relating to risks from mining exploration and exploitation and non-compliance of regulations for the protection of the property;
7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including a report on progress achieved by the Conservatory of Natural Areas (Conservatoire des Espaces Naturels - CEN) to enhance coordinated management of the entire serial property, progress achieved in the implementation of the IUCN mission recommendations, and an update on the status of GEOVIC's proposals to explore and mine cobalt sands in areas adjacent to the property.

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.24; 33 COM 7B.28; 34 COM 7B.22

International Assistance

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

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1998: World Heritage Centre monitoring mission; 2001: UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission; 2005: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/754>

Current conservation issues

On 2 March 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation protected areas included in the property, the status of the Baikal seal population and an update on the status of the re-opening of the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill (BPPM).

a) *Re-opening of the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill (BPPM) and pollution*

At its 34th session the World Heritage Committee noted with serious concern the recent re-opening of the BPPM without a close-loop water system being put in place, as well as a number of other issues. The World Heritage Committee took note of the information provided by the State Party that it had the intention to address the issue of waste water treatment and develop a long term solution within a 30-month timeframe. The World Heritage Committee did not follow the advice of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to request the State Party to rescind Decree No. 1 "On the introduction of amendments to the list of activities prohibited in the Central Ecological Zone of the Baikal Natural Area", which permits the disposal of wastewaters from paper mills into Lake Baikal. The World Heritage Committee also called upon the Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre to convene a meeting with the Russian authorities and relevant stakeholders, in cooperation with IUCN, to identify how the impacts of this reopening can be addressed. At the time of preparation of this report the meeting has not taken place, and is scheduled for the period after the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee. The different issues reported below will be discussed during the mission.

The State Party reports that the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology Order No 63 of March 5, 2010 had approved the norms for discharges of pollution from BPPM directed towards maximum preservation of the ecosystem of Lake Baikal in the existing conditions. On this basis a permit for release and emission of pollutants to atmosphere has been granted. No information is provided in the report on whether the emissions are monitored nor whether the BPPM is operating within the established norms. IUCN has received information that multiple violations of the norms set for BPPM were registered in 2010. Investigations by the Office of Environmental Prosecutor of the Irkutsk region are reported to have resulted in 12 cases of administrative prosecution against the BPPM. IUCN has also received information that the State Party might consider suspending Order No.63 of 5 March 2010 and thereby further weaken the norms, as it may not be feasible to achieve the norms with the existing infrastructure at BPPM and because of fears that the strict application of the Order would lead to high fines which could affect the economic situation of the plant.

The State Party reports that the Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Plant is developing the draft development strategy of "Baikalsk Pulp and Paper Plant", under which it is proposed to transit to the closed system of water use for achieving zero discharge. This strategy would be tied with modernization of the single-industry town of Baikalsk between 2010-2014. The report does not confirm that the closed water cycle will be achieved within the announced 30-month period.

The State Party also reports on the development of a draft of the Federal target program "Preservation of Lake Baikal and social and economic development of Baikalsk natural territory", which stipulates an allotment of 1 billion Roubles in 2011 for nature preservation measures at Lake Baikal, including for the treatment of accumulated toxic lignin waste and seepage water from the storage areas, as well as restoration of the land areas used for the storage of the waste. Amongst the points raised in the State Party report, it notes that the most significant factor affecting Baikal Biosphere reserve and Kabansky nature reserve is the negative effect of industrial atmospheric emissions from BPPM and industry in Angarsk-Irkutsk. On 10 January 2011, the World Heritage Centre wrote to the State Party having received information that the Director of the BPPM had declared that the process to transition to a closed loop system might take up to five years, contrary to the declaration made by the State Party at the 34th session. At the time of finalisation of the present report no response has been received to this letter.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the potential negative impacts of the reopening of the BPPM on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of Lake Baikal as a result of the discharge of toxic chemicals into the Lake ecosystem, as explained in earlier State of conservation reports. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate their position that reopening of BPPM without the installation of a closed water cycle to prevent discharge of polluting chemicals into the lake is not compatible with the conservation of the OUV of Lake Baikal and that, as a minimum, the environmental norms set for discharges should be retained and upheld during the 30-month period announced by the State Party for the mill to transition to a closed loop system. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that further weakening of the norms for the discharge of chemicals into the lake or the continued operation of BPPM without a closed water cycle beyond the 30-month period announced by the State Party would threaten the OUV of the property and provide a clear basis for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the stated commitments to establish alternative livelihoods within Baikalsk, but note the information provided on alternative livelihoods in the State Party report is very brief and not specific. They also note that the reopening of the Mill is costly and also may be detracting from an alternative investment strategy to create more sustainable, long-term employment and economic development based on green growth.

The State Party does not report on measures regarding pollution of the River Selenga, but notes that there is a significant reduction in fish stocks at the nature reserve “Kabansky” and within the delta of the River Selenga as a whole.

b) Other conservation issues

The State Party report provides brief information on the population of the Baikal Seal, which it assesses at 95,000 individuals. Calving rates are reported to be high at 20,000 to 30,000 a year, and the previously reported ageing trend of the population is reported to be reversed. The State Party report also contains useful information on a range of conservation issues in the protected areas which are part of the property, including in relation to fires, management of habitats and species conservation. The State Party notes that it is unable to provide information requested by the World Heritage Committee on a marina development in Buryatia that was reported at the 34th session, as it does not know to which site this refers.

IUCN has recently received information concerning a potential threat within the Central Ecological Zone of the Baikal Nature Area, from the planned exploration of the Kholodninskoye poly-metal deposit. In late 2010, a draft chart of area planning for the Central Ecological Zone of the Baikal Natural Area was published on the official web site of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology where the polygon of the Kholodninskoye deposit is designated as “territory of exploration of natural resources deposits in enclosed mines (zinc, lead, etc.). Whilst this information awaits discussion with the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN wish to highlight that mining exploration activities are incompatible with the World Heritage status.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN wish to draw the World Heritage Committee’s attention on the reopening of BPPM, and on the fact that this development poses a critical threat to the OUV of the property, as well as a potential detraction from an investment strategy to create alternative and sustainable livelihoods in the Baikalsk region. They remain of the view that BPPM should not have been brought into operation ahead of the establishment of a feasible and cost-effective business plan based on a closed-loop system.

They recommend that the World Heritage Committee indicate that further weakening of the norms for the discharge of chemicals into the lake or the continued operation of BPPM without a closed water cycle beyond the 30-month period would threaten the OUV of the property and provide a clear basis for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

They also underline the importance of continued action on the other factors affecting the property, as noted in the State Party report, and as above to also ensure that there is no approval of mining activities within the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.23

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision 34 COM 7B.22, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Regrets that it was not possible to organize the meeting with the Russian authorities and other stakeholders to identify how impacts of the re-opening of the Baikalsk Paper

and Pulp Mill (BPPM) on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property can be addressed, and requests that this be organized as soon as possible;

4. Reiterates its serious concern regarding the re-opening of the BPPM without a close-loop water system, as well as the continued pollution from the Selenga river, and its potentially critical impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of Lake Baikal, and therefore also requests the State Party to review its decision to reopen BPPM;
5. Considers that further weakening of the norms for the discharge of chemicals into the lake or the continued operation of BPPM without a closed water cycle beyond the 30-month period, which was announced by the State Party at the 34th session (expiring in December 2012), would further threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and provide a clear basis for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;
6. Urges the State Party to ensure a careful monitoring and enforcement of the norms established by the State Party in Order No.63 of 5 March 2010 throughout this short-term period of operation;
7. Encourages the State Party to extend its efforts to develop and implement a long-term alternative livelihoods strategy for the town of Baikalsk, and to consider the investment of limited finances in such efforts as an alternative investment strategy to maintaining the potentially uneconomic operation of BPPM;
8. Further requests the State Party to confirm that no mining or mineral exploration will be permitted within the property as inscribed on the World Heritage List, in line with the World Heritage Committee's clear position that mining is incompatible with World Heritage status, and the international policy statement of the International Council of Mining and Metals (ICMM) of not undertaking these activities in World Heritage properties;
9. Reiterates its request to the State Party to clarify the extent of the reportedly planned marina within the territory of the Republic of Buriatia and submit its Environmental Impact Assessment to the World Heritage Centre prior to granting permission for the development, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and requests furthermore the State Party to verify information regarding the location of this development with the World Heritage Centre;
10. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a further report, by **1 February 2012**, on the state of conservation of the property, and in particular progress made in preventing the discharge of untreated wastewater into Lake Baikal, addressing continuing high levels of pollution in the Selenga River, developing a comprehensive tourism and livelihood strategy for the property, and the confirmation that there are no planned mining activities within the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

26. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation (N 768rev))

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1998

Criteria
(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.25, 32 COM 7B.22, 33 COM 7B.27

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
2001: UNESCO/UNDP mission; 2007: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Impacts of a road project across the property;
b) Gas pipeline construction plans.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/768/gallery/>

Current conservation problems

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received information that plans for the proposed gas pipeline traversing the World Heritage property of the Golden Mountains of Altai in the Russian Federation have not been abandoned as requested in previous Committee decisions. In the report submitted by the State Party on 12 April 2010, it is noted that no official information exists on the construction of a gas pipeline through the Ukok Quiet Zone of the property. Since this report, the World Heritage Centre did not receive any official notification from the State Party about a planned pipeline through the property. However the information received by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN indicates that work on the Altai gas pipeline to China is to commence this year.

The World Heritage Centre wrote to the State Party on 10 January 2011 requesting additional information on this issue. In a second letter dated 4 February 2011, it informed the State Party that the property's state of conservation would be reviewed by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session, and requested that it provide a state of conservation report no later than 1 March 2011. The State Party replied in a letter dated 1 March 2011 that it has forwarded the information to the relevant authorities and to Gazprom and awaits their reply in order to provide a state of conservation report by the end of March. No state of conservation report or any further information regarding the state of conservation of the property had been provided to the World Heritage Centre at the time of drafting this document.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the World Heritage Committee in its decision **32 COM 7B.22** previously stated that the construction of a gas pipeline through the property would constitute a threat to its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and would present a clear case for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further recall that the report of the 2007 joint World

Heritage Centre / IUCN mission clearly highlights the important impacts of the construction operation and maintenance of such a gas pipeline.

IUCN was provided with a copy of an official letter from Gazprom to civil society representatives dated 05.04.2011 № 03/0850-216 and signed by the Deputy-Head of the Department of Transportation, Underground Storage and the Use of Gas. The letter states that a decision about the construction of the gas pipeline via the territory of the Golden Mountains of Altai has not been adopted yet, but that an independent Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has shown that the proposed route through Ukok Plateau within the property is considered as the optimal route for the gas pipeline. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that no EIA has been submitted to the World Heritage Centre to date.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note that a letter was sent to the Director General of UNESCO on 15 December 2010 by the “Sosnovka” Coalition, a group of non-governmental and indigenous rights organizations from Siberia and the Russian Far East. The coalition opposes the construction of the pipeline and points to possible adverse impacts on the natural ecosystems and cultural heritage of the Ukok Plateau. It also suggests that a reasonable alternative pipeline route exists along the Chuiskii tract through Mongolia, and that this would require further evaluation.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the World Heritage Committee, in its Decision **32 COM 7B.22**, previously stated that the construction of a gas pipeline through the property would constitute a threat to its OUV and would present a clear case for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. They reiterate that, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, an independent Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) should be conducted for this project and submitted to the World Heritage Centre before a decision is taken. The EIA should consider possible alternative routes for the Altai gas pipeline outside the property, which would not adversely impact its OUV. They recommend that the Committee request the invitation of a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission to the property to examine the current status of this project.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.26

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **32 COM 7B.22** and **33 COM 7B.27** adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions respectively,*
3. *Expresses its outmost concern about that the State Party has not yet made an unequivocal decision to abandon the construction of the Altai gas pipeline through the property as requested in Decision **33 COM 7B.27**, and about reports that the construction is scheduled to go ahead this year;*
4. *Reiterates that any decision to go forward with the construction of the gas pipeline through the property would constitute a threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and represent clear case for its inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as noted in its Decision **32 COM 7B.22**;*

5. Urges the State Party to submit an independent Environmental Impact Assessment of the proposed pipeline to the World Heritage Centre before a decision is taken on the project, including a map showing all potential and preferred pipeline routes in relation to the property, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
6. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property to determine the status of the proposed pipeline, to meet with representatives of the pipeline developers, and to evaluate the possible impacts of the proposed pipeline on the property's 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 clarification of the status of the proposed pipeline and a copy of its Environmental Impact Assessment, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012, **with a view to considering the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

27. Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Extension 2005

Criteria

(vii)(ix)(x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.25; 29 COM 8B.16; 34 COM 7B.26

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1998: World Heritage Centre advisory mission; 1999, 2001, 2004: joint World Heritage Centre, IUCN and Ramsar Convention missions (Doñana 2005 expert meetings on Hydrological Restoration of Wetlands). January 2011: World Heritage Centre -IUCN-Ramsar joint reactive monitoring mission.

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;
- d) Potential threats from accidental oil spills.

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

At the time of preparation of this report, only a report in Spanish was received from the State Party on 18 April 2011. The English version of the State Party's report was submitted on 18 May 2011. As requested by the Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia 2010) in Decision **34 COM 7B.26**, a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring and Ramsar advisory mission visited, from 19 to 22 January 2011, the Doñana Natural Space (Espacio Natural Doñana), which includes the Doñana National Park World Heritage property and Doñana Wetland of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention. The detailed mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>.

a) *Potential impacts from infrastructural projects*

In 2009 and 2010, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received reports from a number of NGOs concerning the development of infrastructure projects in the vicinity of the property that could have a potential impact on its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

Several oil refinery projects are located near the property, including the expansion of the existing La Rábida refinery located to the west of the Doñana Natural Park at the Huelva industrial area. Two minor oil spills linked to La Rábida refinery were already reported by the State Party and included in the working document to the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee. They occurred on 30 July and 15 September 2009 and reached the property's coastline. The expansion project to increase the refinery's production capacity has undergone an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which was approved by the Spanish authorities in March 2009. While direct impacts on the OUV of Doñana are unlikely, and in spite of the fact that the report from the State Party of 28 March 2011 notes that measures taken through the modernization of this facility will significantly reduce the risk of spills, in the opinion of the NGOs and experts consulted during the reactive monitoring mission, the risk of accidental oil spills from increased maritime traffic due to this proposed refinery is high.

A pipeline project for the Balboa refinery located in the Extremadura north of Andalusia is undergoing an EIA process. The Balboa pipeline could potentially affect the property in its section traversing the province of Huelva to the crude-oil and oil product storage terminal in the port of Palos de la Frontera. Originally the developer (Refinería Balboa-Grupo Alfonso Gallardo), suggested seven alternative routes for this crude-oil pipeline of which one could affect the World Heritage property. 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. In March 2010 IUCN and the World Heritage Centre received information from NGOs that the Spanish administration has requested that no oil pipeline should be authorised that could directly affect Doñana Natural Space. IUCN and the World Heritage Centre consider that this approach will not address the possible indirect impacts of such a pipeline, which could include accidental discharge from the pipeline polluting soil, streams and groundwater, and the high risk of oil spills from potential pipeline accidents and increased maritime traffic linked to the port of Palos, which could cause important impacts to the OUV of the property.

Finally, during the reactive monitoring mission the mission team was informed by a number of NGOs of mining projects further away from the World Heritage property (allegedly in the North East of Andalusia), with potential impacts on the values and integrity of both the natural and national parks of Doñana. In this regard, the State Party report notes that this issue concerns a series of projects in the vicinity of Doñana entailing the construction of new gas extraction sites that, if proven to be technically and environmentally feasible, would be used for underground gas storage where injection and extraction cycles would depend on market supply and demand. As noted by the State Party most of these projects are still undergoing an EIA process.

b) *Water issues and water quality*

As Doñana is predominantly marshland, water has been and continues to be, despite important advances in its management, the most problematic topic in the management of the property. The intensive extraction of groundwater for irrigation, tied to the fact that this practice is concentrated in certain sites, has caused important lowering of the groundwater table, the reduction of natural recharge and the substitution by artificial recharge, and locally it has favoured salt intrusion, all of which has impacted ecosystems very significantly in some places, be it mainly outside of the property. These and other longstanding problems surrounding the use of water around Doñana are being addressed in the *Plan Especial de Ordenación de las Zonas de Regadío, ubicadas al Norte de la Corona Forestal de Doñana* (Special Management Plan of the Irrigation Zones Located to the North of the Forest Crown of Doñana) known as the “Plan de la Corona Forestal” which was presented for public consultation on 21 January 2011.

c) *State of the Guadalquivir River and dredging project*

The Doñana system is intimately associated to the watercourses of the Lower Guadalquivir and the Brazo de la Torre. The action of the tides, in synergy with the flow regime of the Guadalquivir River, determines the ecological integrity of the unique ecosystems that characterize this property. There exist a series of projects that could seriously impact the ecosystem of the Lower Guadalquivir. Among these is the project of the Port Authority of Seville of “Actions to improve the maritime access to the Port of Seville”, which includes, among other, the dredging of the river to eight meters of depth, with the aim of enabling access to the port of Seville of ships with a freeboard length of up to 300 meters and a beam of 40 meters. The State Party established a “Scientific Commission for the Study of the Impacts of the Dredging of the Guadalquivir River”. The State Party report notes that, based on the findings of the scientific research done by the Scientific Research Council and the University of Granada, a statement was issued in November 2010 concluding that the ecological functioning of the estuary must be improved before any dredging can be done. This statement also calls for definitive abandonment of the dredging plan to deepen the channel and, if the Port Authority is adamant about this project, then it recommends that a new EIA procedure is initiated once the conditions of the estuary have been improved.

Conclusion

Following the analysis of all material provided and the field visits and meetings with a wide range of stakeholders undertaken as part of the reactive monitoring mission, the mission concludes that the state of conservation of the World Heritage property is satisfactory. The values for which the property has been inscribed under the World Heritage and Wetlands Conventions are still present. The mission also notes that the different national protection levels of the National Park and Natural Park and the different international designations as Ramsar wetland site, UNESCO Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage property, are mutually beneficial. In 2010, Doñana received the renewal of the European Diploma granted by the Council of Europe, another indicator of the effective management of the property. However, the mission notes a number of critical issues, including the proposed additional dredging of the Lower Guadalquivir River, the over-abstraction of the Doñana Aquifer, the proposed Balboa oil pipeline from Huelva to Extremadura, and the cumulative effects of infrastructure projects outside the World Heritage property and Ramsar site which could impact on the values and integrity of the site.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the World Heritage Committee should re-examine the state of conservation of the property in 2013 to consider whether the inscription of Doñana on the List of World Heritage in Danger would be warranted, in relation to the following issues:

- i. the risks posed by the proposed Balboa pipeline from Huelva to Extremadura on the property's values and integrity, if the project is not cancelled or at least changed substantially in its design;
- ii. the effects of the proposed additional dredging of the Lower Guadalquivir River, if finally approved without an integrated management plan for this area to enhance the environmental quality of the river; and
- iii. the effective implementation of the plan to control water abstraction from the Doñana Aquifer (Plan de la Corona Forestal).

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that these issues should be addressed as a priority and to ensure that the integrity and values of the World Heritage property and Ramsar site are maintained.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.27

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35 COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.26**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note of the conclusion of the 2011 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission that the Outstanding Universal Value for which the property has been inscribed is still present, but could be threatened by a number of proposed development projects, including the proposed additional dredging of the Lower Guadalquivir River, the over-abstraction of the Doñana Aquifer, the proposed Balboa oil pipeline from Huelva to Extremadura, and the cumulative effects of infrastructure projects outside the World Heritage property;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to update all risk preparedness and management plans in view of the expansion project of La Rábida refinery and to establish direct communication lines in case of emergencies with the specialized unit of La Rábida refinery dealing with rapid response to emergency situations;*
5. *Considers that the proposed Balboa pipeline could have both direct and indirect impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value and urges the State Party to refrain from choosing any route for the Balboa pipeline which could impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
6. *Requests that the State Party ensures the implementation of the the Special Management Plan of the Irrigation Zones (located to the North of the Forest Crown of Doñana) and considers the following points:*
 - a) *Every effort is made to produce a consensus-based plan, with the full participation of all the stakeholders, but without diluting the essential objectives of said Plan regarding the "protection of the exceptional natural values of Doñana and the rational use of water",*
 - b) *The Government Council of the Junta de Andalucía approve the Plan before 31 December 2011, and commence implementation by 1 January 2012 at the latest;*
7. *Also urges the State Party to halt any works related to the project "Actions to improve the maritime access to the Port of Seville" of 1999, and to not authorise the dredging of*

the Guadalquivir River as proposed in this plan, as this could have a critical impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;

8. *Also requests the State Party to fully and effectively implement all other recommendations of the 2011 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission and the Ramsar advisory mission, in order to address the key conservation and management issues and challenges facing the property;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013** a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, in particular on the above mentioned issues and on progress achieved in the implementation of the recommendations from the reactive monitoring mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

28. Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1032)

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

N/A

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD100,000, World Heritage Biodiversity Programme for Brazil, USD30,000 Rapid Response Facility support for firefighting.

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1290>

Current conservation issues

In 2010, the World Heritage Centre received reports that the area of Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park (CdVNP), which is one of the two components of the property, had been reduced from the 235,970 ha inscribed by the World Heritage Committee, to its original 65,515 ha - a reduction of 72%.

The original nomination for this serial property consisted of the Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park (CdVNP), with a surface area of 65,515 ha. Following its May 2001 evaluation of the nomination, IUCN recommended to the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee at its meeting in June 2001, that the State Party should explore the possibility of nominating additional relevant sites that would more adequately address the complexity of the ecosystem it was attempting to represent. The Bureau of the World Heritage Committee decided to refer the nomination back to the State Party to prepare a serial nomination including CdVNP. A revised nomination was quickly prepared, this time including Emas National Park. An IUCN Mission returned to the site in August 2001 and advised the State Party that a large buffer area abutting CdVNP would be a welcome addition to the site, contributing to its integrity.

In reaction to the World Heritage Committee's concern about the insufficient size of the property, the State Party passed a Federal Decree in September 2001, expanding the size of CdVNP to 235,970ha, making CdVNP the largest national park in the Cerrado ecoregion. This Decree was passed shortly before the meeting of the World Heritage Committee in that year. Based on this expansion, and on IUCN's recommendation that the property be of

sufficient size to include all important areas required for the long-term survival of key species, particularly large predators, the World Heritage Committee inscribed the site at its 25th Session in December 2001.

In a letter dated 14 January 2010 to the State Party, the World Heritage Centre suggested to the State Party that additional information on the 72% reduction in size of the CdVNP the largest component of the property be provided. The State Party's reply, dated 27 April 2011, stated that after the inscription of *Chapada dos Veadeiros* on the World Heritage List, some land owners questioned the legality of the Decree that established the 235,970 ha protected area for the Park. In 2003, the Court's decision declared the Decree void due to two flaws: (1) the information communicated by the competent federal authority at the time, the Brazilian Institute for the Environment and Renewable Natural Resources, did not meet the public consultation requirements set out in Law No. 9.985/2000 for expanding the boundaries of a conservation area, and (2) Law No. 9.985/2000 was not effectively regulated or applied in the formulation of the Decree. The writ used for this judgment nullified the Decree that increased the size of Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park, returning it to its former size of 65,515 ha.

The State Party's letter confirms that since 2003, the Government of Brazil has been trying to re-establish the legal framework for the protection of the area inscribed on the World Heritage List. In 2007, a new body was created for the management of Brazil's nature reserves and parks, the Chico Mendes Institute for the Conservation of Biodiversity (ICMBio). This change triggered some delays with the procedures for the re-establishment of the Park's legal protection. In January 2011, ICMBio restarted the legal procedures for a new Decree for *Chapada dos Veadeiros*. The State Party has indicated that these procedures should be finalized by March 2012.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee express its concern that the legal framework protecting 72% of Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park, the larger component of this serial property, is no longer valid. They note the State Party's commitment to re-establish the protection status of the property by March 2012. They are of the view that the legal protection regime of this component of the property should be urgently reinstated, and recall that lack of legal protection of most of the CdVNP's area jeopardises the World Heritage status of the property as a whole, as such protection is a key requirement of Outstanding Universal Value as per paragraphs 77 and 78 of the *Operational Guidelines*. They also noted that Paragraph 180(b) (i) of the *Operational Guidelines* clearly states that the modification of the legal protection status of a property constitutes a potential danger to World Heritage properties. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee states that a continuing lack of legal protection status for the property would require consideration of the inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.28

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Expresses its serious concern that the legal framework protecting 72% of Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park (CdVNP), the larger component of the Cerrado Protected Areas has been removed;

3. *Requests the State Party to immediately act to reinstate the legal protection regime of the property in its entirety, and takes note of the commitment of the State Party to re-establish the national park status of CdVNP by March 2012;*
4. *Considers that the lack of legal protection of most of the CdVNP poses a significant threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, a report on the state of conservation of the property and confirmation of the re-instatement of legal protection of Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012, **with a view to considering, in the absence of re-instatement of legal protection, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1983, extension in 1990 and 1997

Criteria

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.35; 33 COM 7B.35; 34 COM 7B.32

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: Conservation – USD 231 350

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 30 000 from the Rapid Response Facility

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);
- c) Planned road construction which would traverse the property on the side of Panama.

Illustrative material

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

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/659>

Current conservation issues

On 1 March 2011, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party of Costa Rica. The report provides a detailed overview of progress achieved in the implementation of World Heritage Committee recommendations adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008), 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 34th (Brasilia, 2010) sessions. On 18 February

2011, the State Party of Panama submitted a copy of the proposal of regulations for the operation of the Bi-national Executing Technical Unit for the management of La Amistad International Park (UTEB-PILA). It did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property as requested by the Committee at its 34th session and thus, there is little information available on progress achieved in the implementation of World Heritage Committee recommendations relating to the Panamanian portion of the property.

a) *Hydro-electric dams and mining*

The State Party of Costa Rica notes that there are several potential hydropower projects identified within the boundaries of the Costa Rican portion of the property, and that whether or not these will be developed depends on the outcome of current discussions of a law on electric power generation. It also notes that there has recently been a public request to the national authorities to forbid any further mining in the country. However, it further notes that individuals interested in exploiting the mineral resources of the property have been visiting its buffer zone recently. IUCN has received reports that an illegal heliport was constructed for mineral exploration purposes within a proposed 20 km² mining concession located entirely within the Talamanca Bribri Indigenous Reserve, which is adjacent to the property. According to these reports, the Bribri are opposed to dams and mining in their territory.

The State Party of Costa Rica reports that the national environmental authorities of Costa Rica and Panama, in cooperation with the Inter-American Development Bank, are in the process of selecting the consulting team that is to carry out the transboundary Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) requested by the Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), in order to identify the least environmentally damaging options to meet energy and water management needs. The State Party of Costa Rica notes that it will submit a copy of the final SEA report to the World Heritage Centre upon its completion, due four months after commencement of the work. It does not provide further information on the detailed analysis of all development proposals within the property (including dams, mining and forestry), as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). However, it notes that the SEA consultation team will carry out a large part of the work needed, and that the Costa Rican government is still looking for funding to carry out the remaining studies.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the World Heritage Committee, at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), requested the State Party of Panama to halt all dam constructions until a detailed transboundary SEA has been undertaken. IUCN has received consistent Non Governmental Organization (NGO) reports that the construction of dams on the Changuinola (CHAN-75) and Bonyic rivers is ongoing, and that no mitigation measures are being implemented to ensure that migratory routes for fish and shrimp species remain intact. This raises concerns that a situation may soon be reached where the loss of up to 16 migratory fish and shrimp species is irreversible, with potential impacts on its Outstanding Universal Value. A press release by the Center for Biological Diversity and the International Human Rights Clinic at Harvard Law School, dated 21 April 2011, states that the company constructing the CHAN-75, CHAN-140 and CHAN-220 dams (AES Corporation) has failed to compensate all flood victims and build a resettlement community, and intends to begin the flooding process without rescuing and relocating flora and fauna, in direct violation of Panamanian environmental legislation.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that existing and potential projects involving hydroelectric power and mining represent both a potential and an ascertained danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in accordance with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and note that these projects had already been assessed by a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission in 2008.

b) *Land tenure and land use issues*

The State Party of Costa Rica provides information on the implementation of the strategy it developed in 2009 for integrating private lands into the property by 2018. It notes that there are ongoing efforts to resolve the existing overlap problem between La Amistad International

Park (PILA) and indigenous territories, update land tenure information systems for most Costa Rican protected areas, and undertake regular monitoring of the state of forest cover in areas where land ownership is not entirely clear. However, it also notes that most of the actions that form part of this strategy are yet to be implemented, including those related to the assessment of encroachment taking place on the Caribbean side of the property and cattle grazing in the property. With regards to cattle grazing in the Panamanian portion of the property, IUCN has received NGO reports indicating that no concrete action has been undertaken by the State Party.

c) *Road development*

IUCN recalls reports that as part of its five-year governmental plan (2009-2014), the State Party of Panama intends to build a road traversing the property from Boquete to Bocas del Toro, but that there are currently no concrete maps or designs, nor is there a budget to implement these plans. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that, as long as there is no official statement that the road will not be built, this issue remains serious and could irreversibly damage the property's integrity. They recall that the World Heritage Committee, at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), requested the State Party of Panama to submit any preliminary environmental assessments to the World Heritage Centre as soon as these become available.

d) *Other conservation issues – (bi-)national coordination, long-term funding of park rangers, and ecological monitoring*

The State Party of Costa Rica notes that, following the recent approval of the management plan for PILA, it expects to establish the coordination and decision-making structure proposed in that plan, namely the National Council for the Management of PILA and both the Caribbean and Pacific Local Management Councils. It also notes that a joint agenda for indigenous territories and protected areas is being prepared, which provides a good opportunity to adopt the approach of "shared responsibilities" included in the management plan. Both the States Parties of Costa Rica and Panama note that the imminent recognition of the Bi-national Executing Technical Unit for the management of PILA (UTEB-PILA) is expected to strengthen the coordination of the management of the property.

The State Party of Costa Rica notes that the annual budget of the National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC) has been increasing steadily over the past years, and that a Global Environment Fund (GEF) funded project to update SINAC's financial strategy could provide opportunities to improve the property's budget in the middle term.

The State Party of Costa Rica also notes that a number of indigenous people are being trained as tourist guides, and that some of them may become part of permanent biodiversity monitoring teams, which is expected to contribute to addressing the lack of information on the conservation status of target species and ecosystems. It also notes that the ecological indicators and related protocols previously developed by partner organizations will be revised as soon as the draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been officially adopted by the World Heritage Committee, in order to ensure that they reflect those elements that determine the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee acknowledges the efforts of both the States Parties of Costa Rica and Panama to establish a Bi-national Executing Technical Unit for the management of La Amistad International Park (UTEB-PILA), and to commission a transboundary Strategic Environmental Assessment, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session. However, they note that there appears to be little progress in removing cattle from the property, and the State Party of Panama's intention to build a road traversing the property from Boquete to Bocas del Toro

could be a matter of concern. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also recommend that the World Heritage Committee notes its regret that the State Party of Panama did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property as requested at the World Heritage Committee's 34th session, and note that construction of dams on the Changuinola and Bonyic rivers appears to be ongoing, despite the World Heritage Committee's request that all dam construction be halted until a detailed transboundary SEA has been undertaken (Decision **34 COM 7 B.32**). It should also consider that the potential development of dams and mining in the Costa Rican portion of the property is also a concern.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that existing and potential hydroelectric and mining projects in both Costa Rica and Panama represent both a potential and an ascertained danger to the property's Outstanding Universal Value, in accordance with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and note that these projects had already been assessed by the 2008 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission. Given the complexity of the threats to the property's values and integrity, they recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the States Parties of Costa Rica and Panama to jointly invite a World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the potential cumulative impacts of the multiple threats from dams, possible mining, planned roads, and cattle grazing on the property.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.29

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.32**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party of Panama did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session;*
4. *Notes with appreciation the efforts of both the States Parties of Costa Rica and Panama to establish a Bi-national Executing Technical Unit for the management of La Amistad International Park (UTEB-PILA), and to commission a transboundary Strategic Environmental Assessment, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session, and requests the States Parties to keep the World Heritage Centre informed on the effective operation of the UTEB-PILA, and submit a copy of the complete SEA report to the World Heritage Centre for examination, as soon as it becomes available;*
5. *Expresses its serious concern that the State Party of Panama has not halted dam construction on the Changuinola and Bonyic rivers until a detailed transboundary Strategic Environmental Assessment process is undertaken, and considers that ongoing discussions over the construction of new dams within the property in Costa Rica, if not immediately resolved, could lead to conditions whereby the integrity of the property would be considered threatened, in accordance with Paragraph 180 (a) (ii) of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Also expresses its concern that the State Party of Panama has not abandoned its plans to build a road traversing the property from Boquete to Bocas del Toro, and reiterates*

its request that it submit preliminary environmental impact assessments for this development to the World Heritage Centre as soon as these are available;

7. *Also reiterates its request to both States Parties that measures be adopted to ensure the complete removal of cattle from the property;*
8. *Also requests both States Parties of Costa Rica and Panama to jointly invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property prior to its 36th session, which should assess the threat posed by ongoing dam construction in Panama, by potential dam developments and mining in Costa Rica, and from the planned road traversing the property from Boquete to Bocas del Toro, and make a recommendation on the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
9. *Further requests both States Parties of Costa Rica and Panama to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, a joint report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress on the transboundary dam Strategic Environmental Assessment, a report on progress achieved in resolving land tenure and land use issues (Costa Rica), as well as on the other points raised above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

30. Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1978, extension in 2001

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

Year (s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
2007-2010

Previous Committee Decisions
33 COM 7A.13; 34 COM 7A.15; 34 COM 8C.3

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 506 250 for emergency, training and technical support.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount provided to the property: USD 3.5 million for the capitalization of an introduced species trust fund, management of introduced species, tourism management studies and other technical support.

Previous monitoring missions
June 1996 : Joint UNESCO / IUCN mission (including World Heritage Committee Chairperson) ; June 2003 : UNESCO mission ; April 2005 : UNESCO informal visit; February/March 2006 : Joint UNESCO/IUCN mission ; April 2007 : Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission (including World Heritage Committee Chairperson) ; April 2009 : UNESCO informal visit; April/May 2010: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Inadequate implementation of the Special Law on Galápagos;
b) Poor governance;
c) Inadequate and ineffective quarantine measures;
d) Illegal fishing;

- e) Instability of Park Director's position and inadequacies in the Park's management authority;
- f) High immigration rate;
- g) Unsustainable and uncontrolled tourism development;
- h) Educational reform not implemented.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1>

Current conservation issues

On 3 March 2011, the State Party submitted a comprehensive report on the state of conservation of the property. The Galapagos Islands were removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger at the World Heritage Committee's 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) and the State Party was requested to focus its efforts on three key issues: i) completing the biosecurity chain of inspection and control for invasive species, ii) developing and implementing a clear tourism strategy to control visitation levels, and iii) strengthening the Galapagos National Park Service's capacity to deal effectively with challenges to its mandate (Decision **34 COM 7A.15**). The State Party's progress addressing these three issues, as well as the recommendations of the 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission, is reported below.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall their view, expressed at the World Heritage Committee's 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), that the property remains in potential danger of losing the values for which it was inscribed on the World Heritage List due to the ongoing breakdown of its ecological isolation and unsustainable tourism development that facilitates the introduction of alien species which threaten species native to the Galapagos.

a) *Completing of the biosecurity chain of inspection and control to address invasive species*

The State Party reports that it intends to establish a single loading dock at Guayaquil on the continent by the end of 2012. Terms of Reference have also been issued for a pre-feasibility study to establish a single deepwater dock at Baltra to receive cargo from the continent, as recommended by the 2010 joint mission. The pre-feasibility study will also recommend an efficient distribution system of goods to the property's other islands. The State Party notes that an improved dock facility and crane was opened in December 2010 on San Cristobal Island, that there are plans to develop a new dock on Isabela Island, and that it plans to improve the infrastructure of the four populated islands ports by 2013. The 7 cargo ships operating from Guayaquil and transporting cargo to the Galapagos will be subject to a number of new and more stringent biosecurity, inspection and maintenance regulations from 31 March 2011 onward.

The State Party also reports that the '*Galapagos Inspection and Quarantine System*' (SICGAL by its Spanish acronym) is being restructured and will most likely result in the creation of a Biosecurity Agency, which would be operational by the end 2011 and should, in the State Party's view, provide a more holistic approach to invasive species control. Moreover, Agrocalidad, the agency currently dealing with the implementation of SICGAL and the enforcement of the '*Optimal System for Maritime Cargo Transportation to Galapagos*' (SOTMCG by its Spanish acronym), has been strengthened through the adoption of Resolutions N° 14 and N° 16, which establish disinfection procedures for cargo and passenger ships as well as aircraft, and grant Agrocalidad the mandate to undertake this work. Efforts are on going to control invasive species, including the Mediterranean fly, big headed ant, fire ants, African snail, feral goats, donkey and cattle, feral cats, and introduced rodents.

While the State Party has made some progress in implementing the 2010 mission recommendations as requested by World Heritage Committee Decision **34 COM 7A.15**, the

World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that a critical gap still remains in preventing the arrival of new species to the islands. They consider that the impacts of the reported dock facility developments on the biosecurity chain in the islands should have been assessed in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, before being undertaken. They consider that the nature of these developments requires clarification. In line with the recommendation of the most recent mission, they consider that new docks should not be constructed, whilst improvements to existing facilities should not lead to increases in the arrival of goods directly from the mainland. They consider that the development of transport between the islands should be linked with the development of a single shipping entry point at Baltra. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party does not clarify whether it intends to replace the 7 aging and mal-adapted cargo ships serving the Galapagos, with new ships designed to facilitate the application of biosecurity measures, as urged in Decision **34 COM 7A.15**. They consider that additional biosecurity regulations, while laudable, are unlikely to address this issue. The State Party also makes no mention of whether it will consider dismantling or permanently converting the Villamil air terminal to another use, as recommended by the 2010 mission in order to limit the number of entry points on the islands. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note that, ahead of the establishment of a new Biosecurity Agency, there is a need to institute a capacity building programme, including a focus on dogs trained in detecting organic matter, strengthen the budget and staff for inspections, and to apply internationally certified bio-security practices, including independent compliance audits.

b) *Developing and implementing a clear tourism strategy to control visitation levels*

The State Party reports that it is developing a tourism strategy for the property, in line with the 2010 mission recommendations and World Heritage Committee Decision **34 COM 7A.15**. During the first Sustainable Tourism Summit held in September 2010, a '*Declaration of Ecotourism as a model touristic development for Galapagos*' was signed, and guidelines, as well as pilot projects, are currently being developed to establish ecotourism public policies for the property. The number of visitors to the islands in 2010 was not expected to exceed the 173,420 visitors recorded in 2008 (as of 30 November 2010, 158,300 visitors had been recorded). The State Party also reports that while 'artisanal experiential fishing' has been fully regulated since 2009, these regulations were manipulated to license sports fishing. It intends to review these regulations to ensure that they do not allow sports fishing in the future, and to sanction boats carrying out sports fishing.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the State Party has made notable progress in initiating a tourism strategy for the Galapagos, and welcome the establishment of ecotourism as the standard tourism model for the property. However, they note that the State Party has not considered limiting the number of visitors to the islands while the tourism strategy is being developed, as was requested by the World Heritage Committee. It is also unclear whether the above tourism strategy will include concrete mechanisms to discourage rapid and uncontrolled growth in visitation, such as imposing an upper limit to the number of Park entrance permits awarded annually, as recommended by the 2010 mission.

c) *Strengthening the Galapagos National Park Service's capacity to deal effectively with challenges to its mandate*

The Director of the Park was replaced in June 2010. The State Party reports a number of activities, regulations and resolutions aimed at strengthening the Galapagos National Park Service's capacity to deal effectively with the challenges to its mandate, some of which are described above. The Park Service has engaged in an in-depth management effectiveness assessment with the support of an international team of experts. The Galapagos Governing Council's budget for 2011 is reported to be 30 million USD, with considerable emphasis on preventing the introduction of invasive species, immigration control, environmental management and territorial planning.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the further progress by the State Party in addressing the decisions of the World Heritage Committee. They note that a number of critical activities are still however in the planning stage. Actions still in need of full implementation include key components of the biosecurity chain of inspection and control of invasive species, and the demonstrated ability to effectively manage rapid and uncontrolled tourism related development, and further strengthening the Galapagos National Park Service's capacity to deal effectively with the challenges to its mandate. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that as long as these activities are not fully implemented, the property will continue to face serious threats to its Outstanding Universal Value, in particular due to the introduction of alien species which threaten species native to the Galapagos. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to strengthen its efforts to implement all of the 2010 mission recommendations, with a focus on the above three issues. They consider that an assessment of the likely effects of improving the ports of the property's four populated islands on the biosecurity chain should be made and provided to the World Heritage Committee prior to undertaking this work in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision : 35 COM 7B.30

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7A.15**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),
3. Welcomes the further progress achieved by the State Party in implementing the 2010 World Heritage Centre/IUCN joint reactive monitoring mission recommendations;
4. Notes that a number of critical conservation activities are still at the planning stage, including those relating to securing the biosecurity chain of inspection and control of invasive species, and the development of a tourism strategy in response to uncontrolled tourism related development, and considers that while the above activities are not implemented, the property will continue to face serious threats to its Outstanding Universal Value due to the breakdown of its ecological isolation, the introduction of alien species which threaten native species, and unsustainable tourism development;
5. Reiterates its request to strengthen the efforts to implement all of the 2010 mission recommendations, with a focus on completing the biosecurity chain of inspection and control for invasive species, further strengthening the Galapagos National Park Service's capacity to deal effectively with challenges to its mandate and developing and implementing a clear tourism strategy to discourage rapid and uncontrolled growth in visitation, including by assessing the feasibility of imposing an upper limit to the number of Park entrances granted annually;
6. Requests the State Party to assess the effects of the improvement of port facilities currently under construction or planned within the property's four populated islands in order to ensure that they do not impact negatively on the biosecurity chain and to provide plans and assessments to the World Heritage Centre for review, prior to undertaking such projects, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*;

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, with particular emphasis on the points above and on progress in the implementation of the 2010 mission recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

Criteria

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

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

1996-2007

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.38; 33 COM 7B.37; 34 COM 7B.34

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 190,025 for Conservation

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 80,000 (in addition to approximately USD 100,000 of in-kind technical assistance) under the management effectiveness assessment project "Enhancing our Heritage".

Previous monitoring missions

1995 and 2000: IUCN monitoring missions; 2003 and 2006: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring missions; 2011: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal settlements;
- b) Illegal livestock grazing and agricultural encroachment;
- c) Illegal logging;
- d) Illegal commercial fishing;
- e) Poaching;
- f) Alien Invasive Species;
- g) Management deficiencies;
- h) Potential impacts from hydroelectric development projects Patuca I,II and III;
- i) Lack of law enforcement
- j) Lack of clarity regarding land tenure and access to natural resources.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/196>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the property's state of conservation on 8 February 2011. As requested in Committee Decision **34 COM 7B.34**, a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the property from 31 January to 9 February 2011. The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>.

a) *Land tenure and illegal settlement of the property by squatters*

Major illegal settlement was one of the main threats that led to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1996, as a result of the region attracting poor settlers in search of cattle ranching lands, transforming forests into extensive pastures in an uncontrolled agricultural frontier. The mission recalls that extensive efforts to organize land tenure over more than 10 years, in large part with the support of German development cooperation, have yielded promising results. Most long standing settlers have obtained clear titles to their lands in areas surrounding the property, reducing the illegal land trading market. However, indigenous groups with traditional rights within the property are still in the process of negotiating land tenure and resource use access arrangements with the authorities that are adapted to their needs. Lack of clarity in terms of access to land and natural resources in these areas is aggravated by the general lack of planning and law enforcement, inviting unauthorized settlement by squatters seeking land for ranching. The mission notes that the property was removed from the Danger List in 2007 after important advances had been made in land titling and in removing illegal settlers from within its boundaries. Unfortunately, the State Party reports the presence of several dozen new squatters in this zone, but adds that all legal procedures are being implemented to ensure their removal by mid-2011. Though the State Party reports that it will be removing these squatters, the mission considers that they represent only a small proportion of illegal settlers currently located in the property.

b) *Development of hydroelectric dams in nearby watershed (Patuca I, II and III)*

The mission was informed that after several years seeking a development partner, the State Party finalized an agreement with Chinese company network Sinohydro, to build the first of possibly three dams on the Patuca river, Patuca III. This river's watershed abuts part of the property, and even includes, to a small extent, portions of the property. Construction began in February 2011, with funding from the Chinese government. Though an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was carried out in 2008, a copy of the EIA was first obtained during the 2011 mission. The EIA makes no reference of potential impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, leaving this question unanswered. Similarly, approvals to proceed with the other two Patuca dams have reportedly been granted, though no communication from the State Party to this effect has been received by the World Heritage Centre. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, there is need for clear information on the precise location of the dams and the expected impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value, before construction on the dams is started.

c) *Management and Institutional Capacity*

The mission was informed that protected area management, formerly under the remit of the Forestry Development Corporation of Honduras, is now under the newly created National Institute for the Conservation and Development of Forests, Protected Areas and Wildlife (ICF) which reports directly to the President. There is also substantially revised new forest legislation, which contributes to removing the structural conflict in mandates that existed when the protected areas management agency had to cover the cost of its operations through logging concession revenues. The mission notes that the ICF remains a poorly resourced agency, relying in large part on extra-budgetary financing obtained from bi- and multi-lateral projects to carry out field activities. The ICF is in the process of producing a new management plan, though the mission considers that given that one of several projects (Proyecto Corazon) is taking the lead, there is a risk that not all initiatives and stakeholders are involved in producing the new plan in a coordinated fashion. The mission also considers that the confusion regarding the official property boundaries (the World Heritage property is effectively managed as if its boundaries were the same as the much larger Biosphere Reserve), poses the risk that World Heritage considerations are not fully considered nor reflected in the new management plan. Beyond the ICF, conservation of the property's values, including its integrity, depends on the capacity of other government agencies,

particularly those responsible for controlling illegal activities. The mission notes that the near absence of capacity to apprehend, to transport to holding areas, to hold in custody, and to prosecute people carrying out illegal activities, due to the remote nature of the site, results in an environment of impunity. The general atmosphere of intimidation, and potential and actual violence, are also disincentives for environmental prosecutors to venture into the zone.

d) *Property boundary design*

The State Party provided to the mission, as well as in its report, a sketch map of the current boundaries and zoning of the Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve, as legally recognized in national law. Though the area officially recognized by the World Heritage Committee in 1982 is still contained within the expanded boundaries of the Reserve, there is no coherence between management planning and the property boundaries recognized under the *World Heritage Convention*. Much of the inscribed property is included in the buffer zone of the Rio Plátano Biosphere Reserve, where significant agricultural activities occur, and a cultural zone, where human settlements, existing at the time of inscription, are located. The mission considers that there is a need to revisit the boundaries of the property to more accurately reflect the extent of the ecosystems for which it was initially inscribed, and to take into consideration the existing uses within the current boundaries. It notes that the key values of the area are the mosaic of ecosystems in the northern part of the Rio Platano watershed, which are now largely included in the cultural zone, and the exceptional protection of an entire watershed. The mission recommends that both these aspects be considered in the future boundary design.

e) *Illegal logging and fishing, poaching*

The mission concludes that despite visible efforts at controlling illegal logging, the practice remains widespread. There is little or no management of fishing practices in the property. Though local and indigenous communities rely on fishing for subsistence, their practices are unsustainable, as they throw nets across the main canals separating the sea from the lagoons during tidal flows. Besides subsistence fishing, the seasonal migration upriver of one species triggers a human migration for commercial fishing. The mission also found evidence of poaching in the core zone, and it was informed that manatees, large marine mammals, are hunted for food in the lagoons

f) *Increase in illegal drug transshipment activities in and near the property*

The mission was informed that in the past 4-5 years the property has become a major transportation hub for moving narcotics from South America northwards. The State Party reports several illicit landing strips in the property, also observed by the mission during its helicopter overflight.

The State Party has recognized the severity of the situation. On 15 February 2011, it adopted a decree recognizing the property as a zone of special interest requiring priority on the part of the government and deciding the development and implementation of an inter-ministerial action plan to address the situation. Subsequently, the State Party proactively requested the World Heritage Committee, by a letter sent to the World Heritage Centre received 11 April 2011, to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in response to concerns over increased incursions into the property by cattle ranchers, and to the growing inability to deal with the conservation challenges as a result of growing insecurity in the area.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that although there has been significant progress in establishing and implementing a solid foundation over which to manage land occupation and land transactions, much work remains to be done, particularly in regards to finalizing the process within indigenous community lands. They note that despite these efforts, the number of squatters is again on the rise, and the State Party has demonstrated the ability to deal with

only a fraction of these. The continuing absence of an effective response to squatters' risks creating an irreversible situation leading to the loss of habitats and biodiversity, which are part of the property's Outstanding Universal Value, as more land is cleared for cattle ranching within the property.

In addition, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that construction of hydroelectric dams on the nearby Patuca River, is taking place without first having clearly addressed potential environmental and social impacts. A clear pronouncement on such impacts must urgently be made before deciding if and how work should continue, and this information should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. Though organizational restructuring has clarified conservation mandates, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that institutions responsible for carrying out conservation work, law enforcement and other roles remain poorly resourced, and in some cases, completely absent from the region. Until the State Party is able to establish a functional presence in the region, the integrity of the property will remain at serious risk. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to assess if and how the property's boundaries should be modified to better capture and protect the values and reflect the zonation introduced after inscription. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further point out the alarming increase in the use of the property as an illegal drugs transshipment area, which represents a very serious challenge to the State Party's capacity to address all other matters relating to integrity. Until this situation is reversed, the prospect for effective management interventions is very limited.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the combination of threats from illegal logging, illegal occupation, the reduced capacity of the State Party and the general deterioration of law and order and the security situation in the region constitute a serious threat to its Outstanding Universal Value. Under these circumstances, they recommend that the World Heritage Committee support the request by the State Party to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Corrective measures are proposed in the draft decision below.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.31

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.34**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Takes note that the State Party has stabilized the illegal land market by advancing significantly in the land titling process in areas abutting the property, and restructured the administration of protected areas so as to clarify the mandate of pertinent governmental agencies;*
4. *Expresses its serious concern over the alarming trend in illegal drug trafficking carried out in and around the property, which is undermining conservation efforts, contributing to deforestation within the property, and creating an environment of insecurity;*
5. *Also takes note that the State Party has requested, by letter to the World Heritage Centre, that the property be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and further notes with appreciation that the State Party adopted a decree recognizing the property as a zone requiring priority action and has decided on the development and implementation of an inter-ministerial action plan to address the situation;*

6. *Considers* that the combination of threats from illegal logging, illegal occupation, the reduced capacity of the State Party and the general deterioration of law and order and the security situation in the region constitute a serious threat to its Outstanding Universal Value;
7. ***Decides to inscribe Rio Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;***
8. *Urges* the State Party to implement the following corrective measures:
 - a) *Establish permanent and systematic monitoring to identify encroachment and land use changes of the entire protected area, and if possible the broader region, and relocate illegal occupants who have recently settled in the property, in particular in the core zone of the Rio Plátano Biosphere Reserve,*
 - b) *Continue efforts to negotiate and clarify access to land and natural resources while enforcing existing land tenure and access arrangements and explore opportunities for more meaningful co-management with a particular focus on the indigenous communities of the cultural zone,*
 - c) *In cooperation with the indigenous communities concerned, complete land tenure and resource access arrangements adapted to their historical and cultural contexts,*
 - d) *Halt the construction of hydroelectric dams on the Patuca River until it has been clearly demonstrated to the World Heritage Committee that they will not negatively impact the property's Outstanding Universal Value,*
 - e) *Provide the necessary human resources and logistical capacity to the agencies responsible for the protection and management of the property to enable them to regularly monitor and deal with illegal activities affecting the property,*
 - f) *Using the ongoing management planning process, seek to coordinate the many actors, various institutions and external supporters involved in Río Plátano in order to significantly improve coherence, effectiveness and efficiency of future management in addressing the issues affecting the property;*
9. *Also urges* the State Party to take the necessary measures, in cooperation with other concerned States Parties, to prevent the use of the property, and surrounding lands, for drug trafficking;
10. *Further urges* the State Party to consider the various options to redefine the boundaries of the World Heritage property to reflect the increased size of the protected area, the new zonation, and the existing land uses, in order to ensure that the property's Outstanding Universal Value can be more effectively conserved;
11. *Requests* the State Party to translate the political recognition of the severity of the threats to the property into a coordinated, workable and budgeted long term Action Plan and *encourages* the State Party to consider a request for International Assistance in support of corresponding efforts;
12. *Also requests* the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, a 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 at its 36th session in 2012;
13. *Further requests* the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the

implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

34. Manu National Park (Peru) (N 402)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987, Minor boundary modification in 2009

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.39; 33 COM 8B.39; 34 COM 7B.36

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property USD 60,000 for Conservation and Management

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

The December 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission was the first monitoring mission to the site.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Agricultural encroachment;
- b) Livestock keeping;
- c) Deforestation/ Illegal logging;
- d) Hydrocarbon concessions;
- e) Infrastructure developments (road construction);
- f) Human occupation in the National Park;
- g) Illegal hunting, fishing and extraction of non-timber forest products;
- h) Coca cultivation;
- i) Management capacity and financing.

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

On 4 March 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property to the World Heritage Centre. The report provides information on the current status of threats to the property, identified by the World Heritage Committee at earlier sessions. From 5 to 14 December 2010 a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the property to assess its state of conservation, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>.

a) *Demographic trends*

The State Party reports 2,203 indigenous people living within the Park, compared to 1,645 in 2003 with a growth rate of 4.7% over the past 7 years. These do not include a smaller number living in voluntary isolation. Distributed across a small number of communities, these

people are gradually adopting small-scale farming lifestyles and clearing forests in order to do so in areas traditionally used in semi-nomadic fashion. There are also reports of indigenous people moving into the property from the Camisea River in the northwest of the property, possibly as a result of the decimation of wildlife in the Camisea River Basin. The sedentary indigenous communities within the property are likewise growing and there seems to be no clear policy in place for managing this growth. New settlements are forming and groups in initial contact in the headwaters of three smaller rivers are reported to become sedentary. Whilst these different changes are not yet a critical issue, the mission notes the importance of a proactive policy by the State Party to consider their implications and develop appropriate action.

b) Agricultural encroachment / livestock keeping / coca plantations

The zonation of the property includes recuperation zones and special use zones. The management objective of the 17,500 ha recuperation zone, according to Peruvian protected areas legislation, is restoration and subsequent consideration as a different zone. However, despite major efforts, the poverty of local communities remains fundamentally unchanged, as well as their significant impacts on the Park through livestock keeping, agriculture and use of fire in land management. Hence, the mission considers that a more decisive management response is required. The special use zones of the property cover around 39,000 hectares where non-commercial resource use, including subsistence agriculture, is permitted. However, population growth of sedentary indigenous communities, as well as increasing migration into the agricultural community of Callanga, leading to expanding agricultural activity and numbers of livestock in the area, are a concern that needs to be addressed. In addition, the movements of domestic livestock within the property present the risk of spreading disease. The mission recommends that policy, equipment and infrastructure for managing the import of domestic animals into the Park, where currently permitted, be developed, including vaccination and quarantine arrangements and corresponding training for both staff and farmers. Furthermore, the mission notes that hunting with firearms is having significant impacts on mammal populations locally around sedentary indigenous communities. The mission also recommends more systematic law enforcement as a priority. The mission notes that lands on either side of the Alto Madre de Dios River, the left bank of which falls in the buffer zone of the property are occupied by small communities engaged in subsistence and small-scale commercial agriculture. Depending on future road access, these areas are likely entry points for future agricultural encroachment, logging and other resource use. While currently not out of control, the mission considers that management interventions at this early stage appear to be a wise investment, including as a means of conflict prevention. The mission also notes that small, reportedly growing areas in the southern part of the property are planted with unlicensed coca. Though controlled and licensed coca production is permitted in Peru, the mission considers that this development, which is known to be accompanied by security concerns and violence elsewhere in Peru, requires attention through an updated evaluation of the extent of illegal coca cultivation within the National Park and appropriate follow-up interventions.

c) Illegal logging

The State Party reports that there are only isolated and insignificant incidents of illegal logging within the property. The mission notes that there is a very specialized small timber processing facility in Boca Manu based on the use of trees that topple as a result of natural bank erosion during the rainy season. Such operations are known to sometimes rely on illegal supply, as the natural supply does not allow planning, and consequently require monitoring. The mission further notes that most if not all of the logging taking place near the property is unregulated and unlicensed, and thus technically illegal. Government agencies responsible for forest management are absent. More aggressive illegal logging has been reported in the Alto Purus National Park to the north. As access to the property improves and resources outside protected areas are depleted, logging pressure within the property will become a growing concern. The mission notes that the southern part of the property is likely

to eventually be targeted by illegal loggers if current trends are not soon reversed. No significant deforestation within the property was noted, save small areas in the recuperation and special use zones.

d) *Hydrocarbon concessions / hydrocarbon pipeline*

The impacts of the nearby Camisea gas field, including reported movements of indigenous peoples into the property as a result of the decimation of wildlife in the Camisea River Basin, could not be conclusively analyzed through the monitoring mission and are not referred to in the State Party report. The exploration for hydrocarbons in the concession block south of the property (Lot 76) remains a concern. Whilst there is no exploitation allowed within the property, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that indirect impacts such as transportation infrastructure and disturbance, including from helicopter activity, are likely and require management consideration. Concerns have previously been noted about the possible location of the pipeline which Lot 76 would require. One hypothetical route would have it cross the property, to link with the existing Camisea pipeline to the Northwest. Hunt Oil, the company involved in the exploration is also involved in the Camisea northwest gas field and pipeline. IUCN met with representatives of Hunt Oil in the presence of senior staff of the Peruvian Protected Areas Agency (SERNANP). Hunt Oil confirmed that there is no intention to plan or build a pipeline affecting the property, as documented in the State Party report and the mission report. The SERNANP representative also indicated that under no circumstances would a pipeline be allowed to cross the property.

e) *Infrastructure / roads*

The mission notes that the property's only access road from Cuzco is precarious and is one of the reasons that resource use pressure on the property remains limited. The mission also notes that should the road link be established to Boca Colorado, 100 km away, pressure on the property from the quickly growing regional capital of Puerto Maldonado would likely increase. The State Party points out that such a connection will be located outside the property and its buffer zone. The planned new road is reported to receive local funding and work appears to have started. The improvement of access, in combination with the expected influx of people related to future hydrocarbon extraction, is likely to dramatically change the situation in the buffer zone and could have impacts on the property itself. An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has not been undertaken. The mission considers that the current capacity of government agencies to deal with this scenario is inadequate, and will need investment of additional resources. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) of the planned road would be needed, in order to balance the associated risks and benefits and ensure that it does not negatively impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, nor on forest-dependent indigenous communities, prior to continuing with the connection of Boca Colorado and Boca Manu.

f) *Other conservation issues – inclusion of Megantoni National Sanctuary, tourism management, and staffing deficiencies*

Megantoni National Sanctuary is a recent addition to Peru's National Protected Area system, contiguous with the property and located west of it. Covering the entire altitudinal gradient from the lowlands to the Andean "Puna", the protected area not only matches the property in terms of biodiversity but is also a sacred site for indigenous residents. The mission considers that inclusion of Megantoni National Sanctuary into the property through a minor boundary modification would add additional values and protection to the property in an area of major strategic importance, as Megantoni is both adjacent to the Camisea gas field, and has a key function linking Manu within the Vilcabamba – Amboro (Bolivia) biodiversity corridor.

The mission found that road access and expensive and unreliable air access are limiting factors for tourism. In line with the Peruvian government policy to seek greater revenues for protected areas from tourism with 70% of such funds remaining in the area, tourism could play a much more prominent role in the property. The mission considers that the property could benefit from a comprehensive tourism management plan to address funding limitations

for the Park. These factors should also be part of the assessment of the road proposals within the area.

The headquarters of the Park are based in the city of Cuzco in the Province of Cuzco, located far away from the park and the reality on the ground. It is also noteworthy that the majority of the property is located in the territory of the neighboring Province of Madre de Dios. The mission considers that the increased involvement of this provincial government could contribute to addressing the gaps between identified funding and staffing needs and the actual situation, and better prepare the property for the expected increase in pressures in the broader region mentioned above.

At the time of the mission, the renowned ecological research station Cocha Cashu, among the most important ones in the neotropics, faced an uncertain future. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN understand that an agreement has since been achieved and welcomes the expected continuation of Cocha Cashu.

Conclusions

The mission found that the Park appears to be largely intact, substantially as a result of the remoteness and economic isolation of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the property's Outstanding Universal Value is not currently under significant threat, though some trends, if not properly addressed soon, may eventually become intractable. The threat of an influx of people as a consequence of possible increased road access via Boca Colorado would inevitably result in increased pressures on the property's natural resources (timber, wildlife). Such pressures would require a very large increase in planning and law enforcement. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee ask for greater attention to the role of the different groups of indigenous peoples within the Park. Attention is drawn in particular to the growing population, including new settlers within the property and on its Southwestern and Southeastern borders, including the buffer zone, which could potentially result in increasing conflict with the property if there is no governmental presence to help manage growth sustainably through better regulation of logging, road building and land use.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also recommend that the World Heritage Committee urge the State Party to update the Master Plan for the property, which should include a comprehensive tourism management plan to promote sustainable tourism to generate local income and employment, raise the profile of the property and to support conservation financing. Additional staffing and regular patrols are needed, including in the upper Camisea River sector, with special emphasis on effective communication with local communities. The opportunities for funding from companies involved in the Camisea gas field should be explored, as hydrocarbon extraction activities could potentially have significant impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.34

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.36**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),

3. Takes note of the recommendations of the December 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission;
4. Requests the State Party to consider the recommendations of the 2010 reactive monitoring mission in future management, with a particular focus on:
 - a) Strengthening governmental capacity across sectors to effectively plan infrastructure and land and resource use in the Alto Madre de Dios river corridor, including in the buffer zone of the property and adjacent protected areas and communal reserves,
 - b) Strengthening governmental capacity for participatory planning, management and law enforcement in the "recuperation", "special use" and buffer zones,
 - c) Using the current updating of the Master Plan as an opportunity to identify staffing and funding gaps and derive realistic and concrete funding strategies, including from Peru's Conservation Fund (PROFONANPE), private sector companies involved in hydrocarbon extraction, and tourism revenues,
 - d) Protecting the indigenous peoples living in voluntary isolation and in initial contact from external pressures and engage with sedentary indigenous groups within the property in a more meaningful dialogue to define the future,
 - e) Revitalizing an operational multi-stakeholder management committee, which is designed to provide advice to management planning processes, including in the buffer zone,
 - f) Considering the feasibility of a minor boundary modification including Megantoni National Sanctuary in the property;
5. Takes note with appreciation of the commitment of Hunt Oil, who is exploring gas reserves in the region, and that there is no intention to plan or build a pipeline affecting the property, as also documented in the State Party report;
6. Notes with concern that the planned road from Boca Manu to Boca Colorado is likely to result in increasing pressures on the property's natural resources and therefore also requests the State Party to conduct an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) of the planned road, in order to balance the associated risks and benefits and ensure that it does not negatively impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, nor on forest-dependent indigenous communities, and submit its results to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines prior to implementation of this project;
7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including a copy of the Environmental and social Impact Assessment for the Boca Manu – Boca Colorado road, as well as a report on progress achieved in the implementation of the 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission recommendations.

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(vii) (viii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.40; 33 COM 7B.39; 34 COM 7B.37

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 19,950 (Preparatory Assistance)

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2010: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Development pressures associated with tourism and housing

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1161>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2011 the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. This report provides an overview of the State Party's progress in enforcing a moratorium on all residential and hotel developments within the Pitons Management Area (PMA), as requested in the World Heritage Committee Decisions **32 COM 7B.40**, **33 COM 7B.39**, **34 COM 7B.37**, until effective mechanisms are put in place to ensure that future land use within the property is compatible with its Outstanding Universal Value.

a) *Development pressures associated with tourism and housing*

The State Party reports that it remains committed to preserving the Outstanding Universal Value of the Pitons Management Area, and is continuing to implement Cabinet Conclusion No.645 of 31 October 2010 which enforced a "*moratorium on all development activities within the PMA...*", until the findings of a Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) study are adopted and implemented in the review of the area's land use plan and planning control guidelines. The State Party also notes that it is working with the IUCN Regional Office for Mesoamerica and the Caribbean to secure technical assistance for the PMA, and is also in the process of reviewing a study on the recommended legal and institutional framework for the property. The World Heritage Centre has received a letter from the State Party in this regard and has suggested it apply for support under the International Assistance window.

While the World Heritage Centre and IUCN commend the State Party for its progress in enforcing a moratorium, drafting the terms of reference for the LAC study, and its commitment to reviewing land use plans and planning control guidelines, they noted an ambiguity in the State Party's report regarding the application of the development moratorium. Section 2.2 of the report implies that the State Party continues to review some development applications within the PMA, on the basis of the Integrated Development Plan (IDP), which is the land use plan for the area. A moratorium is clearly incompatible with

reviewing development applications within the PMA. The World Heritage Centre requested further clarification on this point and the State Party responded in a letter dated 12 April 2011, indicating that indeed, a strict moratorium on development was in place throughout the property, citing a Saint Lucia Cabinet Ministers decision dated 10 July 2010 in this regard.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN emphasize that open and transparent dialogue with stakeholders, and in particular private landowners within the property, will be crucial to securing a lasting resolution to the development pressures facing the Pitons Management Area. The assistance provided to St Lucia by IUCN's Caribbean Initiative is intended to facilitate this dialogue, as outlined in the terms of reference annexed to the State Party's report.

b) *Hurricane impacts on the property*

The State Party reports that St Lucia was devastated by Hurricane Tomas on 30 October 2010. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN extend their deepest sympathies to the people of St Lucia, and to the families of those who lost their lives in the wake of Hurricane Tomas. The property suffered several landslides from heavy rain, which affected forest cover in some areas and also severely affected the fragile reefs of the marine component of the property by clogging them with washed-out soil and debris. Rehabilitation works are planned, but the State Party does not provide further details. IUCN notes that the impacts of the hurricane appear to have been less significant within the PMA, than in Soufrière and the surrounding coastal zone. However, the fact that several of the larger landslides occurred at the Jalousie and other resorts is an indication of the fragility of the property's soils and the importance of ensuring that future land use is compatible with its Outstanding Universal Value.

Conclusion

The State Party has clearly committed to a moratorium on development applications until such time as the Limits of Acceptable Change study has been completed and ratified by the Cabinet of Ministers of St Lucia, as requested by the World Heritage Committee.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee welcome the State Party's intention to undertake a Limits of Acceptable Change study on the levels of land use that would be compatible with the property's Outstanding Universal Value, and recommend that the study take into account the World Heritage Committee's clear position that development within the PMA should be strictly circumscribed in order to avoid any deterioration of its integrity (Decision **34 COM 7B.37**). They also recommend that the World Heritage Committee also encourage the State Party to consider completing the process of acquiring additional private lands within the property, as recommended by the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription, in order to facilitate the conservation and management of its Outstanding Universal Value.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.35

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.37**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),

3. *Extends its deepest sympathies to the people of St Lucia, and to the families of those who lost their lives in the wake of Hurricane Tomas;*
4. *Notes the State Party's progress in enforcing a moratorium on residential and hotel developments within the property;*
5. *Welcomes the State Party's intention to undertake a Limits of Acceptable Change study, as well as a review of land use plans and development control guidelines, and reiterates its clear position that development within the property should be strictly circumscribed in order to avoid any deterioration of its Outstanding Universal Value;*
6. *Considers that open and transparent dialogue with all stakeholders, and in particular private landowners within the property, will be crucial to securing a lasting resolution of the development pressures it faces;*
7. *Invites the State Party to submit a request for International Assistance to the World Heritage Committee to support the preparation of the Limits of Acceptable Change study;*
8. *Requests to the State Party to finalize the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which should be submitted within the framework of the Latin America and the Caribbean Periodic Reporting exercise;*
9. *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 progress updates on the Limits of Acceptable Change study, revisions to land use plans and development control guidelines, and a list of all development applications and approved developments within the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

42. Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26)

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

ARAB STATES

46. Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1982

Criteria
(iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
2002–2006

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.54; 32 COM 7B.56; 33 COM 7B.51

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 99,231 for Emergency assistance, Technical cooperation and training.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 9,564 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust.

Previous monitoring missions

2002: World Heritage Centre and experts missions; March 2006: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Natural degradation caused by littoral erosion, marine salt and vegetation covering part of the inscribed sectors;
- b) Deterioration of the remains due to vandalism, theft and uncontrolled visitation causing accumulation of rubbish;
- c) Urbanisation on the outskirts of the property where,;
- d) Lack of capacities for site conservation, unsuitable restoration techniques, and poor conservation conditions for the archaeological remains;
- e) Proposed port development.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/193>

Current conservation issues

On 25 February 2011, the State Party submitted a report including a detailed study of the development of the port of Tipasa and a copy of the final draft of the Permanent Plan for the Enhancement and Safeguarding of the site (PPEAS). This detailed and well-illustrated document also identifies and evaluates the heritage resources, the urban growth scenario, the normative framework, the various public utility easements, and the demographic and socio-economic impacts. It also analyses the vulnerable components of the site and establishes emergency measures to be implemented for its protection and enhancement. A series of maps complete the document as well as specifications of technical requirements for urban planning and architecture, and specifications of technical standards (Handbook on conservation, development and management of the archaeological sites of Tipasa), and easement regulations for the protected area.

a) *PPEAS*

The final version of the Plan for the Protection and Enhancement of the Archaeological Sites of Tipasa was adopted on 13 December 2010 by the Popular Assembly of the Wilaya of Tipasa. It is based on the property boundaries as adopted by the World Heritage Committee

at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) in the framework of the Retrospective Inventory (Decision **33 COM 8D**).

b) Project for the development of recreational spaces of the Port of Tipasa

The Directorate of Public Works of the Wilaya of Tipasa entrusted the study for this project to the Laboratory for Maritime Studies. The detailed and illustrated report presents the first two phases of development works: the preliminary study and summary pilot project. Two development scenarios, a grid plan and an open spiral plan were studied and presented. The project management retained the grid plan. This plan, the implementation of which is estimated at more than USD 6 million, defines six components: the marina, the fishing port, the landscaped park, the ancient garden which is the extension of Tipasa Museum, the esplanade of the port, and the cliff garden. The landscaping provides a link between the two historic sites. In the context of this study a diagnosis and a summary pilot project for the protection of the cliff were produced and attached to the report. Several variants of protective works were considered, but the solution retained is not specified.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the completion of the Plan for the Protection and Enhancement of the property, and will carefully study the documents provided.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also take note of the punctual dispatch of the summary pilot project for the development of the port of Tipasa. They would appreciate the opportunity to discuss the proposals with the State Party on the ground. This would allow a proper assessment giving the significant impact the works could have on the property. To this end, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies recommend that the State Party invites an advisory mission.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.46

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.51**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),*
3. *Takes note of the extensive work in drafting the final Plan for the Protection and Enhancement of the property and its protected area (PPEAS) and requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed of progress in its implementation;*
4. *Also takes note of the summary pilot project for the development of the port, but regrets that the requested impact study was not transmitted, and encourages the State Party to invite an advisory mission to make an appropriate assessment, before preparing the detailed pilot project;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress made on the implementation of the PPEAS, for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.*

47. Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1992

Criteria
(ii) (v)

Previous Committee Decisions
29 COM 7B.44; 31 COM 7B.59 ; 33 COM 7B.52

International Assistance
Total amount allocated to the property: USD 87,600 for Technical assistance

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
September 2001: World Heritage Centre reactive monitoring mission; November 2007 and November 2009: Six World Heritage Centre missions financed by the State Party for the Safeguarding Plan and the issue of the metro.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports:

- a) Natural erosion
- b) Lack of maintenance of dwelling places
- c) Loss of traditional conservation techniques
- d) Uncontrolled land use
- e) Non-operational safeguarding plan
- f) Lack of coordination of activities

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/565>

Current conservation issues

On 25 February 2011, the State Party submitted a report on the implementation of Decision **33 COM 7B.52** concerning the conservation status of the Kasbah of Algiers, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009). Three World Heritage Centre missions funded by the State Party have taken place since then to monitor the Safeguarding Plan and the metro project. In addition, a detailed archaeological diagnostic motivated by the proposed construction of the metro station "Place des Martyrs" was produced by the French Institute of Preventive Archaeological Research (INRAP) and delivered to the State Party in September 2010.

It is noteworthy that the World Heritage Centre was informed that major projects in the framework of the development of the Bay of Algiers and the Urban Development Plan for the entire city were being considered, which could have an impact on the Place des Martyrs. It requested the State Party, in March 2010, for information on these projects which, however, do not appear in the present report.

a) *Progress on the phases of the Permanent Plan for the Safeguarding and Enhancement of the Safeguarded Sector of the Kasbah of Algiers (PPSMVSS):*

- (i) Diagnosis and emergency measures (phase 1): Emergency conservation measures intended to stabilise the physical and human dimensions of the urban fabric are nearing completion. To date, 394 buildings are classified as "highly

degraded". Nineteen technical offices and more than 150 companies are mobilised. Studies have been conducted for 92% of the buildings, work on 80% of them is underway, and the work is completed for 66% of them. This work of provisional protection has enabled the urban fabric of the Medina to be preserved and the degradation to be stopped or forestalled until restoration operations are initiated. The severely degraded buildings with a real risk of collapse have been evacuated and their inhabitants relocated.

(ii) Historical and typological analysis, and pre-project (phase 2): The report gives an overview, with supporting cadastral maps, of the analysis of the buildings and development proposals. It also provides an estimate of restoration and development projects, and relocation needs of residents.

(iii) The final draft of the Permanent Safeguarding Plan (phase 3) is completed and awaiting adoption by the Popular Assembly of the Wilaya of Algiers.

The report of the State Party also indicates the preparation of the following documents:

- A manual of techniques and building materials;
- A directory of listed buildings in the safeguarded area;
- A directory of homogeneous areas.

b) The metro project

Archaeological excavations conducted in the framework of the Franco-Algerian Cooperation Agreement revealed a rich content, evidence of 2000 years of history. This obliged the company responsible for carrying out the metro project to reconsider the location of the station at Place des Martyrs. The metro, initially planned to be 19m deep, will cross the Place des Martyrs at a depth of 34m in order to save the remains. The station will be built entirely underground, beneath the archaeological substrata, reducing the surface ground impact from 8000m² to 5000m². The State Party foresees a museum component at the entrance of the station for the valorization of the vestiges and their daily presentation to the metro users.

c) Boundary line of the property

A large-scale cadastral map was submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 31 January 2011. However, the property line, as shown on the map, does not match the cadastral parcel and it frequently crosses the buildings. The State Party was thus requested to review the delimitation submitted.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the first phase of the Safeguarding Plan, including emergency interventions to stabilise the buildings financed by the State, is about to be finalised, and that the Permanent Safeguarding Plan should be adopted soon.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note that the metro project for the Place des Martyrs has been adapted to respect the recently discovered archaeological layers, but they consider that further modifications are still needed.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also wish to receive more information on the projects proposed for the Place des Martyrs, which are linked to the project for the Bay of Algiers and to the Urban Development Plan for the entire city.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.47

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.52**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Takes note of the information given by the State Party concerning actions taken in the perspective of the conservation of the Kasbah of Algiers and encourages it to continue its efforts towards the finalisation of the emergency measures and the implementation of the Permanent Safeguarding Plan for the property;
4. Also takes note of the information on the rich archaeological content discovered during the excavations conducted at the site chosen for the metro station of Place des Martyrs and the modification of the metro project in the light of these discoveries;
5. Considers that the surface impact of the construction of the metro station at Place des Martyrs remains significant and requests the State Party to attempt to further reduce this impact and to submit to the World Heritage Centre, before starting work, the detailed project and the development plans for the metro station, notably for the museum component;
6. Reiterates its request for information of the projects envisaged for the Place des Martyrs, and which are linked to the project for the Bay of Algiers and to the Urban Development Plan for the entire city;
7. Also requests the State Party to review and to submit, by **1 December 2011**, the cadastral map showing the boundaries of the property;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, a progress report on the implementation of the above recommendations, for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013.

48. Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1979

Criteria
(i) (v) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
31 COM 7B.56 ; 32 COM 7B.58 ; 33 COM 7B.55

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 503,849 for technical assistance

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: Special Account for the safeguarding of the cultural heritage of Egypt: USD 44,000 allocated for the preparation of the project document for the Management Plan; USD 1,753,805 dollars for the Urban Regeneration Project of Historic Cairo.

Previous monitoring missions

August 2002, March 2005: ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions; April and December 2007: World Heritage Centre missions for the Cairo Financial Centre; October 2008: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; 2009, 2010: World Heritage Centre missions for the Urban Regeneration Project.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Rise of the underground water level;
- b) Dilapidated infrastructure;
- c) Neglect and lack of maintenance;
- d) Overcrowded areas and buildings;
- e) Uncontrolled development;
- f) Absence of a comprehensive Urban Conservation Plan;
- g) Absence of an integrated socio-economic revitalization plan linking the urban and the socio-cultural fabric of the city core.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/89>

Current conservation issues

At its 33rd session (Seville, 2009), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to submit a report on the state of conservation of the property as well as a progress report on modifications to the Cairo Financial Centre and on the elaboration of the Management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011. At the time of drafting the present document, the State Party had not transmitted a report.

In July 2010, the programme for the elaboration of a conservation/regeneration plan for Historic Cairo, requested by the World Heritage Committee for many years, was launched by the World Heritage Centre, through the Special Account for Egyptian Cultural Heritage at UNESCO and in collaboration with the Ministry of Culture.

The project focuses on:

- a) the preparation of a Conservation Plan for the World Heritage property of Historic Cairo and its "buffer zones" which would include the Management Plan required by the *Operational Guidelines*;
- b) the setting up of an institutional and legal framework to undertake and develop a sustainable urban conservation policy, promoting the coordination and collaboration amongst the different institutions, administrations and agencies which are concerned with the management of the property;
- c) the creation of an appropriate and shared information platform for urban conservation.

The Plan will provide tools for protecting the heritage from further deterioration, favouring at the same time possible compatible interventions to improve the living conditions of the population and bring new activities and uses, associating the "conservation" with the "rehabilitation".

The progress achieved in the first nine months of activities are:

- First nucleus of the project team created;
- Delimitation of the Historic Cairo property done and Statement of Outstanding Universal Value drafted;
- Documentation collected and organised;
- Synthesis of the transformation of Cairo urban fabric drafted, 1948-2006;

- Consultation with the concerned administrations and institutions launched.

The recent political events have slowed the progress of activities due to the current unclear institutional framework. With the appointment of new official counterparts, the agreement of the Egyptian authorities on the whole project has to be confirmed.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.48

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.55**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Regrets that the State Party has not submitted the requested report on the state of conservation of the property as well as the progress report on modifications to the Cairo Financial Centre and on the elaboration of the management plan;
4. Takes notes of the information provided by the World Heritage Centre on the progress made in the implementation of the programme for the elaboration of a conservation/regeneration plan for Historic Cairo;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and a progress report on modifications to the Cairo Financial Centre and on the elaboration of the management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

49. Petra (Jordan) (C 326)

Year of inscription on the List of World Heritage
1985

Criteria
(i)(iii)(iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
24 COM VIII.38; 25 BUR V.212; 34 COM 7B.56

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 147,079 for Technical Assistance.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions

September 2000: ICOMOS mission; March 2004: UNESCO mission; 2009: UNESCO technical expert missions; December 2010: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of management plan for the property;
- b) Lack of clear boundary delimitations.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/326>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 2 February 2011. A joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out on 4-10 December 2010. The mission report is available online at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/35COM>

a) *Stabilization of unstable rock in the Siq*

The State Party reports that work has continued for the stabilization of a portion of the Siq through a conservation project that includes consolidation, stabilization and anchoring measures. The topographic map and the monitoring of activity of the crack and its vicinity have been concluded. As reported in 2010, preventive measures were also implemented which included the sealing of the crack to prevent further water seepage, the installation of a temporary support wall and tests to match geological, physical and chemical properties of the unstable rock. The anchors have been installed in April 2011 and grouting materials filled in to avoid any gaps. Within the framework of the International Assistance, a rapid risk assessment of the entire Siq will be carried out, and extra-budgetary funds will allow a full assessment of the stability of the Siq including a set of monitoring and mitigation methods. Additional extra-budgetary funds are expected to undertake the risk mapping of the entire property.

The mission verified the implementation of the works but noted that considerable cracks, which can potentially lead to significant detachments, as well as collapses of rock, can be seen throughout the site. It considers that a full risk analysis and mapping is needed of the entire Siq to provide definite solutions to cracks and unstable rocks and prevent potential collapses that might threaten visitor safety and the built environment.

b) *State of conservation of the property*

The reactive monitoring mission assessed the current state of the property. It reported that lack of maintenance is evident throughout the site and that a large part of conservation works currently implemented are of low quality and are insufficient to ensure the acceptable condition of the monuments and to mitigate decay factors that are affecting both the structures and the surfaces. The mission considers that a holistic conservation plan is urgently needed, with adequate human and financial resources for its implementation. This should also include a risk management plan to mitigate the impacts of vulnerabilities at the property, including earthquakes, flash floods, and fires, among others.

As for presentation and interpretation, the mission noted that this is insufficient and in mostly poor condition and does not reflect the significance of the site. It considers that visitor management and public use is not adequately addressed. Carrying capacity has been exceeded and no regulations have been defined to manage the increasing numbers of visitors. There is congestion at several parts of the property and impacts have been produced on the historic fabric as movement throughout the site is uncontrolled and surveillance is insufficient. The use of animals to facilitate visitation is not controlled enough.

The overall situation reflects the lack of a comprehensive plan for public use, which should be a priority objective. Previous initiatives in this respect, such as the Interpretative Plan for Petra Archaeological Plan (2000), should be updated and resources secured to ensure effective implementation.

c) Infrastructure development at the property and the Dara area

The State Party reports that impact assessments of the Dara project were carried out in 1999 and the Department of Antiquities has expressed its concerns about its potential impact. No further information is provided on how the proposal will be revised to address the situation or on the request to include the area as part of the buffer zone of the property.

The mission reports that commercial points and construction of facilities for visitors, such as toilets, have continued to increase without any control or regulations. It noted that restaurants and kiosks have a strong impact on the archaeological landscape, along with the impact caused by diesel generators. As for electricity, although there is a need to improve the existing situation, the existing proposals have not been comprehensively assessed and the required environmental and heritage impact assessments are not foreseen prior to implementation. A similar situation exists in regard to water supply and waste management, where no integral planning has been carried out.

The mission also noted that expected economic growth in the area is likely to increase negative levels of urban development, which, if left unregulated, will erode the qualities of the landscape and therefore impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The situation is further exacerbated by the fact that the precise boundaries of the property and the establishment of a buffer zone, with adequate regulations, remain to be defined in spite of the requests made by the World Heritage Committee.

In December 2010, the World Heritage Centre expressed its concern, based on the preliminary results from the reactive monitoring mission, about the impact of new constructions, in particular the construction of concrete toilets, on the integrity and environment of the property. In January 2011, the State Party responded that construction of facilities would be halted and that constructed elements would only be temporary. However, additional information, including photographic documentation, was received pointing out that constructions were in fact being continued in spite of assurances previously made. Additionally, it was mentioned that a solar power plant was foreseen and that the use of the Turkmaniye exit road was being considered for tourism purposes. As for the latter, information on the proposal has been requested since May 2010 for its evaluation and has not been submitted to date.

d) Management Plan and management arrangements

The State Party reports that a Master Plan, which would incorporate all documents prepared to date, is being prepared and expected to be finalised in late spring 2011. As for the management system, it reports that the creation of an Advisory Committee and of a Technical Committee, with representation from both the authorities and relevant stakeholders, has been proposed and is pending approval by the Government. The Committees would be responsible for conservation, development and management planning and decision-making at the property. No indication is provided on the expected date for approval and on the roles and operation of said Committees. The State Party also reports that 10% of the entrance fees have been allocated to implement conservation actions in the property.

The mission reports that no clear decision-making structures exist for the property. There are several involved agencies with overlapping functions and mandates and roles have not been clearly identified. Lack of communication and coordination among all involved stakeholders,

including the local communities, continues to exist which hinders the implementation of holistic strategies for the property. The mission also noted that human, financial and material resources are insufficient and lack the capacities to implement a sustained plan of action for maintenance, conservation, monitoring and protection. As for the Management Plan, the mission reports that in spite of the existence of several documents, no formal plan has been established or legally endorsed so far.

Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the information about the current state of the property, in particular the conditions of the heritage assets and the continued unregulated developments both at the property and the adjacent areas. They consider that long-standing issues, such as the development and implementation of a comprehensive management plan and the definition of a buffer zone, have remained unresolved, in spite of the requests made by the World Heritage Committee. They wish to highlight that if these issues are not addressed, the attributes that sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property could be considered to be under potential or ascertained threat, in which case the World Heritage Committee might consider the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.49

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.56**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Acknowledge the information provided by the State Party on the implementation of its recommendations and urges it to finalise the process to establish functioning management arrangements with adequate resources for operation;*
4. *Expresses its deep concern about the state of conservation of the property and the lack of implementation of holistic strategies to address pressing conservation, maintenance and protection issues;*
5. *Notes the results of the December 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, endorses its recommendations and requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *Prepare and implement a comprehensive risk management plan for the property, based on updated surveys to identify emergency measures and actions plans for monitoring and interventions to mitigate potential threats,*
 - b) *Develop and implement an integrated conservation plan, based on updated condition recording surveys, and identify required conservation, maintenance and protection measures to ensure the conservation of heritage assets and define conservation guidelines and principles to guide future interventions at the property,*
 - c) *Develop and implement a public use plan, including the definition of visitor management strategies and the identification of policies to guide future facility development at the property and the buffer zone,*

- d) *Halt archaeological excavations until current conservation and maintenance needs are fully addressed and develop regulations for archaeological research at the property,*
 - e) *Formulate, approve and enforce regulations for the protection of the buffer zone to ensure uncontrolled development is effectively halted and to guarantee that proposals for new development do not impact the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property;*
6. ***Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012, with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

51. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)

Year of inscription on the List of World Heritage
1984

Criteria
(i) (iii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
32 COM 7B.60 ; 33 COM 7B.57 ; 34 COM 7B.57

International Assistance
Total amount provided to the property: USD 20,000 for Technical Assistance in 2001

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount provided to the property: USD 19,173 from 1997 to 2001 for the International Safeguarding Campaign

Previous monitoring missions
2004: Evaluation mission by the UNESCO Office in Beirut; September 2006: UNESCO mission following the 2006 summer conflict; February 2009: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; 2011: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Major, and often illegal, urban development;
- b) Major highway development near the property and the redevelopment of the port;
- c) Unplanned tourism development;
- d) Lack of management and conservation plans;
- e) Insufficient maintenance.

Illustrative material
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/299>

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.51

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1998

Criteria
(iii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
27 COM 7B.103

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

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.52

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1982

Criteria
(ii) (iii) (vi)

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

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

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds
N/A

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

Conclusions

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.53

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

Criteria

(iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

33 COM 5A ; 34 COM 7B.59

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2011: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Vandalism

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.54

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

Year of inscription on the List of World Heritage
2003

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

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

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

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

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

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

b) Management plan for the property

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

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

c) Urban encroachment and other development projects

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.57

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1986

Criteria
(iv) (v) (vi)

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

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

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

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

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.60

The World Heritage Committee,

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

ASIA-PACIFIC

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1985

Criteria
(i) (ii) (vi)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

a) *Management plan*

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

b) Refraining from carrying out major conservation works

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

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

c) Personnel

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

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

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

d) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

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

Conclusions

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.61

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

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

69. Prambanan Temples (Indonesia) (C 642)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1991

Criteria
(i) (iv)

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

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

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

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

Previous monitoring missions

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

Main threats identified in previous reports

Earthquake

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

a) *Research and restoration work*

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

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

b) *Capacity building and awareness – raising*

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

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

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

c) *Planning*

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

d) *Volcanic eruption of Mount Merapi*

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

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

Conclusions:

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.69

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2001

Criteria
(iii)(iv)(vi)

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

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

International Assistance

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

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

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

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B 72

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2008

Criteria
(ii) (iii) (iv)

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

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

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

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

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

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

Current conservation problems

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

Conservation management plan and Special Area plans

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

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

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.73

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1988

Criteria
(iv)

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

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

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.78

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1993

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

34 COM 7B.74

International Assistance

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

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

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

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

The main recommendations of the mission are the following:

a) *Conservation project*

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

b) *Management plan*

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.79

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1993

Criteria
(iii) (iv)

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

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

International Assistance

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

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

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

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

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

a) Illegal buildings and inventory of properties of heritage significance

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

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

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

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

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

b) Suspension of major infrastructure projects

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

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

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

c) Development of a management plan

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.81

The World Heritage Committee,

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

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1983

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

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

International Assistance

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

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.87

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1997

Criteria
(iii) (iv) (v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
33 COM 8D

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
N/A

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

a) Management

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

b) Restoration, maintenance and lack of skills base

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

c) Visitor pressure

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

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

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

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

d) *Other conservation issues*

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

Conclusions

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.96

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2000

Criteria
(v)

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

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

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

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

a) *Kaliningrad Economic Development Zone*

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

Within the Kaliningrad Economic Zone there are proposals for a series of leisure complexes in the municipality of Zelenogradsk. This development is in line with a new "Federal Target Program of Economic and Social Development of the Kaliningrad Region for the Period till 2010". The planned leisure complexes would be located on four sites, two of them on the Baltic coast and two on the lagoon shore, covering a total area of 282 ha. The proposals include parking for 1,000 vehicles, 1,200 rooms/apartments, restaurants and coffee shops (with 550 seats) as well as a business and conference centre (6500 m²).

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

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

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

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

b) *Erosion of the dunes and water quality*

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

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

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

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

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

c) *Collaboration between States Parties*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

e) *Joint Management plan*

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

f) *Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.99

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2005

Criteria
(ii) (iv)

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

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

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

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

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

Current conservation issues

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

a) *New Constructions and Developments with the property*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

b) *Management*

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.103

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1990

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Current conservation issues

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

a) *Boundary issues*

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

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

b) *“Okhta Centre” Tower*

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

c) *Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

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

d) *Management of the property*

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.104

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1992

Criteria

(iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

16 COM XA

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

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

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.107

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

Criteria

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

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

International Assistance

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

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

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

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

a) Management plan development

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

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

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

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

b) Ottoman Houses Rehabilitation Strategy / Programme

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

c) Urban Renewal Projects and Impact Assessments

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

d) Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

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

e) Traffic Plan

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

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

f) *Marmaray Rail tube Tunnel Project*

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

g) *Bosphorus Transition Tunnel Project for Motor Vehicles*

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

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

h) *Golden Horn Metro Bridge Heritage Impact Assessment*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

i) Awareness raising

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

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.111

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

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

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Urban development projects:

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.118

The World Heritage Committee,

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

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2000

Criteria
(iii) (iv)

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

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

International Assistance

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

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

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

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

a) *Management system*

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

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

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

b) Protection of the property

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

c) Current state of conservation

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.119

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

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

International Assistance

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

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

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

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.120

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1982

Criteria
(iv) (vi)

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

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

International Assistance

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

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

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

Previous Monitoring Missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.125

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1983

Criteria
(iii) (iv)

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

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

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

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

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

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

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

b) *Management system*

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

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

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

c) Other issues

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

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

Conclusions

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.133

The World Heritage Committee,

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

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

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1995

Criteria
(iv)

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

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

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

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

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

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

Current conservation issues

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

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

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

Draft Decision: 35 COM 7B.135

The World Heritage Committee,

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