



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

# World Heritage

# 37 COM

**WHC-13/37.COM/7B**

Paris, 3 May 2013

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-seventh session

Phnom Penh, Cambodia

16 - 27 June 2013

**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. 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/37COM/>

All previous state of conservation reports are available through the World Heritage State of conservation Information System at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

**Decision required:** The World Heritage Committee may wish to adopt the draft Decision presented at the end of each state of conservation report.



## Table of content

I. INTRODUCTION .....	5
ELABORATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS .....	6
STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT .....	7
II. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST.....	10
NATURAL PROPERTIES.....	10
AFRICA.....	10
1. Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407).....	10
2. Sangha Trinational (Cameroun / Central African Republic / Congo) (N 1380rev) ...	10
3. Mount Kenya (Kenya) (N 800) .....	10
4. Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis) .....	13
5. Lake Malawi National Park (Malawi) (N 289) .....	13
6. Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N 1162) .....	13
7. Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199bis).....	16
ARAB STATES.....	21
8. Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506).....	21
9. Socotra Archipelago (Yemen) (N 1253) .....	21
ASIA-PACIFIC.....	22
10. Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154).....	22
11. Macquarie Island (Australia) (N 629 rev).....	27
12. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Area (China) (N 1083 bis).....	29
13. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955).....	29
14. East Rennell (Solomon Island) (N 854).....	29
15. Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590rev) .....	33
16. Ha Long Bay (Viet Nam) (N 672bis).....	38
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA .....	39
17. Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225).....	39
18. Gros-Morne National Park (Canada) (N 419).....	39
19. Gulf of Porto: Calanche of Piana, Gulf of Girolata, Scandola Reserve (France) (N 258).....	39
20. Pitons, cirques and remparts of Reunion Island (N 1317) .....	41
21. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765bis) .....	45
22. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754) .....	49
23. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900).....	49
24. Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719).....	53

25. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768rev) .....	56
26. Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany (Slovakia / Germany / Ukraine) (N 1133bis) .....	56
27. Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685bis) .....	56
28. Giant Causeway and Causeway Coast (United-Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (N 369).....	60
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....	61
29. Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1032) .....	61
30. Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205bis).....	61
31. Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) (N 1138 rev) .....	66
32. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161).....	66
MIXED PROPERTIES.....	67
AFRICA.....	67
33. Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lopé-Okanda (Gabon) (C/N 1147rev) .....	67
34. Bandiagara Cliffs (land of the Dogons) (Mali) (C/N 516) .....	67
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....	68
35. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274) .....	68
CULTURAL PROPERTIES .....	69
AFRICA.....	69
36. Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323 bis) .....	69
37. Historic Town of Grand-Bassam (Côte d'Ivoire).....	69
38. Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15).....	72
39. Lower Omo Valley (Ethiopia) (C 17) .....	76
40. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055) .....	76
41. Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev).....	77
42. Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956 bis).....	79
43. Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099) .....	82
44. Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai, and Environs (South Africa) (C 915bis).....	86
ARAB STATES.....	87
45. Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193).....	87
46. Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565) .....	89
47. Qal'at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun (Bahrain) (C 1192bis) ..	91
48. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87) .....	92

49. Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89).....	94
50. Petra (Jordan) (C 326).....	96
51. Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093).....	99
52. Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299) .....	102
53. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190).....	106
54. Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 287).....	106
55. Ancient <i>Ksour</i> of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750)..	106
56. Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) (C 1073).....	108
57. World Heritage properties of Syria .....	108
58. Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) (C 385) .....	108
ASIA-PACIFIC.....	109
59. Historic Centre of Macao (China) (C 1110) .....	109
60. Ancient Building Complex in the Wudang Mountains (China) (C 705).....	111
61. Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241) .....	114
62. Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115).....	117
63. Masjed-e Jame of Isfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 1397).....	117
64. Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi (Kazakhstan) (C 1103).....	117
65. Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121) .....	117
66. Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143).....	121
67. Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451).....	124
68. Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan) (C 602rev) .....	124
69. Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603rev).....	124
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA .....	128
70. Historic Centres of Berat and Gjirokastra (Albania) (C 569bis) .....	128
71. World Heritage properties of Vienna (Austria).....	132
72. Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784) .....	135
73. Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria) (C 217) .....	135
74. Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (C 85) .....	138
75. Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066).....	140
76. Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrássy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400bis).....	141
77. Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata (Italy) (C 829) .....	141
78. Portovenere, Cinque Terre and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto) (Italy) (C 826) .....	141
79. Alto Douro Wine Region (Portugal) (C 1046) .....	144
80. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544).....	147
81. Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation) (C 1170).....	147

82. Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632) .....	147
83. Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545) .....	147
84. Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev) .....	148
85. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356) .....	150
86. Neolithic Site of Çatalhöyük (Turkey) (C 1405) .....	150
87. L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C 865bis) .....	153
88. Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis) .....	155
89. Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1215) .....	159
90. Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 426bis) .....	159
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....	160
91. City of Potosi (Bolivia) (C 420) .....	160
92. Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia, Plurinational State of) (C 567rev) .....	160
93. Brasília (Brazil) (C 445) .....	160
94. Churches of Chiloé (Chile) (C 971) .....	164
95. Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso (Chile) (C 959rev) .....	166
96. Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526) .....	170
97. City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2) .....	174
98. National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180) .....	177
99. Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129) .....	178
100. Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis) .....	180
101. Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016) ... ..	181
102. Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500bis) .....	184
III. OMNIBUS DECISION .....	185

## I. INTRODUCTION

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

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

- Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger (see Documents WHC-13/37.COM/7A and WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add);
- Properties for which state-of-conservation reports and/or reactive monitoring missions were requested by the World Heritage Committee at previous sessions;
- Properties which have come under serious threat since the last session of the World Heritage Committee and which require urgent actions;
- Properties where, upon inscription, follow-up was requested by the World Heritage Committee.

Since the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007), the draft decisions prepared by the World Heritage Centre, jointly with the Advisory Bodies, reflect an attempt, wherever possible, to establish a two-yearly reporting cycle for most of the World Heritage properties under consideration. This would reduce the number of state of conservation reports to be examined by the World Heritage Committee (which this year number 160 in total, including 38 on the List of World Heritage in Danger), also providing States Parties, among other things, a more realistic timeframe to report on progress achieved on the Decisions by the World Heritage Committee. Exceptions to this approach have been made when special circumstances demanded an annual review. This approach for a 2-year cycle has also been strongly recommended by the experts meeting on the decision-making procedures of the statutory organs of the *World Heritage Convention* (Manama, Bahrain, 15-17 December 2010) and was adopted by the Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011) (see Decision **35 COM 12B** para.10).

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

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

advice, advisory missions (missions at the request of States Parties and financed by them) and international cooperation and Funds in Trust projects.

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

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

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

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

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

To enhance institutional memory, improve transparency of processes and easier access to the relevant information by the largest number of stakeholders, it would be a positive step to upload all such States Parties reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties on the World Heritage Centre’s website, linked to the property concerned, with public access, and not only restricted to World Heritage Centre staff members and Advisory Bodies as it is currently the case. This would also improve consistency with other UNESCO normative instruments, as all States Parties reports provided within the framework of the UNESCO Convention for the safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage (2003) are already available on the Convention’s website (see page <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00460>).

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

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

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

The first draft is then circulated several times between the relevant Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre until the report is agreed upon and reflects a joint position. It is then integrated into the main document on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties (Documents WHC-13/37.COM/7A, WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add, WHC-13/37.COM/7B and WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add), for examination by the World Heritage Committee.

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

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

## **STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT**

Decision **27 COM 7B.106.3** requested “...that the reports are categorized as follows:

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

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies refined the selection process for the properties to be discussed by the World Heritage Committee, taking into account the procedures and statutory deadlines as set out in the *Operational Guidelines*, the different monitoring tools at the disposal of the Committee and the ever growing number of properties to report on at World Heritage Committee sessions within Agenda item 7B (116 in 2010, 135 in 2011 and 141 in 2012).

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

- **if the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger is proposed,**
- **if the property is subject to the Reinforced monitoring mechanism,**
- **if significant new information regarding the property has been received after the document was issued, requiring a revision of the draft Decision,**

World Heritage Committee members can still decide to discuss in detail a state of conservation report which is submitted for adoption without discussion, providing a written request is made to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee **strictly prior to 10 June 2013**. **In agreement with the Chairperson, it will not be possible to request the opening of new items after this deadline.**

To facilitate the work of the World Heritage Committee, a standard format has been used for all state of conservation reports. This format has been adapted taking into account Decision **27 COM 7B.106** para 4, as well as Decisions **29 COM 7C** and **35 COM 12E** para. 13:

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

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

Therefore, the standard format includes:

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

As mentioned previously, the most important source of information is the state of conservation report submitted by the concerned States Parties, which according to the *Operational guidelines* need to be submitted before the statutory deadline of **1 February**.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies point out that **the respect of this deadline is important to allow for a professional assessment of the reports** and avoid delays in the preparation of working documents for the World Heritage Committee.

In this sense, at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011), the Committee requested States Parties to consider refraining from providing additional information regarding state of conservation issues “*after the deadlines indicated in the Operational Guidelines, as this information is not able to be evaluated by the Advisory Bodies*” (Decision **35 COM 12B.16**).

Delayed reports inevitably will lead to more properties being included in the Addendum documents. Therefore, in spite of the major efforts made this year to include even reports

which were delayed in documents WHC-13/37.COM/7A and WHC-13/37.COM/7B, and considering the further delays due to late missions or late receipt of complementary information, an important number of reports (88) are included in the Addendum documents (7A.Add and 7B.Add).

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

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

### NATURAL PROPERTIES

#### AFRICA

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late supplementary information)

##### 2. Sangha Trinational (Cameroun / Central African Republic / Congo) (N 1380rev)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late information)

##### 3. Mount Kenya (Kenya) (N 800)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1997

Criteria  
(vii)(ix)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/800/documents/>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 25,000  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/800/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
January 2003 and October 2008: joint UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring missions.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal forest resource extraction;
- b) Community-wildlife conflict;
- c) Poaching;
- d) Land excisions from the property.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/800/>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 30 January 2013, the State Party submitted a short report on the state of conservation of the property, which unfortunately provides little information on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 monitoring mission or the concerns raised by the Committee at its 35th session. The State Party submitted a proposal for the extension of the property to include the Lewa Conservancy and Ngare Ndare Forest Reserve, which will be examined by the Committee under item 8 of the Agenda.

*a) Demarcation of the boundary*

Action to demarcate the boundary between plantation zones and natural forest is included in the Mount Kenya Ecosystem Management Plan (2010-2020), but the State Party provides no update on the matter. It remains unclear if the replacement of physical boundary signs recommended by the 2008 mission has been accomplished.

*b) Establishment of wildlife corridors*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the Committee at its 35th session welcomed completion of the elephant corridor connecting Mount Kenya and the northern rangeland through the Lewa Wildlife Conservancy, but recommended that additional wildlife corridors should be developed in order to mitigate any likely adverse impacts of fences on wildlife populations. The State Party does not provide any information on the establishment of additional corridors.

*c) Management of the property – illegal activities and fire prevention*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the 2008 mission recommended defining the roles and responsibilities between Kenya Wildlife Services (KWS) and Kenya Forest Services (KFS) with regards to the management of the property. Both parties are now signatories to the Mount Kenya Ecosystem Management Plan, and the State Party reports an intensification of joint security patrols which suggests collaboration between the two agencies is good. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that if the proposed extension is approved by the Committee, the implementation of a single ecosystem wide joint management plan would require a high degree of collaboration between both these agencies and the Lewa Wildlife Conservancy.

The State Party states that this intensification of security patrols has helped reduce the threat of illegal logging and poaching. It notes that the transfer of responsibilities and benefits to the communities through the establishment of Community Forestry Associations (CFAs) and related agreements signed between KFS and the CFAs to manage the sustainable utilisation of various sections of the forest, together with complementary efforts to diversify the local subsistence economy, is stated to have greatly reduced illegal logging and poaching, and to also have motivated the communities to participate in fire prevention and control.

The State Party reports that all stakeholders together have developed a Mount Kenya Hotspot Strategic Fire Plan to guide future fire preparedness within the ecosystem. This Plan is at a final draft stage awaiting finalization and launch. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the report does not mention the very important fire that raged across Mount Kenya

in March 2012. According to reports received the fire raged for nine days and affected 10% of the Mount Kenya National Park.

*d) Long term impacts of climate change*

In addition to the proposed extension of the property which is considered a measure to improve its overall resilience to climate change by building greater ecological connectivity with the Matthews Range to the north, the State Party notes that Parks Canada has partnered with KWS to enclose and rehabilitate a degraded area in Gathiuru Forest as a climate change mitigation measure. It is intended that this will also serve as a demonstration plot for stakeholders to learn the best ways of rehabilitating degraded areas within the ecosystem in the face of other challenges such as grazing and fire. The State Party also refers to other rehabilitation efforts including the production of close to 3 million seedlings annually for rehabilitation activities both within the protected areas and on farms. Apart from contributing to climate change mitigation, these activities will help relieve pressure on the natural forest also.

The World Heritage Centre has prepared a “*A Field Guide to Climate Change Adaptation Strategies for Natural World Heritage Site Managers*” and an accompanying “*Climate Change Adaptation Workbook*”. These products are to be piloted in Mount Kenya, among other sites, and the output is expected to be a site-specific Climate Change Adaptation Plan that can serve as an annex to the site’s General Management Plan.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee commend the increasingly effective collaboration between the key managers, KWS and KFS, and between the managers and local communities. The various ongoing efforts to improve the property’s resilience to climate change are also encouraging.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party report provides little information on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 reactive monitoring mission or the concerns raised by the Committee at its 35th session such as the replacement of physical boundary signs and the establishment of additional wildlife corridors. They recommend that the Committee requests the State Party to urgently address these issues and to report on the progress made.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also recommend that the Committee takes note of the March 2012 fire and requests the State Party to report on the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

**Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.3**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.2**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Commends the State Party for the effective collaboration between the Wildlife and Forest Services and their efforts to increase stakeholder involvement in the site’s management, particularly through agreements with Community Forest Associations;
4. Notes with concern the significant forest fire that affected the property in March 2012 and reportedly affected 10% of the Mount Kenya National Park; and requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a report on the impacts of this fire on the

*Outstanding Universal Value of the property and the actions taken for ecological restoration of the affected areas;*

5. *Notes with satisfaction the initiatives taken to improve fire risk preparedness, and to participate in the design of a climate change adaptation methodology for World Heritage Site managers but regrets that the State Party provided only limited information on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 reactive monitoring mission or the concerns raised by the Committee at its 35th session;*
6. *Requests the State Party to urgently implement the remaining recommendations of the 2008 reactive monitoring mission, in particular the replacement of physical boundary signs and the establishment of additional wildlife corridors;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2014, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and in particular on the impacts of the 2012 forest fire as well as on the progress made in implementing the outstanding recommendations of the 2008 reactive monitoring mission.*

#### **4. Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (supplementary information required from the State Party)

#### **5. Lake Malawi National Park (Malawi) (N 289)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (State Party report on the state of conservation of the property not received)

#### **6. 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  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1162/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Theft and vandalism; Pollution of the Vaal River; Lack of tourism management, particularly access.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1162/>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013 a report on the state of conservation of Vredefort Dome was submitted by the State Party. The report gives an overview of the continued implementation of the 2008 reactive monitoring mission recommendations but did not report on some of the additional recommendations provided by the 2010 mission.

a) *Proclamation of the property under National Legislation and establishment of a Management Authority*

The State Party advises of important progress since its previous report in 2011. The University of Stellenbosch led mediation process between the Ministry for Water and Environmental Affairs and private Landowners has reached agreement for the national proclamation of the World Heritage property to proceed, resulting in the signatory of a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA). The State Party advises that documents have been drafted and the proclamation will be gazetted shortly.

The State Party recalls that the establishment of the Management Authority is linked to the proclamation of the property under national legislation and could not be finalized before the MoA was signed. Progress is reported in setting up the authority: land for a Management Authority office has been set aside and a business plan and Regulations are being established. The report further notes that in the meantime the management of the property is ensured by the Free State and North West Provinces and that an integrated management approach of the property is facilitated through the establishment of an interim Governmental Steering Committee, involving all relevant departments.

b) *Definition and on-the-ground demarcation of the legal boundaries of the three satellite sites*

The State Party notes that it has decided not to clearly mark the boundaries of the serial sites in order to better protect them, as it states that their excellent condition is due to their exact locations not being generally known. The State Party does not provide information on whether the boundaries of the three serial sites have been legally defined. It also notes that in relation to the alignment of the boundaries of the buffer zone with existing farm cadastres, it intends to submit in future a proposal for a minor boundary modification.

c) *Other issues: pollution of the Vaal River and tourism developments*

The State Party advises that a river health assessment, monitoring and work on the upgrading of the Ngwathe Waste Water treatment works and Parys Wastewater treatment works have been implemented as a basis for improving the water quality of the Vaal River.

An Environmental Management Framework (a spatial planning tool) has been commenced that will provide landuse control for the property and surrounding lands, and which is expected to help protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Land use including

tourism facilities will need to be compliant with the Framework. In addition, the State Party is developing Regulations that will provide for the management of land-use, permissible activities and developments within the site. Surveillance by state authorities has been increased in order to control illegal tourism developments.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee commend the State Party for the important progress achieved in establishing the legal protection of the property and in reaching agreement with all stakeholders for the proclamation of the World Heritage property under National Legislation. They recommend that the Committee encourages the State Party to finalize this process as a priority, and to inform the Committee when this is achieved.

### Draft Decision:      **37 COM 7B.6**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **33 COM 7B.5** and **35 COM 7B.5**, adopted at its 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 35th (UNESCO, 2011) sessions respectively,*
3. *Commends the State Party for the progress achieved in securing the support of all stakeholders for the proclamation of the property under national legislation, and requests the State Party to complete the proclamation process as soon as possible and to notify the World Heritage Centre when this has been completed;*
4. *Takes note of the efforts undertaken by the State Party to respond to the previous requests of this Committee and in particular the progress achieved in relation to land use planning controls, the establishment of the Management Authority, and the preparation of Regulations and guidance material for the effective on-ground management by the Authority and also requests the State Party to finalise work associated with previous requests as early as possible;*
5. *Further requests the State Party to implement the other recommendations of the 2010 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission, in particular in relation to the presentation of the World Heritage property to visitors, the alignment of the boundaries of the buffer zone with existing farm cadastres, visitor access and associated site protection mechanisms;*
6. *Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2015**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above.*

## 7. Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199bis)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

### Criteria

(ix)(x)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

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

### International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 70,201

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/199/assistance/>

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

November 2007 and November 2008: Joint reactive monitoring missions World Heritage Centre/IUCN

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Poaching;
- b) Reduction of elephant populations;
- c) Insufficient funding;
- d) Mineral and hydrocarbon prospecting and mining;
- e) Tourism management and development;
- f) Potential and proposed dam development.

### Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/199>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

In February 2013, the State Party submitted a brief report on the state of conservation of the property. The State Party report provides an overview of the progress achieved in the implementation of the Committee's Decision **36 COM 7B.5** but not on the implementation of Decision **36 COM 8B.43**, in which the World Heritage Committee approved the boundary modification of Selous Game Reserve.

#### *a) Poaching*

The State Party reports that a new programme to counter poaching was developed in July 2012 and has been implemented since then. It includes the employment of 40 additional permanent and 150 temporary scouts, repairs of vehicles and equipment, infrastructure rehabilitation and a re-establishment of the former patrolling system. For this purpose, the Government re-employed a former site manager with a history of achievement. The State Party is also implementing a system of Wildlife Management Areas and village game scouts in the buffer zones around the Selous as part of its official Wildlife Policy. It reports that the number of elephants killed by poachers inside the property has decreased significantly since the introduction of the new programme and notes that a report on this is under preparation, but does not provide supporting data.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the efforts of the State Party to step up the anti-poaching efforts to address the elephant poaching crisis. They note recent results of the "Monitoring of illegal killing of elephants" project (MIKE), which were presented at COP16 (Conference of Parties) of the CITES Convention, clearly show a significant increase in the

proportion of illegally killed elephants from 2002 to 2011, with 64% of all elephant carcasses found in 2011 due to poaching. This confirms the results of the 2009 elephant survey in Selous which indicated a 44% decline in the population. They note that a survey was undertaken in 2011, that the results are not yet available, and that it is important that these data are available to the scientific community. They consider that the mentioned report on poaching should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible and include data for wildlife corridors and dispersal areas such as the Selous-Niassa corridor, which are critical for maintaining the values and the integrity of the property, in order to show the impact of the anti-poaching measures taken.

*b) Funding*

The State Party report notes that the Governmental Wildlife Division will soon be converted into a parastatal authority, the Tanzania Wildlife Authority (TAWA), which will retain the income generated from hunting and viewing tourism, and address the financial shortages of the Selous. The State Party also reports that the Revenue Retention Scheme is already reinstated.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome that the retention scheme has been reinstated and the planned creation of TAWA, which should bring a sustainable solution to the funding issue. They note that no financial figures of the percentage of retention of revenues under the scheme are provided. They highlight that the timeframe for the creation of TAWA remains vague and that a draft bill does not yet exist. They consider that it will be important to ensure that transparent processes are put in place to manage the revenue generated in order for TAWA to be effective.

*c) Mining and hydrocarbon exploration*

The State Party report notes that mining exploration is currently being undertaken in the South-Western sector of the property, which is assumed to refer to the Mkuju uranium mine, and that no exploration of hydrocarbons is taking place within the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) approved in an exceptional and unique manner the boundary modification for the Mkuju River uranium mine, due to the significant conservation commitments made by the State Party at the time and note that the Committee requested the State Party to report on the implementation of specific activities as detailed in its Decision **36 COM 8B.43**, in particular:

- Extending the reserve by annexing valuable forest area in order to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property,
- Implementing an environmental management and monitoring plan for the Mkuju River Mining Site,
- Respecting the economic and social needs of the population and workers in connection to the uranium mine,
- Carrying out mining and processing of uranium in adherence to International Atomic Energy Agency rules, and
- Ensuring that investors contribute financially to the property.

They note that such a report has not been submitted by the State Party.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note that given the complex hydrology of Selous, the Mkuju uranium mine, depending on its design and operating conditions, may have a significant negative impact on Selous' water-shed systems (rivers and groundwater) and also on poaching (it is expected that the mine will draw up to 1800 workers). They note that it is crucial that the uranium company and the State Party ensure that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the mine is updated as required and that impacts on the property's OUV are avoided and closely monitored.

On 26 October 2012, the German organization Rainforest Rescue delivered to the World Heritage Centre, a petition against the decision by the World Heritage Committee to modify the property's boundary. The World Heritage Centre shared this information with the State Party for comments on 8 November 2012.

#### *d) Dams*

Concerning the Stiegler's Gorge dam, the State Party report indicates that no official notification has been made to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism on any hydroelectric power projects in the property, and that the Ministry will keep the Committee informed of any developments.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note media reports of January 2013 that planning for the Stiegler's Gorge dam in the centre of the property is ongoing: the reports note that a Memorandum of Understanding was signed between the Rufiji Basin Development authority and the Brazilian construction company Odebrecht and that a proposal for the development of the project was presented to the Government. A letter was sent to the State Party to comment on these reports in April 2013. At the time of drafting of this report, no reply had been received.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the dam project would not only flood a major part of the northwestern reserve, but also radically alter the entire ecology of the Rufiji river and floodplain system in the tourist sector. This would adversely affect the most important ecological elements of the reserve and severely impact its OUV. They recall that the World Heritage Committee in its Decisions **35 COM 7B.6** and **36 COM 7B.5** decided that any decision to go forward with dam construction inside the property would constitute a clear case for inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that a new dam with a 700 MW hydropower plant, planned at Mnyera Falls (west of the reserve), could potentially serve as an alternative to Stiegler's Gorge dam. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee requests the State Party to conduct a comparative analysis of alternatives to the Stiegler's Gorge dam, in the context of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), to comprehensively assess less environmentally damaging alternatives.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also recall the commitment of the State Party not to undertake any development activities within Selous Game Reserve, and its buffer zone without prior approval of the World Heritage Committee.

The State Party has confirmed that due to a new design the Kidunda dam at the northeastern tip of the reserve will not flood any part of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note however that there is no confirmation that the flooding of the key wildlife areas bordering the property in the north, will also be avoided, as requested by the Committee (Decision **36 COM 7B.5**, paragraph 7b). Without these plains and wetlands, which serve as an indispensable dry season grazing reservoir, and which constitute a registered village Wildlife Management Area, the wildlife populations of the reserve's northern sector cannot be maintained.

#### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party has initiated steps to address the poaching crisis, in particular of elephants. They also note the reintroduction of the retention scheme as a major step in the right direction, in particular as it remains unclear when the new Wildlife Authority (TAWA) will be operational. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the exceptional boundary modification at the Mkuju uranium mine area was agreed by the Committee on the basis of major conservation commitments made by the State Party. However, the State Party has not provided a progress report on the implementation of these commitments (as requested by the Committee in Decision **36 COM 8B.43**). The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee welcome the

positive actions taken, but express its deep regret that the State Party has not submitted the required progress report and requests its submission as soon as possible.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the planning and financing of the Stiegler's Gorge dam project, which would severely affect the property's OUV seems to continue and recall that the Committee considered (Decision **36 COM 7B.5**) that the approval of any dam within the property would represent a clear ascertained danger to the property's OUV in line with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and constitute a clear basis for its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee requests a clear commitment from the State Party not to develop the Stiegler's gorge dam project given that it is incompatible with the World Heritage status of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also recommend that given the multiple conservation issues affecting the property, the Committee urge the State Party to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in order to comprehensively identify the cumulative impacts of planned developments within the property, as well as within important wildlife corridors and dispersal areas that are critical for maintaining the values and the integrity of the property. A SEA should act as a forward-planning tool to enable the State Party to identify and assess least environmentally damaging development alternatives and plan mitigation measures in order to maintain the OUV of Selous for future generations.

**Draft Decision:**            **37 COM 7B.7**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **36 COM 7B.5** and **36 COM 8B.43** adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Deeply regrets that the State Party has not provided a progress report on the implementation of its conservation commitments in connection with the boundary modification at the Mkuju uranium mine, as requested in Decision **36 COM 8B.43** and urges the State Party to implement the commitments made and to immediately submit this report;*
4. *Welcomes the anti-poaching measures initiated by the State Party as well as the reinstatement of the retention scheme and requests the State Party to submit as soon as possible a report on the efficiency of these measures and to provide a clear timeframe for the creation of the Tanzania Wildlife Authority (TAWA);*
5. *Takes note of the fact that no official notification has been made to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism on any proposed hydroelectric power projects in the property but notes with concern that the planning of the Stiegler's Gorge dam project is reportedly advancing and a proposal for the development of the project was presented to the Government;*
6. *Reiterates its position that the approval of any dam within the property would constitute a clear basis for its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in line with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines, and urges the State Party to provide a clear commitment not to develop the Stiegler's gorge dam project given that it is incompatible with the World Heritage status of the property;*

7. Also urges the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 2010 reactive monitoring mission to the property and fully implement its commitments agreed in relation to the excision of the Mkuju uranium mine, in particular adding valuable forestland to the property and finalizing compensation in line with the prescribed national legal procedures, including gazettelement;
8. Also requests the State Party to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment to comprehensively identify the cumulative impacts of the following developments, assess least damaging alternatives and plan mitigation measures as appropriate: mining, energy, agriculture and associated infrastructure, such as road building, both within the property as well as in important wildlife corridors and dispersal areas that are critical for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property;
9. Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the state of conservation of Selous Game Reserve, including the impacts of elephant poaching, the management of the impacts of the Mkuju uranium mine adjacent to the property, assess the status of the Kidunda dam and Stiegler's Gorge dam projects as well as the implementation of the recommendations of the 2010 monitoring mission;
10. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a progress report on the implementation of the above, as well as a progress report on the implementation of Decision **36 COM 8B.43**, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014, **with a view to considering, in the case of confirmation of ascertained or potential danger, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

## **ARAB STATES**

### **8. Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late request to the State Party for a report on the state of conservation of the property)

### **9. Socotra Archipelago (Yemen) (N 1253)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the mission report)

## 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  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/154/documents/>

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
March 2012: joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Coastal development
- Development of ports and Liquefied Natural Gas facilities
- Extreme weather events
- Grounding of ships
- Water quality
- Oil and gas

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/154>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

#### Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. The report provides a response to Decision **36 COM 7B.8**, a summary of progress on the recommendations from the March 2012 reactive monitoring mission and a notification of proposed developments consistent with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* and as requested by Decision **35 COM 7B.10**. An updated notification of proposed developments from the State Party was received on 29 March 2013. A significant amount of information, including an evaluation of progress by a range of noted Australia based NGOs (*WWF-Australia and the Australian Marine Conservation Society. 2013. Status and Implementation of Recommendations in World Heritage Committee Decision 36 COM 7B.8, Great Barrier Reef (Australia) and the March 2012 reactive monitoring mission*), was provided to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN. These reports are available at: <http://m.wwf.org.au/index.cfm?6081/Report-to-the-UNESCO-World-Heritage-Committee>).

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note the outcomes of a number of important scientific and technical reports released during 2012, indicating significant loss of coral cover over the past 27 years resulting mainly from storm damage, climate change effects and crown of thorns starfish and concluding that reducing crown of thorn starfish outbreaks are a key factor in restoring the loss. The World Heritage Centre has asked the State Party for its

comments on the information. At the time of finalizing this report, no reply had yet been received from the State Party.

a) *Coastal development*

The State Party reports that, as requested by the Committee, no new port developments or associated port infrastructure have been approved outside existing long-established major port areas. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that no explicit policy statement by the Australian government has been made that assures port development outside of existing major port areas are not permitted. The State Party reports that currently a total of 43 proposed developments are being assessed for potential impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

On 31 October 2012, the Queensland Government released a draft Great Barrier Reef Ports Strategy 2012-2022 for public consultation. The document sets out the vision and principles for the Queensland government's approach to port planning and development in the property, and proposes to prevent "significant" development outside existing port areas until 2022, but does not restrict development to the existing footprints of individual ports. According to the Strategy, development can occur in all areas identified in the land use plans for each port. *The World Heritage Centre and IUCN received reports indicating* that in recent years a number of port boundaries were extended significantly to include areas of significant habitat that contribute to OUV. They note that the Queensland Deputy Premier's media release announcing the draft Port Strategy stated that future development would be possible "at several locations such as Balaclava Island and Port Alma in the Port of Gladstone". They also note that both these locations are outside existing major port areas (40 to 50 km away from the port of Gladstone), in the relatively undeveloped Fitzroy River delta, and that there is currently no development on Balaclava Island that could justify its classification as an existing port area.

The State Party reports that the Queensland Government policy and planning framework "*Draft Coastal Protection State Planning Regulatory Provisions*" is expected to continue to provide protection of key coastal biodiversity values and ensure appropriate planning arrangements for coastal development. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received reports that the proposed changes to land use planning legislation would a) significantly weaken protection of ecological features of the reef, including (riparian) vegetation in the property's catchments; b) require assessment of matters related to coastal protection for fewer types of development, and only for development proposals located in the narrow coastal management district; and c) weaken the provisions for dredging and disposal of dredged material.

On 19 February 2013, the Australian Government announced the Terms of Reference for the Independent Review of the Port of Gladstone, and a scientific review panel was established. Their tasks include a review of all previous findings and information used as a basis for the current approvals for development at the Port of Gladstone. A final report of the findings of the independent review is expected by 30 June 2013.

b) *Strategic Assessment and Long Term Plan for Sustainable Development*

The State Party reports that the strategic assessment of the property (led by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) and the strategic assessment of the adjacent coastal zone (led by the Government of Queensland) are on track and a sustainable development plan will be provided for review to the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015. While the strategic assessments concentrate on assessing the effectiveness of planning, management and institutional arrangements to protect matters of national environmental significance, the long term sustainable development plan is envisioned to establish clear principles and outcomes to achieve the long-term future conservation of the property.

c) *Water Quality*

The State Party notes the Australian government's commitment to a second phase of *Caring for our Country* over 2013-2014 to 2017-2018 and to continue its investment in the Reef Rescue programme, but no details about the amount of the investment are provided. It is noted that the Queensland Government confirmed its ongoing commitment to the objectives and targets of the Reef Plan and to maintain the existing AUS\$ 35 million annual budget allocation for reef water quality initiatives in addition to AUS\$ 2 million to improve education about improved land management practices among farmers.

The State Party mentions that it will continue to report progress towards the goals and targets of the Reef Plan through annual report cards. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that only one such report card has been published at the time of this report (in August 2011, describing the 2009 baseline). A second report card (for results up to mid-2010) was scheduled to be published in early 2012 but has not been delivered.

d) *Overall protection and management of the property*

The State Party notes that management of the property is complex and requires consideration of reasonable human use consistent with the need to maintain the property's OUV. The State Party also notes that progress is being made to articulate and, where appropriate, map the OUV of the property and indicates this work will contribute to the Strategic Assessment. Required improvements in the current management arrangements will be specified in the Strategic Assessment reports. It is further reported that work is also undertaken to identify and assess more clearly the aesthetic, geological/geomorphic and indigenous heritage aspects that contribute to the OUV of the property. Work is also underway to divide the Statement of OUV into smaller 'elements' which will enable a detailed assessment of the condition and trend for all aspects of the property's OUV, benchmarked at its 1981 state. Results of this work are envisioned to be integrated in the 2014 Great Barrier Reef Outlook Report.

The State Party further notes the establishment of a new Coral Sea Commonwealth Marine Reserve, covering 989 842 square kilometres adjoining the property, which could substantially enhance the integrity and protection and management of the property, provided it is effectively implemented.

e) *Other issues - progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission and climate change*

The State Party reports on the status of implementation of the recommendations made in the mission report. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that, while there has been some progress with some of the mission's recommendations, overall progress remains limited. They consider it essential that progress is achieved across all recommendations, in support of the overall long-term sustainable development of the reef, without pre-empting implementation of the outcomes of the Strategic Assessment.

In December 2012, a new Great Barrier Reef Climate Change Adaptation Strategy and Action Plan were released. The strategy outlines a vision toward adjusting industries and communities to a changing climate and envisions improving the overall outlook of the property. Initiatives were also undertaken to share the innovative climate change adaptation measures with other countries where coral reef systems suffer from the effects of climate change.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee welcome progress achieved by the State Party with the Strategic Assessment and the establishment of an independent review for the management arrangements for Gladstone Harbour. They consider that the consultation process of the GBRMPA-led strategic assessment appears strong, but that the one undertaken by the Queensland Government has only limited

stakeholder involvement to date. Given the substantial legislative and policy responsibility of the Queensland Government in future developments that could impact the OUV of the property, it is essential that the related Strategic Assessment has robust stakeholder engagement and consultation. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee reiterate its request that the assessment address fully the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of developments in and adjacent to the property and lead to concrete measures to ensure the overall conservation of the OUV of the property. They note that the time for the review of the management arrangements for Gladstone Harbour is very short (4 months) considering the wide range of environmental and socio-economic concerns and the critical need for comprehensive recommendations toward port development and associated operations, including shipping. They also recommend that the Committee request the State Party to ensure that this review results in optimization of port development and operation in Gladstone Harbour and on Curtis Island, as well as other existing port developments, consistent with international standards for best practice.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that some of the actions undertaken by the State Party appear inconsistent with the requests made by the World Heritage Committee. While the State Party has not approved port developments outside existing major port areas, there is also no clear commitment toward limiting port development to existing port areas. This is further supported by the continued possibility under the Queensland Government's *Great Barrier Reef Port Strategy* for development outside existing major port areas (for example, Balaclava Island and Port Alma), the proposed Queensland Government changes in land use legislation, as well as the ongoing support for development of facilities other than ports and associated infrastructure in the absence of the completion of the Strategic Assessment.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that in addition to the above-mentioned concern related to coastal development, another key concern is the lack of clarity about whether the negative trend in water quality continues to be reduced and the positive signs of restoration are maintained, as annual water quality report cards have not been published as predicted. They recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to confirm a clear financial commitment by the Australian Government to maintain the Reef Rescue programme as a matter of urgency.

In its previous decision, the Committee decided to consider the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in the absence of substantial progress. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that the State Party has made progress on some key issues and actions but progress on several recommendations, including those related to water quality and measures to prevent coastal development that can negatively impact on the OUV of the property and/or undermine the outcomes of the forthcoming Strategic Assessment, remains limited. Urgent and decisive action is needed to address these issues. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee reiterate its request to the State Party to undertake the following actions in order to maintain the property's OUV: a) make a clear financial commitment to maintain the Reef Rescue programme and ensure water quality continues to improve, b) halt the approval of coastal development projects that could individually or cumulatively impact on the property's OUV and compromise the ongoing Strategic Assessment, and c) ensure that the legislation protecting the property remains strong and adequate to maintain and enhance its OUV. They further recommend that the Committee consider the Great Barrier Reef for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 38th session in 2014 in the absence of a firm and demonstrable commitment on these priority issues by the State Party.

**Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.10**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.8**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Welcomes the progress made by the State Party with the Strategic Assessment and reiterates its request to the State Party to ensure that the assessment and the resulting long-term plan for the sustainable development of the property are completed against defined criteria for success, fully address direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on the reef and lead to concrete measures to ensure the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property;
4. Also welcomes the establishment of an independent review of the management arrangements for Gladstone Harbour, and requests that these efforts result in the optimization of port development and operation in Gladstone Harbour and on Curtis Island, as well as other existing port developments, consistent with the highest internationally recognized standards for best practice commensurate with iconic World Heritage status;
5. Notes with concern the limited progress made by the State Party in implementing key requests made by the Committee (Decision **36 COM 7B.8**) and the recommendations of the March 2012 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission and urges the State Party to strengthen its efforts in order to fully implement the Committee requests and mission recommendations that have not yet or only partially been implemented;
6. Also notes with concern that the impacts of poor water quality and ongoing coastal development on the reef continue and progress toward addressing them is limited, and also requests the State Party to urgently address these issues, including by making urgent commitments to:
  - a) Maintain, and increase where necessary financial investment in the Reef Water Quality Protection Plan and associated Reef Rescue measures to address major long-term impacts on the property from poor water quality beyond 2013, and ensure the timely publication of annual water quality report cards indicating trends in water quality,
  - b) Ensure rigorously that development is not permitted if it would impact individually or cumulatively on the OUV of the property, or compromise the Strategic Assessment or the resulting long-term plan for the sustainable development of the property,
  - c) Ensure that no port developments or associated port infrastructure are permitted outside the existing and long-established major port areas within or adjoining the property,
  - d) Ensure that the legislation protecting the property remains strong and adequate to maintain and enhance its OUV;
7. Considers that the above-mentioned issues represent a potential danger to the OUV of the property in line with paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, including on the

*implementation of actions outlined above as well as on the other points raised in the 2012 mission report, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

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

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

### Criteria

(vii)(viii)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/629/documents/>

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

N/A

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- g) Invasive Species
- h) legal and illegal long-line fishing

### Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/629/>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report gives an overview of the implementation and preliminary results of the Macquarie Island Pest Eradication Plan, the State Party's findings regarding the dieback of the Macquarie Cushion Plant, and impacts of long-line fishing within and outside the Australian Exclusive Economic Zone around Macquarie Island.

#### a) *Rabbit and rodent eradication*

The Macquarie Island Pest Eradication Plan is aimed at the eradication of introduced rabbits and rodents (mice and rats). The State Party reports that no rabbits have been observed since December 2011, and no rodents have been detected since June 2011. Vegetation has been re-established and seabirds returned to breed in previously affected areas.

#### b) *Dieback of Macquarie Cushion Plant*

The State Party confirms the progressive dieback of the Macquarie Cushion Plant and attributes it to changes in climatic conditions (increased drying due to greater wind speeds and hours of sunshine) in possible combination with disease. The dieback is reported to be

occurring throughout the property. The State Party plans to establish an *ex situ* orchard in the property, which, together with stored seed, may help to restore populations in the future.

c) *Impact of long-line fishing inside the Exclusive Economic Zone around Macquarie Island on seabirds*

The State Party recalls its research and bycatch mitigation efforts to reduce the impact of legal and illegal long-line fisheries on seabirds. These efforts are proceeding in cooperation with international organisations and instruments, including the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels, the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, and the relevant regional fisheries management organisations. The State Party indicates that long-line fishing is now authorised inside the Exclusive Economic Zone around the property, following four seasons of long-line trials during which time no seabird by-catch was recorded.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress and preliminary results of the Macquarie Island Pest Eradication Plan which show that no rodents have been detected since June 2011, that the vegetation has been re-established and that seabirds returned to breed in previously affected areas. They also welcome the State Party's on-going efforts to implement measures to mitigate the dieoff of Macquarie Cushion Plant.

IUCN notes that it will be important that within the foreseen monitoring programme, outcome monitoring will be included, without which it will be difficult to establish the sustainability of the eradication programme and to document the ensuing vegetation recovery.

**Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.11**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.10**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Expresses its satisfaction about the preliminary results of the Macquarie Island Pest Eradication Plan which show that no rodents have been detected since June 2011, that the vegetation has been re-established and that seabirds returned to breed in previously affected areas and notes the on-going efforts of the State Party to implement measures to mitigate the dieback of the Macquarie Cushion Plant, and to limit impacts of long-line fishing within and outside the Australian Exclusive Economic Zone around Macquarie Island;*
4. *Welcomes the commitment of the State Party to continue to monitor the results of the Macquarie Island Pest Eradication Plan and requests the State Party to include the monitoring of outcomes to confirm the continued recovery of the property's vegetation and ecosystems;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed on the progress made in implementing the above recommendations.*

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late mission)

## 13. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (State Party report on the state of conservation of the property not received)

## 14. East Rennell (Solomon Island) (N 854)

Year of Inscription on the World Heritage List  
1998

Criteria  
(ix)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/854/documents/>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 56,335  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/854/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
October 2012: IUCN reactive monitoring mission; March – April 2005: UNESCO/IUCN monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Mining - previously reported threats from mining and commercial fishing have passed.
- b) Logging;
- c) Invasive species;
- d) Over-exploitation of coconut crab and marine resource;
- e) Legislation, management planning and administration of the property.

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/854>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. An IUCN reactive monitoring mission was carried out to the property from 21

to 28 October 2012. The mission report is available at the following link: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM>.

#### *a) Logging*

The State Party notes that an application submitted by a group of landowners in 2011 to conduct logging operations within the property, was not successful due to strong opposition from other landowners, the general public of East Rennell, the Rennell Bellona provincial government and the Ministry of Environment. Consequently a timber rights hearing will not proceed. A January 2012 assessment of the logging operations in West Rennell (outside the property) conducted by the Environment Division of the Ministry of Environment shows that the company had adhered to the conditions of its licence and the Solomon Islands Code of Logging Practice, but that logging was causing major ecological damage which could result in loss of plant and animal species. The report further claims that although there would be visible impacts for visitors and loss of biodiversity on the island generally, there would be no direct impact on the natural values of the property. The report recommended that development consent be issued for the existing logging operation as required under the Environment Act 1998. The State Party reports that the Government did not have the power to ban logging operations on land under customary ownership, but admitted there was a lack of communication between the Ministry of Environment and the landowners in the granting of existing licences.

The October 2012 mission observed the destructive impacts from clear-felling of broad strips of forest in West Rennell, and the construction of a network of logging roads, log staging areas, ponds and logging camps, and reported undesirable social impacts for island residents from logging operations. The mission further observed that the forests of East Rennell are intrinsically linked within a single island-wide forest ecosystem to those of West Rennell, and that, contrary to the claims made in the January 2012 Ministry of Environment's report, any disturbance of the island's forest ecosystems through logging in West Rennell is likely to have severe adverse impacts on the forest wildlife in the property. The mission noted that current logging operations are being conducted without full legal authority or proper consultation with customary landowners, and that there are no legal provisions in force for protection of the property against logging.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN would like to recall that the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for this property, approved by the State Party and adopted by the Committee in Decision **36 COM 8E** (Saint-Petersburg, 2012), warns that logging in lands adjacent to the property, in West Rennell, could have severe adverse impacts on the forests within the property. It adds that the property's forests were intrinsically linked to those of West Rennell and were insufficient on their own to ensure the long-term survival of a number of endemic birds. Moreover, in its Decision **36COM 7B.15** (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) the Committee requested the State Party to ban all commercial logging on the island, further indicating that inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger would be considered based on how the State Party responded to this request, among others.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that in addition to negative impacts from logging, the construction of wharves, establishment of staging and loading areas, and the increase in activity by logging vessels could all threaten the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the substantial marine component of the property.

#### *b) Invasive species*

The State Party acknowledges that there is obvious impact of black ship rat (*Rattus rattus*) on coastal coconut plantations in West Rennell where logging machinery was off-loaded from ships. It further reports that there is no information about invasive land snails but this will be investigated with help of information from local communities, and that the impacts of invasive species on the natural values of the property require further investigation.

The mission observed that Rennell Island has until now been notable in the Pacific region for the absence of rats and expressed concern that introduced rats will spread into forest areas, especially via logging roads and clearings, where they will have a severe impact on native wildlife including within the property. The mission also reports that African land snails have been seen in the capital Honiara and could gain access to Rennell Island on shipments of food and other produce, where they would compete with the 27 species of native land snails and put their survival at risk, as well as having a destructive impact on crops and other vegetation. The mission observed that there is no evidence of any assessment of the problem of invasive species or that any control measures are in place or planned.

*c) Over-exploitation of coconut crab and other marine resources*

The State Party notes that coconut crabs (*Birgus latro*) have critically declined in size and numbers due to unsustainable over-harvesting by residents in the property. It also reports that a survey of marine resources in the property was conducted in December 2012 and that this will be the basis of deciding any management action. The results of the survey are not provided in the State Party's report, despite the Committee's request that any (preliminary) results of such a study be made available to the mission.

The October 2012 mission noted that crabs have disappeared from the western part of Rennell Island, and that within the property the harvesting success rate is dropping, raising concerns that increased harvesting pressure may lead to localised extinction of the species. Harvesting of marine resources is unregulated and traditional conservation measures have been supplanted by a more commercial approach. The management plan for the property makes provision for several measures to regulate the harvesting of marine resources. However, while the plan is well-directed in principle, it has never been implemented and there is no evidence that resources will be provided to do so. The mission concluded that suitable controls on harvesting of marine resources and coconut crabs are urgently required. A return to traditional conservation measures should be encouraged.

*d) Legislation, administration and management of the property*

The State Party indicates that new national protected area legislation was enacted in 2010. A provincial Lake Tegano Heritage Park Ordinance has been drafted. An intention to update the 2007 East Rennell Management Plan is also noted.

The mission observed that the property is still not declared as a protected area under the Protected Areas Act 2010 and the 2009 Rennell-Bellona Province Lake Tegano Natural Heritage Park Ordinance is currently still in draft form and is yet to come into force. It reported that the management plan for the property has not been effectively implemented. The plan does not fully provide for traditional management under customary laws, or for enforcement of laws and regulations, and it lacks institutional capacity for implementation. There is no evidence that either the local community or other provincial and national authorities have yet made any attempt to review and strengthen the provisions of the management plan in addressing the threats of potential logging operations in East Rennell.

*e) Other issues – Climate Change*

The October 2012 mission reported that weather patterns over the past two decades suggest that climate change may be inducing a higher frequency of cyclonic activity, which in the past has led to extensive damage to forests and high mortality of birds and bats in particular. In addition, climate change effects, including increasing cyclone activity, as well as increasing water levels and salinity in Lake Tegano, induced by sea level rise, have led to shortages of housing, food and medical supplies. The mission considered that environmental controls and replanting are required to alleviate the impacts of lakeshore flooding and increased salinity of lake waters.

## Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the ongoing logging of forests in West Rennell in the Tehakamagoku concession area (12 kilometres away from the property), and the proposal to log forests within the property in the Agapogabu Forest Concession represent a clear ascertained and potential danger respectively to the ecological integrity of the property and its Outstanding Universal Value, in accordance with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*. Furthermore, they consider that the introduction of invasive species represents a potential danger to its OUV, in line with paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*. They therefore recommend that the Committee may wish to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and that it request the State Party to develop and implement an Emergency Action Plan with in-country and international donor support.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that the property's OUV is under serious threat from existing and on-going commercial logging operations in West Rennell and note that the property itself remains legally unprotected from any future logging operations. They strongly recommend that the Committee reiterate its request for the imposition of an immediate ban on all commercial logging operations on Rennell Island, and that the State Party be requested to provide full legal protection to the property as soon as possible. They also consider that the associated introduction of rats and invasive land snails poses a serious threat to native animals in the property and recommend that the Committee request the State Party to immediately assess the threat to the property from invasive species, implement appropriate control and/or eradication measures, and assess the feasibility of a long-term biosecurity programme to prevent reinvasion. These measures should form part of a comprehensive revision of the Management Plan for the property giving more emphasis to traditional resource conservation practices, and the Plan should be provided with an adequate timeline, budget and other resources for effective implementation.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also recommend that the Committee request the State Party to immediately address the decline and potential loss of coconut crab and other marine resources from over-exploitation and introduce appropriate harvesting controls. They further consider that the effects of climate change are having a serious detrimental impact on the natural values of the property and the livelihoods of the local community, and recommend that the Committee promote the provision of appropriate technical advice and financial support required to assist the people of East Rennell to combat this problem.

## **Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.14**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.15**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Commends the State Party for passing the Protected Areas Act 2010 and for drafting the 2009 Rennell-Bellona Province Lake Tegano Heritage Park Ordinance, and urges the State Party to apply both of these instruments to the East Rennell property as soon as possible to ensure full and strict legal protection of the property;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to immediately ban all commercial logging from Rennell Island to avoid loss of property's Outstanding Universal Value;*
5. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to urgently undertake an assessment of the impact of invasive species, especially of associated introduction of rats and*

*invasive snails, to institute control and eradication measures as a matter of utmost priority, and to assess the feasibility of a long-term biosecurity programme to prevent reinvasion, and encourages the State Party to apply for International Assistance to support these actions;*

6. *Requests the State Party to address the over-exploitation of coconut crab and other marine resources and to apply harvesting regimes based on traditional resource management practices, and including the restrictions recommended by the mission;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to take full account of the impacts of climate change on the property and the livelihoods of the East Rennell community, and make provisions in the Management Plan for climate change adaptation and mitigation measures;*
8. *Considers that the ongoing logging of forests in West Rennell could have severe adverse impacts on the forests within the property, the fact that the property is not strictly protected against logging, and the introduction of invasive species represent a clear ascertained and potential danger respectively to the ecological integrity of the property and its Outstanding Universal Value, in conformity with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines;*
9. ***Decides to inscribe East Rennell (Solomon Islands) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;***
10. *Further requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN and with both in-country and other international partners' support, to develop and implement an Emergency Action Plan to remove the threats and provide support to the customary owners to enable them to protect the property to World Heritage standards and in accordance with traditional management practices;*
11. *Requests furthermore the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, to develop a proposal for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and a set of corrective measures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;*
12. *Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, including a report on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

Criteria

(x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

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

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

February/March 2012: joint UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Road expansion, in particular regarding Highway 304;
- b) Forest fragmentation, connectivity and the need for ecological corridors;
- c) Encroachment;
- d) Management Planning;
- e) Tourism and visitor levels;
- f) Dams and cattle grazing.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/590>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2013, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, which provides information on impacts from expansion works on Highway 304, land encroachment and cattle grazing within components of the property, and construction of the Huay Samong Dam. A report on Environmental Mitigation Measures and Environmental Monitoring Plans related to the construction of Huay Samong Dam is annexed to the report. In addition, the State Party submitted the Environmental Impact Assessment of the Wildlife Corridor and Road Widening Project on Highway 304 to the World Heritage Centre in November 2012. It deals with one of the sections where the road crosses the property boundaries. This report includes details and an assessment of proposed options for wildlife corridors for the expansion project from km 26 – 29 on Highway 304.

a) *Expansion of Highway 304*

Highway 304 runs through the joint boundary of Khao Yai and Thap Lan National Parks in two sections, from km 26 to 29 and from km 42 to 57. The State Party reports that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the Wildlife Corridor and Road Widening Project on Highway 304 (the section from km 26 – 29) is currently with the National Environmental Board, which has requested additional information from the Department of Highways (DoH). A complete English translation of the full EIA on this section of the road expansion is yet to be received by the Committee. The English translation of the EIA attached to the current State Party report outlines options for wildlife corridor construction and identifies the most suitable option. However, it does not present an assessment of the different options, and provides only summarized information on the environmental impacts of the preferred option and the proposed mitigation measures during the construction phase. It does not present clear conclusions on impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, nor does it provide details on available resources for the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. Furthermore, it does not provide any information on mitigation measures to be implemented after the construction phase. IUCN considers that the information provided by the State Party is not sufficiently detailed to demonstrate that the expansion of Highway 304 will not have significant negative impacts on the property's integrity and OUV.

The State Party provides details on actions implemented in regards to speed limits and their enforcement on the relevant sections of the highway that transect the property, including checkpoints and patrolling teams to monitor the speed of vehicles, traffic barriers and stops at crucial parts of the road, warning and interpretive signs at dangerous sections and limits

on road access at night. The State Party reports that road # 3436 that bisects the property has been closed, with ranger stations and monitoring put in place. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that other roads bisecting the property remain open. Enforcement of appropriate speed limits along these routes remains important, noting that these roads are, or have the potential to be used as short cuts through the property.

b) *Encroachment*

The State Party previously reported implementation of stricter measures to halt land encroachment within the property. The current report also provides details of additional efforts, including monitoring of encroachment levels (mapping expected to be completed in 2014) and strengthened enforcement measures. Proof of land ownership is still being resolved between the Department of National Parks (DNP) and the local communities with continued consultation between both the authorities and surrounding communities. The State Party indicates that encroachment has not increased since inscription of the property, in contrast to numerous reports received by IUCN indicating increasing encroachment, particularly along the northern border of Thap Lan National Park. IUCN is also concerned by recent newspaper reports indicating a weakening of efforts to address this issue, and notes that the property remains under heavy pressure from encroachment and neighbouring land use practices.

c) *Illegal logging*

IUCN has received reports of increased illegal logging of Siamese rosewood by armed gangs of up to 30 individuals within the boundaries of the property, especially in Dong Yai and Ta Phraya National Parks, including the tragic death of a patrol ranger in March 2013. Reported aloewood collection in Khao Yai National Park, and to a lesser degree in the other components of the property, is also a concern. The illegal logging and international illegal trade of Siamese rosewood and other valuable timber species are directly threatening the property's OUV and a cause for serious concern. There is an urgent need for concerted management action to address these issues and ensure that the OUV is maintained. This should also include international support, particularly from other Siamese rosewood range States, and States concerned with the illegal trade of Siamese rosewood and other valuable timber species (Cambodia, China, Lao People Democratic Republic, Thailand, and Viet Nam). The World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to provide further information on this issue on 8 April 2013. No comments have been received so far.

d) *Huay Samong Dam*

The State Party confirms that construction work on the Huay Samong Dam continues and indicates that all relevant agencies are working towards mitigation of the impacts on the property's OUV during construction. However, details on actions to limit the impact during construction are limited. The State Party states that the area of the property flooded on completion of the dam will serve as a protection zone against encroachment.

However, no details were provided on timelines for implementation of these work plans and which specific actions, if any, have already been implemented. Reports have also been received indicating that there has been no progress on assigning oversight of the dam reservoir area including providing a mandate for DNP to oversee management of the water area to prevent eventual poachers using fishing boats to enter deep into the parks. This issue has been identified as a problem at other sites where DNP does not have the authority to interdict criminals on the water as the management belongs to other authorities that do not have law enforcement authority in regards to the property. Finally, IUCN notes that consideration should be given to associated risks, such as the introduction of exotic commercial fish species into the reservoir, and would strongly advise that preventive measures are taken to avoid the introduction, intentional or accidental, of exotic fish species. The World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to provide further information on this issue on 12 April 2013. No comments have been received so far.

e) *Cattle grazing*

The State Party reports that levels of illegal grazing of livestock in the property have improved with the numbers of livestock decreasing significantly in recent years in response to management efforts, and notes continued efforts to remove small subsistence cattle grazing completely from the property. However, the State Party does not make a unequivocal statement in regards to the issue of release of cattle for long term grazing by commercial agricultural companies, raised in the 2012 mission report and by the Committee. The potential impact on the property from this type of cattle grazing is significantly greater than that posed by small-scale settlements which keep cattle enclosed at night. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the issue of large numbers of cattle, free ranging throughout the area, continues to complicate the removal of smaller subsistence cattle grazing and will require a high level of political will and increased enforcement.

f) *Management Planning, including tourism planning*

The State Party outlines a number of efforts to address Management Planning of the property including a revision of the original 2006 Management Plan. The first draft of the revised plan is yet to be presented for consideration by relevant national committees or the Cabinet. The State Party also provides details of a zoning system proposed for the property to assist with effectiveness of administration and operation control, and notes its willingness and interest to work with the World Heritage Centre in that regard. However, no maps or indication of when the zoning plan will be implemented or how it will be enforced are provided.

The State Party provides considerable detail and background on the issues to be considered in undertaking tourism planning, including ease of access from key transport routes and the popularity of the site due to its inscription as a World Heritage property. However, it does not provide information on the timeline for such planning or its integration into the overall Management Plan for the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note these efforts, but are concerned that insufficient management staff to oversee protection of some parks (e.g. Dong Yai and Pang Sida), as well as a lack of sufficient resources for effective anti-poaching patrols in all five component parks, are impacting on management effectiveness of the property. In that regard, IUCN is seriously concerned about reports indicating that the populations of several key species are now very low, notably Siamese Crocodile (*Crocodylus siamensis*) which is reportedly on the verge of extinction, Banteng (*Bos javanicus*) and Tiger (*Panthera tigris*), whose populations in the property are estimated to be below 30 and 20, respectively. The World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to provide further information on this issue on 12 April 2013. No comments have been received so far.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the completed expansion works on sections of Highway 304 outside the property are likely to have led to an increase in traffic on all sections of the road, and until the construction of ecological corridors is completed, the impact from the existing road on the property is likely to continue. They recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to expedite the construction of ecologically effective wildlife corridors, based on detailed plans and on completed, approved EIA reports for both sections of the Highway transecting the property (26 – 29 km and 42 – 57 km).

Assessment of the scale and extent of encroachment into the current boundaries of the property is essential to improved enforcement and management. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN therefore recommend that the Committee request the State Party to prioritise completion of a detailed mapping exercise and up to date assessment of encroachment. Priority should also be given to reducing illegal grazing activities, particularly those

conducted by commercial agricultural companies, and the increasingly aggressive illegal logging of valuable timber species within the boundaries of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain concerned by the impacts during and after construction of the Huay Samong Dam, including proposed plans for introduction of exotic species and the need for enforcement of regulations restricting access to the property once the reservoir is filled. They recommend that the Committee request the State Party to urgently complete the EIA and detailed plans for mitigation actions, including their implementation during and after the construction of the dam.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee welcome the planned revision of the Management Plan for the property and the proposed zoning plan, and recommend that the Committee request the State Party to submit the (revised) documents, including a tourism Management Plan, to the World Heritage Centre for consideration. It is essential that the updated Management Plan sets clear priorities and includes objectively verifiable indicators and implementation timeframes.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the property's OUV remains under serious threat, particularly related to the expansion of Highway 304, encroachment, illegal logging of high value timber species, particularly Siamese rosewood, and sub-optimal management. They are of the view that there has been limited demonstrable progress with the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee (Decision **36 COM 7B.17**) and the 2012 reactive monitoring mission, and that the current level of threat could warrant inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger if significant progress over the next 12 months cannot be demonstrated. They therefore recommend that the Committee request the State Party to invite an IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property before its 38th session in 2014, in order to assess progress in the implementation of the recommendations, and to make a recommendation on whether the property meets the conditions for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2014.

**Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.15**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.45** adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Extends its deepest condolences to the family of the guard killed during operations conducted to protect the property;*
4. *Notes with concern that implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, to address impacts from expansion works on Highway 304, particularly along the sections of the highway within the property, have not been undertaken and no timeline for completion has been provided, and urges the State Party to expedite the construction of ecologically effective wildlife corridors, based on detailed plans and on completed, approved Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), including detailed assessments of different options and carefully planned measures for mitigating impacts in the long term for both sections of the Highway transecting the property;*
5. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to implement and enforce speed limits and impact mitigation actions on other roads that bisect the property, and to monitor and restrict the use of other roads as shortcuts and transport routes through the property;*

6. *Requests the State Party to complete an up-to-date assessment of the level of encroachment and any increase therein since the inscription of the property, including a detailed mapping exercise, as a matter of priority, and recommends that the State Party considers submitting a request for a major boundary modification to exclude encroached areas that do not contribute to Outstanding Universal Value, and to include adjoining areas of high conservation value, following the relevant procedures as outlined in the Operational Guidelines, and with prior advice of IUCN;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to take the necessary measures to halt all illegal logging in the property, and ensure that all people participating in illegal resource extraction activities are removed from the property, and with the support of other States Parties concerned, particularly Cambodia, China, Lao People Democratic Republic and Viet Nam, halt illegal trade in Siamese rosewood;*
8. *Also notes with increasing concern that construction continues at the Huay Samong Dam site, and also reiterates its request to the State Party to undertake all necessary mitigation, enforcement and anti-encroachment actions to ensure this proposed project does not impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
9. *Further reiterates its request to the State Party to implement all the recommendations of the 2012 joint UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission, including a clear statement on the extent and status of cattle grazing in the property, by **June 2014**;*
10. *Further request the State Party to invite an IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property before the 38th session of the Committee in 2014, in order to assess progress in the implementation of the above recommendations and those made by the 2012 reactive monitoring mission, and to consider whether the property should be considered for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
11. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated and detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including a report on the progress achieved in the implementation of the 2012 mission recommendations and those actions outlined above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

## **16. Ha Long Bay (Viet Nam) (N 672bis)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

## EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of supplementary information)

### 18. Gros-Morne National Park (Canada) (N 419)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

### 19. Gulf of Porto: Calanche of Piana, Gulf of Girolata, Scandola Reserve (France) (N 258)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1983

Criteria

(vii) (viii) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/258/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous Monitoring Missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Non-renewable energy facilities
- b) Oil and gas
- c) Impacts of tourism/visitor/recreation

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/258/>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013, a report was submitted by the State Party on the state of conservation of the property, accompanied by a draft Management Plan of the Scandola Reserve.

The State Party notes that so far the prospection license for liquid or gaseous hydrocarbons has not yet been extended and is still under consideration. No exploration work is currently on-going. It further states that the request concerns the extension of an existing exploration license to confirm the existence of biogenic gas 180 km away from the property and would not allow exploratory drilling. Any request for a permit for exploratory drilling would necessitate an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which would need to take into account the ecological sensitivity of the area. The report further notes that any hydrocarbon exploration or exploitation would be subject to the conditions of the Barcelona Convention and the new regulations of the European Commission, which will enter into force in 2013.

The report confirms that pressure from tourism has increased significantly since the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List in 1993 and notes that the Council of Europe accompanied the renewal of the European Diploma to the Scandola Nature Reserve with a number of conditions and recommendations, in particular to limit the impacts of the mooring of yachts on seagrass beds and of nautical tourism activities. The report notes that the draft Management Plan of the Reserve foresees activities to address this issue. In addition, the State Party notes some other actions which are foreseen to deal with tourism pressure in the larger site. Among them are the construction of a new sewage treatment station for the city of Porto, the enlargement of the D424 road to Osani and the D81 road which borders the property at the level of the Calanche and crosses the property north of Porto. All need to obtain ministerial approval, given the protection status of the site.

The report further notes that many actors are involved in the management of the overall site and that so far no single management authority exists, nor an overall management plan for the site. As a first priority, the management plan for the Scandola Nature Reserve is being revised and expected to be finalized by September 2013.

The report also notes that an extension of the marine part and the core area of the Scandola Reserve is being considered, from Capu Rossu to the Bay of Elbo.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN take note of the fact that the gas prospection license has not been extended so far and that any exploratory drilling would require an EIA. They consider that the EIA would need to assess the potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in particular its marine ecosystems and should be submitted to the World Heritage Committee, for review.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that the World Heritage Committee should express its concern about the increase in tourism pressure on the property and they note that the draft management plan, while recognizing the problem, does not include a concrete strategy or a set of measures to address the issue. They also recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to provide further details on the proposed construction of a new sewage treatment station for the city of Porto and the possible enlargement of the D424 and traffic management on D81 roads, in line with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also recommend that the Committee welcome the efforts made by the State Party to revise the Management Plan of the Scandola Nature Reserve but note that a management plan should be developed for the entire property, which should clarify the management responsibility. They further strongly support the proposed enlargement of the Reserve and are of the view that the State Party should consider reflecting this enlargement of the property following the appropriate procedures for boundary

modifications as outlined in the *Operational Guidelines*, in particular the proposed extension of the marine area included in the Reserve.

**Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.19**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.19** adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Takes note of the fact that the gas prospection license has not been renewed so far and considers that any exploratory drilling would require an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which would need to assess its potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, in particular its marine ecosystems, and be submitted to the World Heritage Committee for review;
4. Requests the State Party to develop an overall management plan for the entire property and to clarify the existing management arrangements;
5. Notes with concern the increase in tourism pressure on the property and its possible impact on the OUV, and also requests the State Party to include in the Management Plan a sustainable tourism strategy and a set of measures to address the tourism pressure;
6. Further requests State Party to provide further details on the proposed construction of a new sewage treatment station for the city of Porto, and the possible enlargement of the D424 and D81 roads, in line with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
7. Welcomes the proposed enlargement of the Scandola Reserve and recommends that the State Party consider reflecting this enlargement of the property, following the appropriate procedures for boundary modifications as outlined in the Operational Guidelines;
8. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2016**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, as well as of the recommendations of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe.

**20. Pitons, cirques and remparts of Reunion Island (N 1317)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2010

Criteria  
(vii) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions

For details, see <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1317/documents/>

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

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1317>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted a full report concerning the state of conservation of the property. The report provides information on progress achieved in the strategy for the combat against invasive species, as well as on the management of fires that had occurred since its inscription on the World Heritage List.

a) *Management Plan*

At the time of inscription, the property did not have an overall management plan in force. In 2008, the public establishment of the La Réunion National Park (PNR) undertook the preparation of its charter that also constitutes its management plan for both the inscribed property and its buffer zone. The project for the charter of the National Park, approved by the Administrative Council on 21 June 2012, covers issues of integrity, protection and management to ensure the long-term conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. For those components of the Park located beyond the territory of the Park, the State Party foresees the completion of these provisions by 2014 through conventions and partnership contracts that will enable the definition of specific management plans and the mobilization of the necessary resources for their implementation.

b) *Invasive alien species*

During 2010, Reunion Island adopted a strategy to combat invasive species (Programme for the Control and Eradication of Invasive Species) that notably concerns prevention, active combat, awareness raising and regional, national and international cooperation. This strategy is conducted by the Directorate of Environment, Development and Housing (DEAL) and is implemented with important financial resources by a steering committee, mobilising all the competent stakeholders. The combat against invasive alien species also constitutes a transversal axis of the charter of the National Park. Demonstration projects for the installation of intensive control areas have enabled the observation of results in the field of ecosystem restoration degraded by invasive alien species. However, the eradication of certain alien invasive species remains problematic, in particular the Guava tree of China (*Psidium cattleianum*), used locally in the buffer zone, and thus its progression within the boundaries of the property is difficult to control. Forestry developments in the National Park of the Reunion Island are in conformity as regards the control of this species and support the restructuring of the sector within the boundaries of the Park. Moreover, the National Forestry Office has developed an intervention strategy and a combat programme to control European gorse. This mechanism requires adapted and sustainable resources.

Finally, following the recommendation of the World Heritage Committee to share information linked to eradication activities and the management of alien species with other interested

States Parties, the State Party has initiated an annual seminar in the Indian Ocean region (2011, 2012, 2014). A draft cooperation agreement is foreseen with the Hawaii National Park to share experiences on issues concerning the management of invasive alien species, and technical exchanges are on-going with Rodrigues Island.

All these actions require sustainable long-term implementation and the provision of sufficient human and financial resources, while ensuring close coordination between the different State components.

c) *Fire management*

In October 2010 and in 2011, fires destroyed several thousand hectares of the property (Maido and Grande Chaloupe Massifs), affecting several rare indigenous or endemic species of flora and fauna, among the rarest on Reunion Island. The main risk concerns the re-colonization by alien species of the ground following fires, in particular by the European gorse, acacia and several herbaceous species. Following the fires, a post-fire action plan (PAPIF) was defined and funds were provided for its implementation that mobilises all the public stakeholders concerned. All the actions of this plan have been initiated, in particular the strengthening of forest defence mechanisms, combat against invasive alien species and landscape restoration work, including the long-term monitoring of biodiversity. However, the presence of wandering cattle prevents the natural restoration of the area and regeneration of the forests following the fires, and favours the spread of invasive alien species and the eutrophication of the environment.

In order to improve fire prevention, Reunion Island envisages strengthening the programme for the creation of tracks (forest defence network against fire) in the Benares and Maido sectors. However, all the technical options available impact the landscape and involve risks as regards the propagation of invasive alien species. Facilitating access in this rare and vulnerable semi-arid vegetation zone also carries the risk of increasing frequentation.

The outbreak of fires in 2011 highlighted the need for aerial methods to combat fires, particularly during the high-risk season (the dry season between September-December). Mechanisms were mobilised at the end of 2012 with the repositioning of an aircraft. However, no formal commitment has been taken towards the sustainability of these means and to establish structures to facilitate their use in the territory.

d) *Other conservation problems*

Increased tourist visitation is likely to constitute a threat for the biodiversity and the landscape. Following the IUCN recommendation, the Regional Council of the Reunion Island announced in 2010 the definitive abandonment of the geothermal project in the Plaine des Sables, which was in contradiction to the protection objectives and the enhancement of the natural heritage. Furthermore, the charter of the National Park plans to prohibit geothermal development within the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that at the beginning of March 2013, representatives of the region of Reunion Island, the French Ministry of Environment, UNESCO and IUCN, as well as its French Committee, had planned a meeting to discuss the potential impacts of geothermal projects on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. However, this meeting was not held.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the geothermal development project was considered incompatible with World Heritage status at the time of inscription of the property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the State Party has taken into account the recommendations formulated in 2010 and their implementation is in progress. Implementation of action to combat invasive alien species is underway, involving all the stakeholders concerned. These actions need to be sustainable, and must be strengthened over the long-term, ensuring good coordination between all the State services, and provide adequate technical and financial support. In addition, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

recommend that the Committee request the State Party to undertake the necessary measures to evacuate the cattle from the property, in order to reduce the risk of the spreading of the invasive alien species.

However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN draw the attention of the World Heritage Committee to the fact that the programme to strengthen the network of fire breaks to combat the fires within the property and the development of some renewable energy projects could have negative impacts on the principal elements of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and that alternatives should be considered to avoid or minimize these impacts. They recommend that the Committee request the State Party to respect the commitment undertaken in 2010 prior to inscription of the property, to abandon definitively the geothermal project in the Plaine des Sables. They also note that it would be desirable to establish a global strategy concerning increasing tourism as well as interpretative schemes. They finally note that it would be also advisable to carry out evaluations on the potential impact of certain major sporting events on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

**Draft Decision:        37 COM 7B.20**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **34COM 8B.4**, adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010),*
3. *Welcomes the progress achieved by the State Party in the preparation of a management plan and the implementation of a strategy to combat invasive alien species, and requests the State Party to provide all the technical and financial resources for the effective long-term implementation of these mechanisms, and to undertake the necessary measures to evacuate the cattle from the property;*
4. *Also requests the State Party to:*
  - a) *strengthen the means to eradicate the Chinese Guava tree (*Psidium cattleianum*) within the boundaries of the property, and to ensure that this objective is inscribed in the forestry development and multi-annual programmes, and support the restructuring of the Guava fruit production activities in the buffer zone,*
  - b) *prepare a prevention, monitoring and rapid intervention strategy to combat fires and ensure minimal impact in implementation on the values of the property, in particular to avoid opening new tracks and to preferably opt for the use of aerial means to combat fires during the dry season,*
  - c) *ensure close coordination with the different stakeholders regarding the actions to be implemented for fire management, and involve the population in fire surveillance activities;*
5. *Recommends the State Party to seek IUCN's expertise with regards to post-fire management and the control of invasive alien species;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to develop a tourism management strategy for the property taking into account the results of the evaluation survey, currently underway, on the potential impact of major sporting events on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
7. *Recalls that the geothermal development project is incompatible with World Heritage status and requests furthermore the State Party to respect the commitment made in*

2010, prior to inscription of the property, to definitively abandon the geothermal project in the 'Plaine des Sables';

8. Also recalls that economic activities such as agriculture, arboriculture, energy production and tourism must be managed in a way to avoid negative impacts to the integrity and the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, that the development projects for economic purposes having a potential impact on the property must be the subject of environmental evaluations, in conformity with international regulations on best practice and requests moreover the State Party to submit the environmental impact assessments to the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
9. Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, and on the implementation of the above.

## 21. Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1996, extension 2001

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/765/documents/>

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
1997: IUCN fact-finding mission; May 2004, August 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring missions.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal salmon fishing;
- b) Gold mining;
- c) Gas pipeline;
- d) Development of a geothermal power station;
- e) Forest fires;
- f) Boundary changes;
- g) Construction of the Esso-Palana road;
- h) Need for the development of a comprehensive national legal framework for the protection and management of natural properties;
- i) Lack of management structure and coordination system.

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/765/>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2013, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party, providing information on the general conservation status of the two Federal State Reserves and four regional nature parks that are part of the property, as well as on on-going and planned development projects that might affect the integrity of the property. The report only includes limited information on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 reactive monitoring mission.

#### a) *Conservation status and trends in wildlife populations in Kronotsky Strict Nature Reserve and South Kamchatka Wildlife Reserve*

The State Party reports that both reserves are in good conservation state, due to their remoteness, lack of transport infrastructure, the strict limitation on the number of visitors and the strict conservation regime. The State Party provides data on abundances but no trend data for key mammal species including Brown Bear, Sable, Sea Otter, Harbour Seal and Sea Lion, and assesses these as near the natural carrying capacity. Exceptions are the negative trends of wild Reindeer and Snow Sheep in Kronotsky Reserve. The former is reported to have more than halved in six years to around 900 in 2012, due to natural disasters and poaching as well as disturbance on winter pastures outside the reserve, in particular in the upper reaches of the Zhupanova River. The report also notes that potential threats from activities in adjacent areas are getting more significant every year. The State Party considers that one underlying reason for the observed decreases in some species is that the property only includes parts of the range of these populations. To address this issue, the report notes that the Commission for Rare and Endangered Species of Kamchatka Krai proposed to add 3000 ha to the Reserve as well as the creation of a conservation zone in the upper reaches of the Zhupanova River. The report states that surveys conducted by the Kamchatka Research Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography show that salmon population trends in Kronotsky Reserve are stable, due to effective conservation management and restrictions on fishing in the rivers leading to the main spawning grounds. Surveys are also reported to show that the Sockeye Salmon population at South Kamchatka Wildlife Reserve is also in good condition, with four million spawning individuals reported from Kurilskoe Lake in 2008-12. However, the State Party reports increasing salmon poaching near the reserve and has increased patrolling intensity in these areas.

#### b) *Management and conservation status of the nature parks that are managed by "Volcanoes of Kamchatka Natural Park" Regional State Budgetary Institution*

The State Party recalls that since 2010 the management of the four regional nature parks (Klyuchevskoy, Bystrinsky, Nalychevo and South Kamchatka Nature Parks) has been brought under a unified management structure. The State Party considers these parks in satisfactory conservation state and wildlife populations are reported to be stable in spite of allowed sports fishing and hunting. However no data is provided on numbers and trends. The State Party further reports on efforts to strengthen the management system, in particular the geo-referencing of the boundaries and the introduction of a monitoring system for key species.

#### c) *Plans to develop hydropower stations*

The State Party clarifies that no hydropower station is currently planned inside the property, but that construction of a hydropower station on the Zhupanova river near but outside the property is currently under consideration by the Government of Kamchatka Krai. The State Party notes that this construction could affect the integrity of some natural values of the property, such as the wild Reindeer population that uses Zhupanovskaya tundra as winter pasture but notes that a final decision will only be made after an assessment of the ecological risks.

d) *Overall area and boundaries of the nature parks managed by “Volcanoes of Kamchatka Natural Park” Regional State Budgetary Institution*

The State Party stresses that the boundaries of the nature parks that form part of the property were not revised in 2010-2012 but that the boundaries were “specified”, without explaining the exact meaning of this term.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that Decision **36 COM 7B.21** refers to a discrepancy between two documents with information from the State Party, namely the Retrospective Inventory (2011) and the report submitted by the State Party in preparation of the 36th session of the Committee (Saint-Petersburg, 2012), which explicitly states that the borders of the Nature Parks were revised in 2010. They note that the State Party did not submit a map showing the current boundaries of the property, as has been requested by the Committee.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party does not include a substantial part of the information requested in previous decisions or the implementation of a number of the recommendations of the 2007 monitoring mission. They note that the State Party reports that potential threats from adjacent areas are getting more significant every year.

They recommend that the World Heritage Committee welcome the information provided by the State Party that there are no plans to develop hydropower stations inside the property. They consider that potential impacts of the construction of a hydropower station on the Zhupanova river, a key wintering area for wild Reindeer, on Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) should be systematically assessed through an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) prior to any final decision on the project’s implementation, including a specific assessment of impacts on Outstanding Universal Value, and to submit copies of these EIAs to the World Heritage Centre in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that, while some information on current wildlife abundance has been provided by the State Party for two out of six component reserves of the property, this is still insufficient to adequately assess the conservation status of the property as a whole. They also note that the current status of wild Reindeer and Snow Sheep remains a cause for serious concern. They support the proposals made to create a conservation zone to better protect the wintering grounds of these species. They note the reported efforts to set up a monitoring system for key species in the natural parks and recommend that the Committee reiterates its request to the State Party to urgently develop and implement a comprehensive monitoring system for the entire property in order to obtain detailed numerical trend data.

According to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, there is still a need for the State Party to clarify apparent contradictions regarding the overall area of the four regional nature parks that contribute to the property, as the area estimate provided by the State Party in 2012 appears to be smaller by 12,492 ha than the area provided by the State Party in the Retrospective Inventory (2011).

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that the recommendations of the 2007 mission remain valid. More particularly, there continues to be an urgent need for an effective management structure and overall management plan for all six protected areas comprised in the property, for a revision of their individual management plans, where such plans exist, for the development of a comprehensive tourism management plan, and for adequate legal protection of the areas that now form the “Volcanoes of Kamchatka Natural Park”.

**Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.21**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.21** adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Notes with concern that the State Party reports that potential threats on the property from adjacent areas are getting more significant every year and regrets that the State Party does not provide sufficiently detailed information on trends in wildlife populations inside the property, nor on the implementation of several of the recommendations of the 2007 reactive monitoring mission;
4. Considers that, in the absence of this information, the current state of conservation and management effectiveness of the property cannot be fully assessed;
5. Also notes with serious concern the decline in populations of wild Reindeer and Snow Sheep, and encourages the State Party to create a conservation zone to better protect the wintering grounds of these species as has been proposed by the Commission for Rare and Endangered Species of Kamchatka Krai;
6. Welcomes the clarification by the State Party that there are no plans to construct hydropower stations inside the property, and requests the State Party to provide detailed information about possible plans to construct a hydropower station on the Zhupanova river, a key wintering area for wild Reindeer outside the property and their potential impact on Outstanding Universal Value, including copies of Environmental Impact Assessments once these are available, before taking any irreversible decisions, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
7. Reiterates its request to the State Party to clarify apparent contradictions regarding the overall area of the four regional nature parks that form part of the property, by providing detailed information, including maps, about the boundary “specifications” implemented in 2010 on these four parks, and a detailed map showing the boundaries of all components of the property;
8. Urges the State Party to fully implement the recommendations of the 2007 reactive monitoring mission, particularly regarding the development and implementation of one integrated management plan and coordination structure, a comprehensive tourism management plan, and the strengthening of the institutional capacity of the administrations of the property, both in terms of human and financial resources;
9. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of supplementary information)

## 23. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)

### Year of Inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

### Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/900/documents/>

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

April 2008: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission; May 2009: High-level visit by Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee; May 2010: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission; September 2012: UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of Management Plan
- b) Weakening of conservation controls and laws
- c) Impacts of proposed tourism infrastructure development
- d) Road construction
- e) Deforestation

### Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/900>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 4 February 2013, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. From 23 to 27 September 2012 a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the property to evaluate the possible impacts of the proposed Lagonaki tourism and ski development on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM>.

#### *a) Amendments to the legislative framework*

The State Party reports that “due to the adoption of Federal Law No 365-FZ dated 30 November 2011 the level of protection of specially protected nature territories, having the status of a World Heritage, will in no case be affected”. However, the mission confirmed that this law permits development of tourism and sport facilities in Biosphere Polygons of State Biosphere Strict Nature Reserves. The Order of the Government of the Russian Federation

dated 23 April 2012 No 603-r specifically permits the construction of tourism and skiing facilities with the necessary supporting infrastructure on the territory of Lagonaki Biosphere Polygon, which is confirmed by the State Party report. The mission noted that these recent decisions, and the decision to set up an economic zone in the Lagonaki Biosphere Polygon (see point (b) below), have significantly weakened the protective status of the property. The mission also noted that the boundaries of the Lagonaki Biosphere Polygon were still not established at the time of the mission, and were under discussion by the relevant authorities.

*b) Infrastructure development for tourism facilities*

The State Party confirms that it is planned to locate mountain ski and ski runs, artificial snow producing systems, cable ways, rope tows, restaurants, mountain shelters, sports infrastructure facilities, administrative and service buildings, roads and other infrastructure within the special economic zone for tourism and recreation established by Decree 833 of October 14, 2010, including in the Lagonaki Biosphere Polygon of the Caucasus Strict Nature Reserve inside the property. Proposals with relevant plans for tourism infrastructure for the “Northern Caucasus Resort” are being elaborated by a state owned company. The State Party states that the further development of the project for an all-season tourist and recreational complex on Lagonaki will only be possible with “account of the position of UNESCO” and notes that work is currently ongoing to define the boundaries of a Special Economic Zone at Lagonaki, within the property.

The mission noted that the Lagonaki Plateau area, including Mounts Fisht and Oshten, is a key area for biodiversity and ecological processes and therefore contributes greatly to the OUV of the property. The mission therefore considered that building ski and tourism infrastructure as projected in the documentation on the “Northern Caucasus Resort” project in its current form would seriously affect the OUV of the property and that in case a decision is taken to go forward with the development, the property would fulfil the conditions for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in line with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*. However, the representatives of the developer pointed out to the mission that the project is still at early stages and that no decision on its final design has been made and that the final project could be different and possibly smaller in scope. Therefore and based on the fact that the State Party and the developer and its partners expressed a clear commitment to respect the commitments under the *Convention*, the mission, at this stage, did not recommend to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

*c) Boundaries of the property*

The State Party reports that it is preparing for a proposal for a boundary modification of the property, in order to optimize its boundaries and particularly those of the Lagonaki area. The State Party notes that it intends to propose territories for inclusion in the property, such as the Sochi National Park, and to propose the exclusion from the property of areas that have been degraded and are of little value from the point of view of nature conservation, referring in particular to areas of the Lagonaki Plateau that were heavily grazed in the past. It specifically states that the boundary modification is considered in connection to the establishment of the above mentioned Special Economic Zone.

The intention of the State Party to submit a proposal for a boundary modification was discussed during the mission. While stressing that it was not its mandate to take a position on the feasibility of such a proposal, the mission reminded that a proposal for a boundary modification can be motivated only on the basis of the OUV and that it needs to be demonstrated that the areas proposed to be taken out of the property, will not impact it. The mission further stressed that given its potential impact on the OUV such a proposed boundary modification should be considered as significant, in accordance with Paragraph 165 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The mission noted that any proposal for boundary modification will have to take into account the importance of the Lagonaki Plateau area, in particular Mounts Fisht and Oshten, for biodiversity and its important contribution to the OUV

of the property. The mission considered that priority should be given by the State Party to urgently complete the demarcation process of the northern boundaries of the property, including its buffer zone, prior to any proposal of modification of those boundaries.

*d) Other issues – infrastructure developments related to the Biosphere Centre*

The State Party does not present any information on other threats, which are mentioned in the mission report, including the continuing expansion of the Biosphere Centre with development of infrastructure such as ski lifts that is clearly not in line with its function as a research centre. The mission noted plans to build a lift to access the Biosphere Centre and to upgrade one of the existing roads to Babuk Aul or Lunnaya Polyana and recalled that the State Party should ensure that infrastructure facilities, even if deemed necessary for management and research purposes, have no significant negative impacts on OUV and reiterated that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre before any final decision is taken on this development, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have since received reports that work on the upgrading of the Babuk Aul road has started, without an EIA having been submitted to the World Heritage Centre. The World Heritage Centre transmitted this information to the State Party in accordance with Paragraph 174 of the *Operational Guidelines* and requested the State Party to clarify this issue.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that the changes to the legislation which make it possible to construct winter sports facilities inside the World Heritage property have significantly weakened the protective status of the property. They recall that the World Heritage Committee has repeatedly requested the State Party to abandon any plans for infrastructure development on the Lagonaki Plateau. They support the conclusion of the 2012 monitoring mission that the installation of tourism and skiing facilities on the Lagonaki Plateau would seriously affect the OUV of the property. They consider that in case a decision is made to go forward with the Lagonaki ski and tourism development project in its current form, the property would be in clear potential danger, and fulfil the conditions for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in line with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines* and World Heritage Committee Decision **36 COM 7B.23**, but note that the project is still at the planning stage. They also note commitment of the project developer to respect the commitments under the *Convention*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the intention of the State Party to submit a proposal for a boundary modification of the property in connection to the establishment of a Special Economic Zone at Lagonaki, by excluding parts of the Lagonaki plateau from the property which are reported to be degraded and by including other parts into the property. They stress that that a boundary modification must be justified and based only on the property's OUV and its inherent characteristics and that such modification cannot be justified based on "*compensating*" for an area taken out by adding other areas. They further point out that the impact on the OUV of the proposed changes needs to be demonstrated on the basis of reliable scientific data and assessments and recall that such a proposal should be submitted as a new nomination, in accordance with Paragraph 165 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee support the conclusion of the mission that while the OUV of the property is currently still preserved, anthropogenic pressures on the property are clearly increasing and therefore, if no urgent action is taken, the integrity of the site could be affected in the near future and stress again the need for urgent and full implementation of the recommendations of previous missions. They also recommend that the World Heritage Committee urge the State Party to immediately implement its recommendations, as updated by the 2012 mission, which are included in the draft decision.

**Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.23**

The World Heritage Committee

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.23**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Expresses its utmost concern about the changes in the legal protection of the property which make it possible to develop large scale tourism infrastructure on the Lagonaki Plateau and reiterates its request to the State Party to ensure that no large scale ski or tourism infrastructure is built within the property;
4. Considers that the installation of tourism and skiing facilities on the Lagonaki Plateau including Mount Fisht and Oshten would seriously affect the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property and would constitute a case for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in line with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines and its previous decisions;
5. Notes the conclusion of the joint 2012 World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission that anthropogenic pressures on the property are increasing and urges the State Party to implement all its recommendations, in particular to:
  - a) Develop an overall sustainable tourism strategy and comprehensive plan for the property and adjacent protected areas, privileging low impact tourism activities and ensuring that proposed tourism and recreational infrastructure does not impact on the OUV of the property,
  - b) Ensure that no areas of high biodiversity and key to the OUV of the property are included within the boundaries of the biosphere polygon of the Caucasus Strict Nature Reserve and that no activities are permitted within the polygon which are contrary to the property's integrity,
  - c) Urgently clarify the delimitation of the northern buffer zone of the Caucasus Strict Nature Reserve, which is part of the property, and reinstate its legal protection,
  - d) Immediately halt infrastructure developments which are affecting the integrity of the property and in particular halt any further infrastructure development at the Biosphere Centre which is not in line with its function as a research and monitoring centre,
  - e) Ensure that the potential impacts of any proposed infrastructure upgrading inside the property on its OUV are carefully assessed and that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is sent to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies before a decision is taken in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines,
  - f) Finalize the exact delineation of the boundary of all components of the property, establish a functional buffer zone for the property and submit an updated map of the property and its buffer zone to the World Heritage Centre,
  - g) Ensure the implementation of an overall management plan for the property by developing an operational plan and establishing an overall coordination body,
  - h) Adapt the "certificates" of the Nature Monuments included in the property to ensure all logging, including sanitary cutting, construction of roads, overpasses, power lines and other communication infrastructure are not allowed and the construction of cabins and other infrastructure for recreational use is prohibited,

- i) *Halt all construction and/or extension of buildings and facilities in the upper Mzimba Valley and upgrade the legal protection status of this area;*
6. *Takes note of the intention of the State Party to submit a proposal for a boundary modification by excluding parts of the Lagonaki plateau from the property which are reported to be degraded and by including other parts and recalls that such a proposal has to be clearly justified in terms of the OUV for which the property was inscribed, should be based on reliable scientific data and should be submitted as a new nomination, in accordance with Paragraph 165 of the Operational Guidelines;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2014, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, including a report on progress achieved with the implementation of the recommendations made above and by the mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

## 24. Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1995

Criteria  
(vii) (ix)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/719/documents/>

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
2010: Reactive Monitoring Mission World Heritage Centre/IUCN

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
a) Changes to the boundaries of Yugyd Va National Park;  
b) Gold mining.

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/719/>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013 the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, including on the following issues:

- a) *Halting gold mining in the property and reversing boundary changes made without approval by the Committee*

The State Party report notes that gold mining works continue within the 19.9 km<sup>2</sup> Chudnoe gold mining concession situated within the property, despite the Committee's requests to halt

mining (Decisions **35 COM 7B.25** and **36 COM 7B.24**), and that a number of permits and plans have been issued in relation to the Gold Minerals mining license, which expires in 2029.

The State Party indicates that it considers that the 19.9 km<sup>2</sup> Chudnoe gold mining concession is not included in the Yugyd Va National Park (YVNP), one of the two serial components of the property, and therefore does not provide a reply to the request of the Committee to reverse the 2010 boundary changes of YVNP which removed legal protection from four circular and rectilinear areas located well within the property, including the Chudnoé concession, a pre-existing pipeline and two pre-existing quarries.

The World Heritage Centre notes that maps submitted with the nomination clearly show that no areas inside the property have been excluded and hence that the location of the gold mine is well within the boundaries of the property as inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1995. This information is confirmed also by a letter of the Office of the General Prosecutor of the Russian Federation addressed to a Russian NGO, which confirms that the YVNP was included in the property as established in 1994, by Directive N377 of the Russian Federation adopted on 23.04.1994. The letter, a copy of which has been transmitted to the State Party by the World Heritage Centre, further notes that the Ministry of Natural Resources in 2010 adopted a new provision for the National Park, excluding the Chudnoe gold deposit, and concludes that by allowing this boundary modification, the Ministry has not respected its obligations under the *Convention*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the State Party has not submitted any proposal for a significant boundary modification of the property and that the report does not provide any information on the development of such a proposal for boundary modification, although the State Party, at the 35th and 36th sessions, announced its intention to submit a proposal by 1 February 2013.

b) *Protection status of the property, establishment of a buffer zone and inclusion of areas of biodiversity value.*

The State Party also reports that the Russian Federation is actively researching options to include several areas of high biodiversity value within the property and to establish a buffer zone along its eastern boundary, in line with the recommendations of the 2010 World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission and the Committee's requests (Decisions **35 COM 7B.25**, **36 COM 7B.24**). A letter has been issued to the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment of the Komi Republic to begin this work.

c) *Other conservation issues*

The State Party briefly reports on a number of other conservation issues, including tourism planning, fire management, staffing, monitoring and the status of Reindeer and Atlantic salmon and European grayling populations.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate their view that the now active gold mine, which is located within the property in a zone that has had its legal protection removed, is likely to have significant negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the Virgin Komi Forests, as documented in the 2010, 2011 and 2012 World Heritage Centre/IUCN state of conservation reports.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the World Heritage Committee has consistently expressed its serious and utmost concern about ongoing gold mining works located within the property (Decisions **33 COM 7B.31**, **34 COM 7B.25**, **35 COM 7B.25** and **36 COM 7B.24**). The Committee has also considered that gold mining, as well as the unilateral boundary changes that have removed legal protection from several zones within the property (including the 19.9 km<sup>2</sup> Chudnoé gold mining concession), constitute an

ascertained danger to the property's Outstanding Universal Value, in line with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines* (Decisions **35 COM 7B.25** and **36 COM 7B.24**).

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate their recommendation that the Committee inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in application of the provisions in the *Operational Guidelines*. They recommend that the Committee reiterates its request to the State Party to halt gold mining within the property, revoke the mining license and reverse the unilateral boundary modifications.

**Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.24**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.24**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Expresses its utmost concern that the State Party has not halted the gold mining works within the property nor reversed the boundary changes which removed the legal protection of four areas within the property, including the 19.9 square km gold mining concession, and notes that maps submitted with the nomination clearly show that no areas inside the property have been excluded and hence, that these four areas are well within the boundaries of the property as inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1995;
4. Considers that these issues clearly constitute an ascertained danger to the property's Outstanding Universal Value, in line with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*;
5. **Decides to inscribe the Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;**
6. Requests the State Party to implement the following corrective measures:
  - a) *Immediately halt gold mining at Chudnoe within the property, including all preparatory activities, and revoke or freeze the exploration and exploitation licenses already granted,*
  - b) *Reverse the boundary changes made to Yugyd Va National Park;*
7. Recalls that mining is incompatible with World Heritage status, which is supported by ICMM's international position statement of not undertaking such activities within World Heritage properties, calls upon the mining companies concerned not to proceed with gold mining within the property, and the financial institutions supporting the mining operation to withdraw their financial support;
8. Also recalls that any proposed changes to the boundaries of a World Heritage property are subject to official procedures at least as rigorous as those involved in the nomination of the property, and should be considered through the procedure for major modifications of boundaries, as required under Paragraph 165 of the *Operational Guidelines*;
9. Also requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, to develop a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and a proposal for a 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;

10. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of supplementary information)

**26. Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany (Slovakia / Germany / Ukraine) (N 1133bis)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (States Parties report on the state of conservation of the property not received)

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1994, extension in 2005

Criteria  
(vii)(ix)(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/685/documents/>

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 reactive monitoring mission and Ramsar Advisory Mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Toxic pollution after mining accident in 1998;
- b) Agriculture impacts;
- c) Potential threats from accidental oil spills;
- d) Potential impacts from infrastructural projects;
- e) Water issues and water quality;

- f) State of the Guadalquivir River and dredging project

Illustrative material

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

Current conservation issues

On 8 February 2013, a detailed report on the state of conservation of Doñana National Park was submitted by the State Party. The report highlights progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2011 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN/RAMSAR mission. In addition, on 7 November 2012 the World Heritage Centre received a letter, in Spanish, from the Seville Port Authority of the Ministry of Public Works (Ministerio de Fomento) elaborating on its view on the infrastructure project "Actions to improve the maritime access to the Port of Seville" with a focus on the dredging of the Guadalquivir River. On 15 February 2013, the World Heritage Centre received another letter from the Port Authority, in English, repeating earlier statements and enclosing a report on "Tide, salt intrusion and sediment transport in the Guadalquivir Estuary".

a) *Proposed additional dredging of the Lower Guadalquivir River*

A controversial infrastructure project by the Port Authority of Seville includes a proposal for deepening dredging of the Guadalquivir River, which forms the eastern boundary of the property and is intricately linked to its wetlands. The State Party recalls that in response to differing views and concerns by the Board of Trustees of the National Park on the positive Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) which was delivered to the project in 2003, a Scientific Commission was assigned to communicate an opinion to the Ministry. The Scientific Commission issued its opinion in 2010 and concluded that while maintenance dredging is considered acceptable if the negative impacts are minimized through careful planning and timing, deepening dredging is considered to impact negatively on the dynamics, morphology and biodiversity of the estuary which could result in direct impacts to Doñana National Park. The State Party further notes that these findings and conclusions have since received multiple endorsements, including from the Doñana Natural Landscape Participation Council. The Secretary of State for Climate Change accepted the conclusions of the Scientific Committee in writing to the Seville Port Authority on 11 October 2011 and noted that it considers the conclusions as binding conditions of the EIS. Furthermore, the Minister of the Environment of the Region of Andalusia endorsed the study and opinion on 4 May 2012 in a communication to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and the Environment. Notwithstanding the above, the Seville Port Authority in its letters argues that the 2003 Environmental Impact Statement remains legally in place. It also notes that dredging is scheduled for 2013 and apparently included in the 2013 budget.

b) *Over-extraction of the Doñana Aquifer*

The Committee (Decision **35 COM 7B.27**) requested the Government Council of the regional government to approve the "Special Management Plan of the Irrigation Zones located to the North of the Forest Crown of Doñana" (Plan de la Corona Forestal) before 31 December 2011, and commence implementation by 1 January 2012 at the latest, in order to address a range of longstanding water management issues comprehensively. The State Party reports that a participatory process is underway, but approval and implementation of the plan are pending. The State Party cites the overwhelming public response and the corresponding workload, as well as changes in governmental responsibilities as the key reasons for the delay. Since the joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission, the governmental responsibility for the surface and underground waters of the Guadalquivir River Basin has passed from the Regional Government of Andalusia to the Central Government.

c) *Proposed Balboa oil pipeline from Huelva to Extremadura and expansion project of La Rábida Refinery*

At the time of the 2011 mission a refinery construction project in Badajoz Province in Extremadura, including the Balboa oil pipeline project that would link this refinery to the Port of Huelva, was undergoing an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The mission expressed concern over the potential impacts of this project on the property due to risks associated with the construction of pipelines and an increase in maritime traffic inside and close to the property. The State Party reports that the overall conclusion of the EIA was negative, citing "significant environmental impacts", including the risk of accidental spills impacting on the coast of Doñana. The statement makes reference to concerns expressed by UNESCO, IUCN and Ramsar, as well as neighbouring Portugal. On 16 July 2012 the corresponding Resolution on the negative Environmental Impact Declaration, signed by the Minister of the Environment of Spain, has been officially gazetted (Document BOE-A-2012-10244), and therefore the construction of the refinery and associated infrastructure were not approved.

As requested by the Committee, the State Party report provides information on efforts to update risk preparedness and management plans in relation to the La Rábida oil refinery expansion project as requested by the 2011 mission. The report notes that several plans exist both at the level of the Andalusia Autonomous Community and at the local level including the World Heritage property, many of which have been updated recently. These include a revised Territorial Emergency Plan for Andalusia approved in November 2011 and a more specific Emergency Plan for Risks of Contamination on the Coast of Andalusia (PECLA). The State Party notes work currently being done on the development and implementation of an Andalusian initiative for Self-Protection Plans for Protected Natural Landscapes on the Andalusian Coast. Moreover, the Self-Protection Plan for the Doñana Natural Landscape designed to respond to discharges on the coastal strip of Doñana has been approved.

d) *Cumulative effects of infrastructure projects outside the property*

The landscape and seascape around Doñana is intensively used for transportation, industry, agriculture, urban spread, recreation and tourism. Conservation efforts in this wider landscape, including but not limited to the much larger Doñana Natural Space (Espacio Natural Doñana) are indispensable for the integrity of the property. The State Party reports that no major changes have recently occurred and no major infrastructure projects are underway.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received information that an EIA for "new gas projects", including gas extraction, storage and transportation and located partially within the "Nature Park" but outside the property, concluded positively. Publicly available official information (BOE-A-2013-868) confirms that Petroleum Oil & Gas España, S.A. is planning the extraction of gas and subsequent storage within the "Espacio Natural Doñana". There is no explicit reference to World Heritage status in the official publication of the Environmental Impact Statement. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the potential impact of any oil and gas exploitation or exploration project located in the vicinity of the property should be assessed to ensure that it will not negatively affect its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). On 8 March 2013, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party requesting further information on this issue, but no response had yet been received at the time of writing this report.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the important efforts by the State Party to make progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2011 mission. They welcome the negative conclusion of the EIA for the Balboa Refinery and its associated infrastructure in

Huelva and Sevilla as well as work done to update risk preparedness and management plans in view of the expansion of the La Rábida Refinery. They recommend that the Committee encourage the State Party to support the multiple disaster response plans with adequate human and financial resources and to establish direct communication lines with the refinery to be able to respond to possible spills without delay.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee urge the State Party not to permit any deepening dredging in the Lower Guadalquivir River, in line with the recommendations of the Scientific Commission and the Committee's previous decision (Decision **35 COM 7B.27**) and to integrate the conclusions of the Scientific Commission as binding conditions into the EIS, as stated by the Secretary of State for Climate Change. They also recommend the Committee to urge the State Party to ensure that any maintenance dredging activities are ecologically optimized in line with scientific recommendations.

Concerning water management, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee regret the delay for the approval and implementation of the "Plan de la Corona Forestal". They are of the view that the need for enhanced watershed management remains urgent as current practices slowly erode the values of the property. They also recommend that the Committee reiterates its request to the State Party to urgently approve and implement the plan.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note reports on possible new gas projects in the immediate vicinity of the property, and recall the need to assess the potential impacts of these projects on the OUV of the property.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the efforts of the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 2011 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN/RAMSAR mission. However they remain concerned about the cumulative impacts of a number of threats to the OUV of the property, in particular the possible deepening dredging of Guadalquivir estuary, the issue of over-extraction of the Doñana Aquifer and the potential impacts from hydrocarbon projects in the vicinity of the property. They note that if these issues are not addressed the property could meet the conditions for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in the near future.

**Draft Decision:        37 COM 7B.27**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.27**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Acknowledges the efforts made in response to the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN/RAMSAR mission conducted in 2011 and requests the State Party to continue these efforts;*
4. *Reiterates its concern about the cumulative impacts of a number of threats to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, in particular the possible deepening dredging of Guadalquivir estuary, the issue of over-extraction of the Doñana Aquifer and the potential impacts from hydrocarbon projects in the vicinity of the property and considers that if these issues are not effectively addressed, the property could meet the conditions for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in the near future;*

5. *Welcomes the conclusion of the Environmental Impact Statement of the Balboa Refinery and its associated infrastructure and the non-approval of the construction of the refinery and associated infrastructure and also requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre of any possible revision of the decision in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Urges the State Party not to permit any deepening dredging in the Lower Guadalquivir River and to ensure that any maintenance dredging activities are ecologically optimized, in line with the recommendations of the Scientific Commission and Decision **35 COM 7B.27** and to integrate the conclusions of the Scientific Commission as binding conditions into the Environmental Impact Statement;*
7. *Expresses its concern on the possible impacts of planned projects for gas extraction and storage in the immediate vicinity of the property and further requests the State Party to ensure that the potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is fully considered as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and the results transmitted to the World Heritage Centre in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
8. *Requests furthermore the State Party to further invest in the follow-up and implementation of the multiple risk preparedness plans and to establish direct communication lines between the management authority of the property and the La Rábida refinery in view of the expansion of that refinery;*
9. *Requests moreover the State Party to approve and implement the Special Management Plan of the Irrigation Zones (located to the North of the Forest Crown of Doñana) without further delay;*
10. *Finally requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.*

**28. Giant Causeway and Causeway Coast (United-Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (N 369)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of advisory mission report)

## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of mission report)

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1983, extension 1990

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/205/documents/>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 276,350  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/205/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
Total amount granted: USD 30 000 from the Rapid Response Facility

Previous monitoring missions  
February 2008: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission; December 2011: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission; January 2013: 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  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/205>; <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/659>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

#### Current conservation issues

From 17 to 24 January 2013, an IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th (UNESCO, 2011) and 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) sessions. On 1 January 2013, a joint report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the States Parties of Costa Rica and Panama. The mission report can be consulted on-line at the following address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM>

#### *a) Transboundary Cooperation*

The States Parties note that the Amistad National Park Management Bi-national Executive Technical Unit (UTEB-PILA) was created in 2009, within the legal framework provided by the formal transboundary cooperation agreement (1992). The Unit has met twice yearly since 2009 and in addition, several joint activities have taken place both in the field as well as at the level of central administration (coordination of management and reporting).

#### *b) Progress on the Transboundary Dam Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).*

The States Parties report that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was conducted by independent consultants between 2011 and 2012 and then shared during three multi stakeholder meetings during late 2012. During the ordinary meeting of the UTEB-PILA in November 2012, the States Parties determined that the document obtained from this consultancy did not comply with national and international SEA requirements and that the obtained results were not in accordance with the reality of the property. The States Parties therefore consider it a draft technical report, providing a support tool for a future complete SEA.

The mission analyzed the SEA process and the perception of the different stakeholders that were involved in this process. It was noted that the process until now is of very preliminary character, with a limited series of multi-stakeholder workshops and lacking substantiated, quantitative information on impact. As reported in the SEA document's annexes, most stakeholders consider the process ill planned, superficial and not following formal procedures. The State Parties noted that under such circumstances, this work could only serve as a support tool for a future, more rigorous SEA, though not deadlines were provided.

#### *c) Hydro-electric dams*

The State Party of Panama reports that the current two projects in various stages of operation and construction (CHAN75 and Bonyic) are located in the Palo Seco Forest Reserve, adjacent to the property. Construction of these projects continued in spite of Decision **34 COM 7B.32** that requested halting dam construction until a SEA had been completed. The State Party of Panama notes that the projects involve contractual agreements between the State of Panama and the development companies, which cannot be terminated without considerable social and economic cost. Also, it states that the projects comply with all national legal requirements and Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and the management authority (ANAM) is monitoring the environmental impact and supervising mitigation and compensation measures for this impact.

The State Party of Costa Rica notes that there is one hydro power dam constructed within the property in Costa Rica before it was included in the World Heritage List. It further notes that four others are in operation, but all are located outside the property. There is one large project (Diquís) currently undergoing feasibility studies. The State Party of Costa Rica states that it is located at a considerable distance from the property's boundaries on the Pacific side, and that its potential impact on the property is yet to be determined.

The mission observed that the two dams on the Caribbean side of the property in Panama (CHAN75 and Bonyic) have direct negative impacts on the biodiversity of the property (fish and crustacean diversity). This is not expected to immediately lead to disappearance of these species in the property, as long as intact watersheds remain elsewhere in the property. However, the assemblage of species, possibly unique in each individual watershed, will be irreversibly affected. In both projects, physical mitigation measures for biodiversity impact (e.g. fish stairs) have not been implemented. According to consulted freshwater biodiversity experts as well as biologists from the dam companies, these measures would unlikely have a major positive impact in this type of (high) dams, hence the impact is considered permanent. The companies' planned measures to restore one or several native fish species to the affected rivers through the installation of fish breeding stations does not compensate for biodiversity loss.

The mission confirmed that at present, there are no additional hydropower projects explicitly planned, hence most of the river basins continue to be without threat. However, the change in ownership (from private to public) of the concession for a second dam on the Changuinola river, whose reservoir will be very close to the property, points to a real possibility of renewed dam construction in the near future.

The mission noted that the construction of the hydroelectric dams has seriously affected the local social and political situation. Traditional indigenous leaders and many individual members of indigenous groups expressed opposition to dam development to the mission. The ongoing projects, where the mission noted that due consultation of indigenous peoples was lacking, have seriously affected the relationship between indigenous peoples' organizations and the government as well as internal relationships within the indigenous groups. This situation decreases governability and increases the threat of uncontrolled migration and inappropriate use of resources in the property.

*d) Mining concessions and oil exploration near the property (Costa Rica)*

The State Party of Costa Rica has indicated that the requests for mining exploration permits, predominantly in the *Bribri* indigenous people's territory near the property have all been rejected. Three more recent requests, corresponding to the same zone, remain open. The Congress of the Republic of Costa Rica has the faculty to approve these types of requests within the indigenous reserves, however the State Party of Costa Rica notes that given the longstanding tradition of refusing such exploration rights in indigenous territories, and given the opposition to mineral exploration by indigenous groups, these will not be approved. Costa Rica has also declared a gold mining moratorium, valid until at least the end of the present government, and there is now a public request to the national authorities in order to forbid any further mining activity in the country.

*e) Road traversing the property from Boquete to Bocas del Toro (Panama)*

The State Party of Panama indicates that although this road is proposed in the relevant section of the 2010-2014 National Government Strategic Plan ("*Estrategia Occidental*"), no action has been taken to date. Relevant government agencies, including ANAM and the Ministry of Public Works, informed the mission that receipt of an environmental permit for any road crossing the property would be highly unlikely. Nevertheless, non-governmental organizations remain concerned, pointing to regular declarations by some public officials in support of its construction, and to the fact that a second dam on the Changuinola River would facilitate its eventual construction.

*f) Presence of cattle, agriculture and situation of private lands within the property*

The States Parties report that there has been no change in the situation since the previous reactive monitoring mission. In Panama, cattle have always been present on private lands within the property, dating back to before it was declared a protected area. According to a 2004 survey and more recent observations, low density cattle grazing is restricted to less than 1% of the total surface of the Panamanian sector of the property. The legal situation of land rights in Panama makes it difficult to oblige long term land owners to abandon productive activity, as requested by the World Heritage Committee (Decision **35 COM 7B.39**). As an alternative, ANAM has formally established a relationship with cattle owners' organizations to promote sustainable practice and support to park management. This, in combination with decreasing profitability of animal husbandry, has apparently led to a lower amount of cattle within and directly outside the property.

Cattle grazing and agriculture in the Costa Rican sector of the property are localized and occur on a small scale. Land acquisition within the property has not happened in recent years due to the fiscal situation in Costa Rica.

The mission noted that, although cattle owners' organizations supported ANAM's claim of fewer cattle inside and directly outside the property, this trend could not be confirmed because no actual land use data exist. Also, the mission confirmed marginal and localized

agricultural activity in Costa Rica and an active effort from the Park Administration to control expansion. Nevertheless, it expressed its concern about the apparent increase in illicit crop cultivation, particularly of marihuana, inside and directly outside the property in Costa Rica, as evidenced by recent confiscations.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee commend the positive efforts of both States Parties to improve the management of the property, particularly through improved international cooperation as well as efforts made to maintain the integrity of the property and its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). However, they note that serious threats to several of the elements of the OUV of the property remain, specifically originating from the ongoing development of hydroelectric dams. They recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to complete the Strategic Environmental Assessment as a matter of priority, and to suspend construction of the Bonyic dam until the SEA has been completed and approved by all relevant government institutions.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that irreversible damage has been done to freshwater biodiversity on the Panamanian side of the property. Given that there are still many intact river systems in the property and that for now, there are no other projects (e.g. hydropower, mining, roads) in concrete planning stages, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that these threats do not currently justify the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger; however, any concrete development of new economic projects (including new hydropower projects, any road crossing the property and mining within the property) would represent an ascertained danger and would lead to the property meeting the conditions for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also stress that the Bi-National Executing Technical Unit for the management of La Amistad International Park (UTEB-PILA) should be converted into the principal management planning and oversight body for the property and should continue increasing the number of park staff as well as their level of training, and include indigenous peoples and local farmers within park monitoring efforts.

### **Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.31**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.31**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Commends the States Parties for the progress achieved in strengthening transboundary cooperation in the management of the property;*
4. *Regrets that construction of the Bonyic dam has continued without prior consideration of the results of the on-going Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), and urges the States Parties to complete it as a matter of priority and in line with international standards of best practice, in particular to:*
  - a) *Analyse impacts based on evidence and science, including impacts on Outstanding Universal Value (OUV),*
  - b) *Consider least damaging alternatives, including the “no project” alternative,*
  - c) *Ensure broad stakeholder consultation and validation processes;*

5. Also regrets that the State Party of Panama did not suspend the construction of the Bonyic dam until the SEA has been completed and its results considered, as requested in Committee Decision **34 COM 7B.32**;
6. Notes with concern the irreversible damage to fresh water biodiversity in at least two watersheds (Changuinola and Bonyic) and the absence of adequate measures to mitigate for biodiversity loss, and requests the State Party of Panama to implement mitigation measures and put in place an effective and long-term monitoring programme to measure the extent to which these measures are effective;
7. Also notes with concern the social conflicts related to the hydroelectric dams in both countries, which complicates governance of the wider region and multiplies the direct threats originating from the economic development projects;
8. Also requests the States Parties to implement other recommendations of the 2013 IUCN reactive monitoring mission, in particular:
  - a) Not permit any further development of hydro-energy projects, mining or road construction within or directly adjacent to the property, particularly in neighbouring protected areas and indigenous territories,
  - b) Ensure that any further planned economic development that could potentially negatively affect the property be subjected to independent Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) that include a specific assessment of impacts on the OUV of the property and counts with all elements of due process to achieve Free, Prior and Informed Consent by indigenous peoples having territorial rights in the affected lands,
  - c) Guarantee the long term integrity of complete unaffected watersheds (from source to sea), which form part of the property at altitudes below 1,200 metres, to preserve aquatic ecosystems therein,
  - d) Harmonize the management plans of the protected areas that constitute the property within the framework of one overarching management plan,
  - e) Compile and monitor field data on the present state of human activities, including intensity of cattle grazing and impact on OUV, extent of illicit crop cultivation within and directly adjacent to the park, including number of hectares affected, number of families making use of resources within the property, and nature and extent of overland pathways / trails present,
  - f) Continue to increase the number of park staff and include indigenous peoples and local farmers within park monitoring efforts to ensure integration of key stakeholders to the conservation agenda;
9. Further requests the States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, a joint report on the state of conservation of the property, including a report on progress with the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.

**31. Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) (N 1138 rev)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of supplementary information)

## **MIXED PROPERTIES**

### **AFRICA**

#### **33. Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lopé-Okanda (Gabon) (C/N 1147rev)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (State Party report on the state of conservation of the property not received)

#### **34. Bandiagara Cliffs (land of the Dogons) (Mali) (C/N 516)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (State Party report on the state of conservation of the property not received)

## **LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (supplementary information requested)

## **CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

### **AFRICA**

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late mission report)

#### **37. Historic Town of Grand-Bassam (Côte d'Ivoire) (C 1322rev)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2012

Criteria  
(iii)(iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1322/documents/>

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
Total amount granted: USD 32,634 from the France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement

Previous monitoring missions  
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
Decision **36 COM 8B.17** had identified the following points and ask the State Party to

- a) Clarify the property's limits for the land parts following the cadastral boundaries
- b) Enlarge the property's unified buffer zone to the Petit Paris neighbourhood and the lighthouse;
- c) Clarify the land ownership situation (N'zima village, land lots with no property deed);
- d) Inscribe all the "buildings of heritage interest" in the property on the National Cultural Heritage List
- e) Define operational monitoring indicators which correspond to precise, periodic and quantified monitoring actions;
- f) Strengthen and give details of the permanent human resources of the Local Committee and/or of the Heritage Centre;
- g) Confirm the Heritage Centre's views' (decisions/notifications) suspensive role in the Building Permits Commission's functioning, for conservation purpose;
- h) Reinforce the practical and operational dimension of the Plan for the Conservation and Management of the property;
- i) Confirming the measures to provide encouragement for the restoration and conservation of the privately owned buildings.

Illustrative material  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1322/>

### Current conservation issues

The report of January 2013 sent by the State Party responds to Decision **36 COM 8B.17**. It informs of progress accomplished in the definition, protection and management of the property, as well as the residual difficulties (See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1322/documents/>).

#### a) *Property boundaries and buffer zone*

Clarifications have been made with regard to the boundaries of the property and extension of the buffer zone (Decree No 490 of 7 June 2012), but the cartographical documentation provided must be completed by a global map showing the property boundaries and its new buffer zone.

#### b) *Establishment of a management mechanism*

Decree No. 46/MCF-CAB of 8 May 2012 creates and organizes the local Management Committee; it was initiated in May 2012. Decree No. 552 of 13 June 2012 strengthens the competences of the Heritage Centre and Order No. 53/MCF/CAB of 18 May 2012 appoints its director. But with regard to staff and competences delegated to the Heritage Centre and the local Management and Conservation Committee of the Historic Town of Grand-Bassam, it is not possible to extract them from the global statistics at State Party level.

#### c) *Protection, prerogatives of the Building Permits Commission*

The prerogatives of the Building Permits Commission have been reinforced by Ministerial Order No.47/MCF-CAB of 8 May 2012 and the new Commission established on 17 May 2012; however, it is not evident whether the views of the Heritage Centre and/or the Management Committee for the property are suspensive and non-consultative as set out in some documents provided at the time of inscription of the property. The State Party, however, indicates that the present practices of the Commission give satisfactory results with regard to the respect of procedures for the conservation of the property and the capacity of the Commission to halt non-authorized work or work not in conformity with the provisions.

#### d) *Monitoring of the conservation of the property*

The State Party has achieved institutional progress in the management of the property in 2012. It also underlines the implementation of a public investment programme, over four years, for the conservation of the property, for USD 1.3M for the restoration programme for four public buildings, improved collection of urban waste, the control of architectural provisions, etc. Work is also expected to be carried out on the repair of facades and fencing but postponed for the time being, awaiting a partnership undertaking as concerns the private properties.

An indicator table proposes general objectives and their periodic evaluation. Overall, the objectives have been accomplished except for the improvement of vegetation. However, monitoring of the salubrity of the property must be reinforced. The announced monitoring of the architectural conservation appears to be more a verification of the implementation of the restoration programme for the monuments, within the Management Plan, rather than precise indicators for the monitoring of all the constitutive components of the property, with the notable exception of N'zima village.

#### e) *Environmental threats*

Several leading environmental questions are rightly raised by the State Party: water quality of the lagoon and tendency towards the increase of invasive species, obstruction of the maritime mouth of the lagoon, coastal erosion, important effects of tempests on coastal homes. A risk management action in the form of a project has been undertaken for the reopening of the lagoon and the establishment of a monitoring policy for natural risks. These efforts must be continued.

## Conclusions

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the general state of conservation of the property is fairly satisfactory, notably as regards the public buildings, but it is more unequal and fragile for the privately owned buildings, in particular in the zone of the ancient European commercial village. More broadly, the property continues to be threatened by a series of human factors (work not in conformity with provisions, unauthorized habitation, pollution, etc.) and natural factors (state of the lagoon, coastal erosion, etc.) The State Party provides a fairly extensive analysis of the situation, whilst informing of the institutional and practical progress in the management of the property. These efforts must be continued, encouraged and, on several points, strengthened and developed.

## **Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.37**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 8B.17** adopted at the 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party, in particular the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone;*
4. *Notes with satisfaction the inscription of all the outstanding monuments and sites of the property on the National Heritage List, the establishment of the local Management Committee, the institutionalisation of the Heritage Centre, an improved functioning of the Building Permits Commission and the implementation of different restoration programmes for the outstanding monuments and houses of the property;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to pursue its efforts for the improved knowledge of the property (cadastral inventory) and further to continue its efforts to strengthen the protection of the property through the Building Permits Commission, the conservation of the property and its monitoring as concerns the privately owned buildings and tree-lined areas, daily management (illegal habitations, waste and pollution) and the surveillance of natural threats (closure of the lagoon and its consequences, coastal erosion);*
6. *Requests the State Party to:*
  - a) *Provide a global map showing the boundary of the property and its new buffer zone,*
  - b) *Indicate the human resources of the local Management Committee and the Heritage Centre responsible for the management of the property,*
  - c) *Confirm that the notifications of the Heritage Centre and/or the local Management Committee of the property, for the attention of the Building Permits Commission are, in fact, suspensive and not simply consultative, as indicated in some of the documents provided at the time of inscription,*
  - d) *Implement a policy to assist in the conservation of private immovable property at both the technical level (practical conservation guide) and financial (combined public/private assistance),*

- e) *Implement a plantation and green spaces programme that respects the authenticity of the property in this domain, and carry out the necessary prior studies,*
  - f) *Define more diversified and precise monitoring indicators for conservation, to be applied to both monuments and houses, public squares and plantations. They must cover all the constitutive components of the property, both public and private;*
7. ***Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2015, a report on the state of conservation of the property providing information on the implementation of the above-mentioned points, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.***

### **38. Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1980

Criteria  
(i) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/15/documents/>

International Assistance  
N/A

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

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Insufficient delimitation of this serial property;
- b) Lack of conservation and management plans;
- c) Lack of appropriate urban planning and building regulations;
- d) Urban encroachment and inappropriate new developments;
- e) Rising water level / seepage;
- f) Structural instability of Stele III.

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/15>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

#### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 30 January 2013. A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission took place from 20 to 27 January 2013

to consider the new museum, which had progressed without plans being submitted for review in advance of work commencing, and in spite of concerns expressed by the 2010 reactive monitoring mission in relation to its potential visual and archaeological impacts, and by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies who reviewed plans submitted by the State Party on 23 March 2012, and considered that the size, scale and design of the building would be incompatible with its sensitive surrounding. The mission report is available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM/>

a) *Construction of the Orthodox Church Museum*

The new Church Museum is being constructed within the Orthodox Church compound next to the Old and New St Mary of Zion church buildings in the property.

In its report, the State Party states that it considers that it had consulted the World Heritage Committee over plans for the new Museum as His Holiness Abune Paulos, the (now late) Patriarch of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church had had a meeting in 2011 at UNESCO at which the project was discussed and as a result of which he assumed that the World Heritage Centre had given permission to proceed. The mission reports that the World Heritage Centre was unaware of the details of the project at this time as the Patriarch's meeting was with the UNESCO Africa Department.

The State Party stresses the fact that the new museum has been built on the same place as the previous archaeological museum and that it will house the ecclesiastical objects, donated by various Ethiopian rulers to commemorate their coronations in the nearby church of St. Mary Zion as well as many other currently poorly conserved artefacts associated with the church. In addition, the new museum shall facilitate access to the collections, and shall provide a library as well as research facilities for those interested in the history of Aksum and its surrounding area.

The mission discussed the rationale for the new museum with Church authorities and formed the opinion that it would have no meaning if moved away from the church compound, as some of the museum collections would continue to be used for church purposes. Furthermore Aksum is important as a centre of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church as it is the place where the Ethiopian Orthodox religion transferred the Axumite paradigm into a new Christianised paradigm. The museum is part of a wider move by the Ethiopian Orthodox Church supported by the Ministry of Culture to establish museums all over Ethiopia to protect ecclesiastical artefacts that reflect the history of the country. The design of the new Church Museum takes up direct references to Axumite architectural form and style in order to stress the strong relationship between the Ethiopian Orthodox Church with pre-Christian Axumite culture.

The mission was made aware of the efforts undertaken to lower the height of the new building so that it does not compete with the new Church of St. Mary of Zion and to clad it with 'old mountain stone'. They were also provided with details of rescue archaeology undertaken before construction that concluded there was nothing important on the site. The mission received a copy of this rescue archaeology study but without the site plan of the excavations.

An overall assessment of the impact of the new museum from specific viewpoints in the property was undertaken by the mission. This confirmed that the new building has no or little impact from critical viewpoints at important sites of the property, and that these low impacts could be mitigated by ensuring that high trees around the New Church of St Mary of Zion are maintained into the future. There are no viewscapes towards the Northern Stele Field that are currently in danger of negative visual impact.

The mission concluded that the overall design needs no mitigation, but the existing screening of the building from critical viewpoints must be maintained through provisions in the Management Plan. However, the design of the building needs minor revisions from the

perspective of visual impacts on the ensemble of the three Churches, cemetery and Chapel of the Ark of the Covenant.

The mission noted that while the primary aim of the new museum is to narrate the history of the church and to exhibit its treasures, it could undertake other related functions to support the interpretation and presentation of the chief attributes of the property. There needs to be linkage between the existing Archaeological Museum and the proposed Church Museum.

Notwithstanding their views on the new museum, the mission considered that the density and grain of the urban zone west of the stele field and north of the Church compound, as well as on the slope of the hill behind the stele field, needed to be addressed by urban control mechanisms to protect the current visual quality of the stele field, through restrictions on height and bulk being included in the Master Plan for the property.

b) *Structured management arrangements for the property*

The State Party reports that once the draft regulation for the protection of the property is endorsed, an office for the management of the property would be opened. Work has commenced on the establishment of a site management plan, for which the potential threats have been identified with the participation of stakeholders.

The mission recommends that assistance be provided for the rapid completion of the urgently needed management plan. The mission also recommended that the Department of Archaeology at Aksum University, be involved in the preparation of the Management Plan and its implementation.

Details of the Aksum Master Plan, funded by the World Bank, were provided to the mission, which recommended that it be reviewed in terms of all aspects of heritage management. It also highlighted the desirability of integrating the development, planning, urban management and conservation sectors in the management of the property and its buffer zone with the needs for the Region, City and Church to provide joint input in all matters. The mission acknowledged that there is a strongly expressed need for training and capacity building to ensure that these objectives are met in the long term.

In relation to proposed future developments, the mission recommended that the State Party clearly define these and ensure that the World Heritage Centre is notified on their scope and extent, before commitments are made.

c) *Maps for boundary and buffer zone*

The State Party reported that reconnaissance surveys had been conducted for all four national World Heritage properties and the draft boundaries located. However, the detailed boundary maps are still to be finalized. The mission recommends that the final drawings with coordinates be submitted to the World Heritage Centre at the earliest opportunity.

d) *Causes of the rising water table*

The State Party provided a technical report on this issue together with a bill of quantities to the World Heritage Centre on 23 March 2012. The World Heritage Centre suggested that the document needed to be updated and the company will be contacted accordingly. The State Party believes that the cause for the rising water table in the Tomb of the Brick Arches has a direct relation with the destabilization of Stele III. Therefore, if the problem in the foundation of Stele III is solved, the rising water table could be stabilized. In the meantime the State Party wishes to request international assistance to investigate the causes of the rising water table. The mission did not have time to investigate this issue.

e) *Stele III consolidation project*

Since the reinstallation of Stele II, structural instability of Stele III has been identified as an important factor affecting the property. Following the structural instability apparently caused by the reinstallation of Stele II, the UNESCO reinstallation project decided to install a temporary securing system consisting of stabilizing cables with an inclination monitoring

system. As part of Phase 2 of the reinstallation project of Stele II, financed by the Government of Italy, a study on structural investigations of the depth of the Stele III foundation was conducted. However as the Italian Government decided in July 2009 not to extend the project's duration beyond 31 December 2009, final consolidation works for Stele III could not be undertaken.

Subsequently in March 2010, a structural engineering company was requested by UNESCO to prepare a technical proposal for the consolidation of Stele III, which had an inclination of 2.24°. The company proposed a deeper foundation. The works were estimated to cost around 500, 000 Euros. The proposal was transmitted to the State Party for it to cover the costs. It was also recommended that until consolidation works were started, the temporary securing system should remain in place. This system was still in place when the mission team arrived in Askum in January 2013.

The mission considered that taking into account the fact that the technical problems encountered by Stele III are the consequence of Stele II's reinstallation; it recommended that the World Heritage Centre assist the State Party in its fundraising efforts to solve this problem.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the mission considered that the close functional relationship between the new museum and the Old and New St Mary of Zion church buildings justifies the position of the new museum within the Church compound, that the comparatively large museum had only little impact from viewpoints at important sites of the property, and that these could be mitigated by ensuring that high trees around the New Church of St Mary of Zion are maintained into the future and by minor modifications to the building.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further note the need for urgent progress to be made on the Management Plan with, if possible, the involvement of the Department of Archaeology, Aksum University. The Plan needs to include an interpretation strategy to show how the new church museum, in coordination with the archaeological museum, can play a pivotal role in presenting the property. They also note the need for the Aksum Master Plan to be reviewed in terms of heritage management, and for training and capacity building to support these processes.

A long-standing lack of clarity over the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone remains to be resolved and the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that work to clarify this issue needs to be undertaken as soon as possible.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party considers that the cause of the rising water table in the Tomb of the Brick Arches has a direct relation with the destabilization of Stele III, which in turn is believed to be related to the re-installation of Stele II. Currently the State Party has not identified funding to deal with either an investigation of the rising water table or with strengthening the foundations of Stele III, as recommended by a technical report. As the international community contributed to funds to repatriate Stele II, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies suggest that the Committee might wish to appeal for funds to address the implications of this project.

### **Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.38**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,

2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.41**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Notes the results of the mission that the Church Museum when completed will not have an adverse visual impact on specific views within the property if a screen of tall trees is maintained and the building façade is slightly modified as recommended by the mission; and requests the State Party to submit the final plans to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible;
4. Urges the State Party to implement the Management Plan with, if possible, the involvement of the Department of Archaeology, Aksum University, and to review the Aksum Master Plan in terms of heritage management;
5. Also urges the State Party to finalise the clarification of the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone as a matter of urgency and to submit a minor boundary modification to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2015** for examination by the World Heritage Committee;
6. Also notes that the State Party considers that the cause of the rising water table in the Tomb of the Brick Arches has a direct relation with the destabilization of Stele III, which in turn is believed to be related to the re-installation of Stele II and that the State Party has not identified funding to deal with either an investigation of the rising water table or with strengthening the foundations of Stele III, as recommended by a technical report;
7. Appeals to the international community, to consider supporting work to address the implications of the consolidation project of Stele III;
8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, 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 39th session in 2015.

#### **39. Lower Omo Valley (Ethiopia) (C 17)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (State Party report on the state of conservation of the property not received)

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late supplementary information from State Party)

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

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

### Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/116/documents/>

### International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 61,310

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/116/assistance/>

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount granted: USD 110,000 (Italian Funds-in-Trust); USD 23,100 (Croisi Europe); USD 86,900 (European Commission)

### Previous monitoring missions

2002, 2005: World Heritage Centre missions; 2006: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) No management and conservation plan;
- b) Pressure from urban development;
- c) Deterioration of dwellings;
- d) Waste disposal problems;
- e) Encroachment of the archaeological sites.

### Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/116>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 27 January 2013 as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012).

#### *a) State of conservation of the historic city*

The report includes an assessment of conditions that currently impact the protection, conservation and management of the property. These include, as noted in past years, the progressive change evidenced in the urban fabric of the property that remain unaddressed to date given the lack of implementation of strong planning and regulatory policies and the lack of regular maintenance. It notes that in addition to existing conservation issues, strong precipitation in August 2012 had a strong impact on the heritage buildings and led to the collapse of 50 historic houses distributed in the 10 quarters of the city. The collapsed buildings had previous structural problems and poor quality of construction materials, as evidenced by their frailty. No information is provided in the report with regards to the actions to be implemented to address these serious conditions. The report also notes that the sewage and general sanitation problems are still far from resolved, in spite of the numerous efforts implemented to date. The State Party highlights that the municipal authorities need to identify and rehabilitate deposits for solid waste management so that the banks are finally cleaned. In addition, the State Party reports on activities implemented to raise awareness regarding the heritage buildings at Djenné including training of guides, the distribution of booklets with heritage information and the development of touristic guides.

*b) State of archaeological components of the property*

Work continued in 2012 at the archaeological sites of Djenné Djeno and Hambarkétolo mainly on the renewal of stone limits, the installation of anti-erosion responses and the planting of trees. A new request for financial support has been submitted to implement the same measures at Kaniana and Tonomba. In addition, the State Party has increased surveillance and monitoring at the sites, has finalized the demarcation of all archaeological sites and has put signs at the four sites. These efforts will be increased in 2013 with emergency activities aiming at stopping erosion, through funding provided by the Government of the Netherlands and the World Heritage Fund.

*c) Demolition of the Old Courthouse*

As reported in 2012, the Old Courthouse building was demolished in September 2011. The Cultural Mission at Djenné halted the works. Several meetings have been held to identify alternative solutions for the now empty space. These include the reconstruction of the building to house the Chamber of Commerce, which would include a craft market.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that no substantial progress has been achieved on addressing pressing concerns regarding the protection, conservation and management of the property due to the conflict situation in the northern region of the country. They consider that for many years there has been a lack of effective collaboration mechanisms between local authorities and also minimal financial resources for the implementation of planning and regulatory measures. If the state of conservation of the property and the complex socio-economic issues being faced remain unaddressed, the attributes that warranted the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List will become highly vulnerable. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the joint reactive monitoring mission requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session assist the State Party in the development of an emergency action plan to address these longstanding concerns.

**Draft Decision:            37 COM 7B.41**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.44** adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Takes note of the actions implemented by the State Party at the property;*
4. *Notes with deep concern the existing conservation conditions, including the recent collapse of historic buildings, and the limited progress that has been made in past years to address them;*
5. *Urges the State Party, within the framework of the UNESCO Mali Action Plan adopted on 18 February 2013, to cooperate with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, as well as any other relevant international bodies, to identify means to implement the existing urban regulations, to update and approve a conservation and management plan for the property and to identify mechanisms to improve synergies among different stakeholders to ensure adequate protection and conservation of the historic fabric and the archaeological sites;*

6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a boundary clarification in the framework of the Retrospective Inventory process;*
7. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property, in particular the vulnerability of its distinctive architecture, the conditions of the archaeological components of the property and development proposals for different sectors, and to develop an emergency action plan for the implementation of priority conservation and protection measures;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2014, 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 38th session in 2014.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2000

Criteria  
(ii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/956/documents/>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 11,500  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/956/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
Total amount granted: USD 192,697.13 from the France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement

Previous monitoring missions  
March-April 2004: Joint World Heritage Centre/ France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement mission; April 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission; 2007: France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement mission; February 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/956>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a very brief report dated 28 January 2013 with partial responses to Decision **35 COM 7B.43** of the Committee. There was no information regarding precise details of the present situation of the state of conservation of the property, the practical functioning of its institutions, notably as concerns the overall control of the new constructions and renovations, the work carried out, ongoing and future, and the overall management of the property and its conservation.

#### a) *Establishment of a management mechanism, coordination with the municipality*

The State Party recalls the decree for the creation of the Safeguarding Committee for Saint-Louis and its Permanent Secretariat (No. 3395 of 29 March 2011), as well as the appointment of the site manager (23 April 2011). The Committee is responsible for the application of the Safeguarding and Enhancement Plan of Saint-Louis and the Secretariat should carry out the technical examination of the rehabilitation, restoration or construction projects for consideration by the Committee. However, the human, financial and technical resources available for these management structures are not indicated. No reference is made to the links with municipality actions and projects for heritage conservation (Local Development Agency, Heritage Centre) except for a possible representation of the municipality within the Committee as “non-State” representatives.

#### b) *Conservation of the property, Management Plan and Tourism Development Programme*

Different programme frameworks and projects are discussed. The main information is the financial consolidation of the Tourism Development Programme for Saint-Louis and its region, with a total amount of 29M EU through a loan and assistance from the French Development Agency (24.5M EU). It will comprise 7.37M EU for conservation of the property, to encourage the regulated restoration of the private buildings by the municipality (Heritage Centre). A part of this budget will be allocated to the upgrading of the open areas (7.82M EU) and to the eradication of unauthorized dumping of household waste (3M EU). The State Party indicated the need to accompany this programme with a “more detailed plan” with regard to conservation of the property. The nature of the conservation activities to be financed in the framework of this development programme at the property is not clear. The manager of the property is indicated as participating in the Steering Committee of the Tourism Development Programme.

Furthermore, the report refers to the Safeguarding and Enhancement Programme for the property (PSMV, 2008) which today no longer appears operational, nor its recommendations respected; only organized monitoring of conservation will enable an evaluation of its compatibility with the conservation component of the Tourism Development Programme, and its updating should be envisaged.

Rehabilitation of the Faidherbe Bridge is indicated as completed, but this is an old project (2007). Other restoration projects concerning the fishing quays, public squares and buildings are announced in partnership with the FDA; however, there is still no conservation plan for the whole property, for its urban fabric nor for its public buildings and private residencies.

#### c) *Control mechanisms for constructions and granting of building permits*

According to the report, building permits are approved by the local representative of the Architectural Office for Historic Monuments of the Ministry of Culture (BAMH). The report does not provide information regarding the state of the new constructions that do not respect the authenticity and integrity of the property, nor the establishment of a monitoring mechanism for conservation to ensure efficacy. There is no evidence of coordination as regards the control of the construction work, neither with the Secretariat of the Safeguarding Committee nor the Town Hall of Saint-Louis.

## Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned about the lack of information, in particular with regard to progress achieved in the Tourism Development project for Saint-Louis and its region, with assistance from the French Development Agency. They are also concerned about the implementation of such a project in the absence of a site manager and a management and conservation plan for the property. Moreover, there is no guarantee there are adequate means available to the property for its conservation and the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value. However, it is necessary to ensure that the work foreseen for the quays and the squares respect the authenticity and integrity of the property. More broadly, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies need to be informed of the detailed programme of the Tourism Development project prior to its implementation.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have since noted the establishment of the Safeguarding Committee and its Secretariat and the appointment of a site manager, but no significant progress has been accomplished and there is no apparent progress in cooperation at the national, regional and local levels. Clear and precise division of responsibilities for the protection, conservation and monitoring of the property is not evident.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that to date no significant action has been undertaken to halt the degradation of the architectural heritage and the urban fabric, which continues to negatively affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Consequently, they recommend that a joint reactive monitoring mission by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS take place to evaluate the state of conservation of the property, progress made in management and the existence of the necessary criteria for the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Furthermore, all the information available to date indicates that the architectural and urban heritage of Saint-Louis continues to deteriorate, for both natural and socio-economic reasons, with insufficient coordinated management, and this despite the efforts undertaken by the State Party. Also, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies continue to draw the attention of the World Heritage Committee to the degradation of the state of conservation of a large area of the historic urban fabric and the replacement of traditional historic buildings by new constructions that do not respect the authenticity and integrity of the property.

## **Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.42**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.43** adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the progress accomplished by the State Party with regard to the financial consolidation of its tourism development projects for Saint-Louis and its region, with an important percentage to be allocated to the conservation of the property;*
4. *Expresses its deep concern once again with regard to the continued degradation and collapse of the historic urban fabric and the construction of buildings that do not respect the authenticity and integrity and adversely affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
5. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to consolidate the conservation and management mechanisms for the property, and in particular:*

- a) *Ensure sufficient human, financial and technical resources for all the necessary activities in the conservation and management of the property,*
  - b) *Apply, without derogation, the control mechanisms for constructions and grant building permits, in coordination with the Secretariat of the Safeguarding Committee of the property and the municipality of Saint-Louis,*
  - c) *Ensure adequate coordination between the initiatives carried out at the site and between the different institutional actors at the national, regional and local levels,*
  - d) *Urgently begin to prepare the management plan in coordination with the municipality,*
  - e) *Foresee in the management plan a coordinated programme for the conservation of both the urban fabric and the public buildings and private residences,*
  - f) *Establish a monitoring mechanism for the state of conservation of the property based on precise indicators with regular controls;*
6. *Reiterates its encouragement to the State Party to clarify the specific roles, responsibilities, tasks and capacities of the governmental institutions at the national and municipal levels through a Memorandum of Understanding or by different means;*
7. *Invites the State Party and the municipality to provide the World Heritage Centre with detailed information concerning the rehabilitation projects for the quays and surrounding areas, the Tourism Development Programme and in general any major project foreseen on the Island of Saint-Louis and its buffer zone for examination by the Advisory Bodies in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to evaluate the general state of conservation of the property and progress in its management and to evaluate whether there exist criteria for its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
9. *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 indicating progress in the implementation of the above points for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

#### **43. Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2003

Criteria  
(ii) (iii) (iv) (v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1099/documents/>

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2010 and January 2012: Joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a proper buffer zone;
- b) Lack of a management plan;
- c) Mining activities;
- d) Development pressure.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1099>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 29 January 2013. This report addressed the requests of the World Heritage Committee at its last session in relation to the impact of open-cast coal mining, the drafting of the management plan, protection, conservation and consolidation of archaeological sites and the clarification of the boundary and the buffer zone. It also reported on progress with the Trans-Frontier Conservation Area and on the proposed underground expansion of the De Beers Venetia Mine in the buffer zone.

a) *Impact of Open-cast Coal Mining*

The World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to ensure that the open-cast coal mining that was resumed in November 2011 does not negatively impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. In its report, the State Party reiterated that the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) carried out in 2011 concluded that the open-cast mining will have no direct impact on the OUV of the property although the mining activities will impact on sites in the buffer zone closely related to the Mapungubwe Kingdom. The proposed mitigation, as set out in the HIA, is for archaeological sites to be recorded before destruction.

The State Party reports that a professional archaeologist has been appointed to provide day to day monitoring of the mining area and to oversee all mitigation measures, including cases where archaeological sites may have to be rescued. The State Party is also working with stakeholders in ensuring that archaeological research is undertaken on sites outside the mining areas but located within the wider landscape. This is part of an offset programme funded by the mining company that is currently being finalised.

b) *Integrated Management Plan*

The State Party has finalized the Integrated Management Plan for the property, and its draft was submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 29 January 2013, pending the final approval by the Minister in terms of the relevant national legislation.

c) *Protection, Conservation and Consolidation of Archaeological sites*

The State Party reports that a project to rehabilitate and conserve major archaeological sites within the property has been completed. No details were provided in the submitted report.

d) *Clarifying Boundary and Buffer Zone*

The State Party indicates that at the time of the inscription, although there was no buffer zone marked on the maps supplied, the area of the buffer zone was indicated in the text of the nomination dossier and this was said to include the Limpopo, Venetia Limpopo and Vhembe Reserves.

In the ICOMOS evaluation, it was stated that a trilateral Memorandum of Understanding had been drawn up with the objective of establishing a Limpopo-Shashe Transfrontier Conservation Area (TFCA) and that this very extensive area in South Africa, Botswana and Zimbabwe would, when established, constitute a very effective buffer zone. The nomination stated that on the South African side the TFCA would include the Mapungubwe nominated area and its buffer zone. A map provided to the evaluation mission indicated this area encircling the property.

In 2009, the State Party delineated and approved at national level a buffer zone that excluded land in private ownership to the east of the property – but this buffer zone has not been presented to the Committee for approval. The State Party now acknowledges that the existing buffer zone does not extend to cover all areas that are necessary for the effective protection of the property's OUV. An assessment has enabled the State Party to map out a more effective buffer zone, informed by distribution of archaeological sites, view shed protection and catchment protection areas

The State Party reports that, in 2012, as a result of appointing a facilitator to speed up negotiations with the land owners, it is now in a position to inform the Committee that the owners of the properties making up the 7 km of land to the east of the property have agreed to be incorporated into the buffer zone. A legal agreement between the land-owners and the State Party is under development. The State Party will be submitting in due course an application for a minor boundary modification.

e) *Trans-Frontier Conservation Area*

The State Party reports that the process of establishing a TFCA is almost completed waiting the signing of the treaty by the States Parties of Botswana, South Africa and Zimbabwe. The three countries have already agreed on the final draft of the TFCA treaty at a Ministerial level.

f) *Proposed expansion of De Beers Venetia Mine & other mineral issues*

The Venetia Diamond Mine lies within the buffer zone to the south of the property. It was officially opened in 1992. The mine has been operated as an open-cast mine within the footprint that existed at the time of inscription.

The State Party reports that an expansion of the mine is now proposed. This next phase involves an underground expansion and will take place within the existing footprint of the mine. No details are provided on any infra-structural implications of this expansion. The 2012 mission expressed concern at several large installations in the northern part of the property that provided the mine with water from the Limpopo River. The Management Plan mentions that as well as the rich coal and diamond resources, there are other strategic minerals on the borders of the park, and also a projected power station and a coal /gas field north of the Soutpansberg that will it is said "change the character of the landscape in and around the Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (MCL)." It also refers to the appraisal of the buffer zone as an opportunity to "facilitate the strategic engagement with the now numerous prospecting and mining applications in the area, especially around the need to negotiate advantageous off-set arrangements with prospective mining companies."

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the arrangements made for archaeological advice on measures to mitigate the impact of the open-cast coal mining on archaeological remains associated with the Mapungubwe Kingdom.

They recommend that the Committee welcome the progress made with the establishment of the TFCA and with extending the current buffer zone to the east of the property following the negotiations with private owners. As soon as a legal agreement with these owners has been agreed, a formal map of the overall buffer zone, together with details of its protection and management, needs to be presented to the World Heritage Committee for approval. In

particular there needs to be clarification that no further mining activities will be allowed to take place in the buffer zone and this clarification needs to be reflected in the Management Plan, particularly in respect of 'off-set arrangements'.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the proposed underground expansion of the Venetia diamond mine and consider that further information needs to be provided on the associated infra-structural activities, such as roads and water supplies that will be needed for an expanded operation, in relation to their potential impact on the OUV.

The Advisory Bodies have reviewed the draft Management Plan and consider it a thorough, readable and professional plan for the World Heritage site and the contiguous National Park. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that in relation to mining activities in the buffer zone, the plan needs to have greater clarity in terms of the impact of mining on the property and of the benefits of 'off-set arrangements'. The Management Plan also refers to the development a coal /gas field north of the Soutpansberg that will "change the character of the landscape in and around the MCL". Further information on this project needs to be provided as soon as possible in relation to its potential impact on the OUV of the property.

**Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.43**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.48**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Acknowledges that archaeological advice will be provided to oversee the mitigation measures associated with the impact of open-cast coal mining on archaeological sites associated with the Mapungubwe Kingdom;*
4. *Notes the progress made in establishing a buffer zone for the property that will cover land to the east of the boundary, and progress with the establishment of the Limpopo-Shashe Transfrontier Conservation Area (TFCA);*
5. *Urges the State Party to submit a minor boundary modification for a buffer zone that clarifies the policies for protecting the property with respect to mining in the buffer zone and in relation to "off-set benefits";*
6. *Also notes the production of the detailed and comprehensive Management Plan, requests the State Party to provide copies of the final approved plan to the World Heritage Centre and also urges the State Party to implement the plan with immediate effect;*
7. *Takes note of the proposed underground expansion of the De Beers Venetia Mine in the buffer zone and also requests the State Party to provide further details to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies on the infrastructure arrangements associated with this expansion, in particular for transport and water supplies, and to provide appropriate Heritage Impact Assessments before any irreversible commitments are made;*
8. *Notes with concern the proposals for the development a coal/gas field north of the Soutpansberg, which it is stated will "change the character of the landscape in and around the Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (MCL)", and in line with Paragraph 172 of*

the Operational Guidelines, and further requests the State Party to provide, as soon as possible, an Environmental Impact Assessment and a Heritage Impact Assessment to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies before irreversible commitments are made;

9. Reiterates past decisions regarding gas exploration and exploitation in World Heritage properties as well as the International Council on Mining and Metals' (ICMM) Position Statement on Mining and Protected Areas to "not explore or mine in World Heritage properties", and therefore requests furthermore the State Party to ban any development of the coal/gas field in the property and to halt any development of the coal/gas field in the buffer zone until a Heritage Impact Assessment has been undertaken and submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;
10. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.

**44. Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai, and Environs (South Africa) (C 915bis)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (State Party report on the state of conservation of the property not received)

## ARAB STATES

### 45. 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  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/193/documents>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 102,160  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/193/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
Total amount granted: 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, in the absence of a defined buffer zone, illegal construction provokes land disputes;
- d) Lack of capacities for site conservation, unsuitable restoration techniques, and poor conservation conditions for the archaeological remains;
- e) Proposed port development.

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/193>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report, prepared in response to Decision **33 COM 7B.51** (Seville, 2009), provides a brief overview of progress made in implementing the two recommendations made in that Decision and reiterated in Decision **35 COM 7B.46** (UNESCO, 2011). The report concludes with a notification that the State Party intends to invite an advisory mission to be sent to the property.

- a) *Progress made on implementing the protection and enhancement plan for the archaeological sites of Tipasa and its protection zone (PPMVSA)*

In its report, the State Party advises that the PPMVSA (Plan de protection et de mise en valeur des sites archéologiques de Tipasa et de sa zone de protection) was adopted on 13 December 2010 by the Popular Assembly of the Wilaya Province of Tipasa. The Plan was subsequently approved by Executive Decree of 25 March 2012 and published in the official

gazette of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria. The State Party further advises that the Plan is being implemented by the Department of Culture of the Wilaya of Tipasa.

The report notes that the Directorate of Culture has launched a limited consultation on a project for development and enhancement of the Royal Mausoleum of Mauretania (Kbor er Roumia); the emergency protective work and temporary shoring-up of unstable structures in both East and West archaeological parks. It also includes repair of the enclosures and establishment of monitoring, security, fire protection, and lighting systems in both East and West archaeological parks. This project must be validated by the Ministry of Culture's *Direction de la conservation et de la restauration des biens culturels*. Some security work for the property was initiated during 2012. The State Party also reports that reinforced measures for securing these three archaeological units have been taken, following a major recruitment of guards trained for this purpose.

b) *Assessment of the impact of the proposed enhancement of Tipasa's port*

The 2011 preliminary study for the proposed enhancement of Tipasa's port includes six components: marina, fishing port, landscaped park, ancient garden, port esplanade, and cliff garden. A summary pilot project for the protection of the cliff is also included. In its report, the State Party notes that the detailed draft project design for the enhancement of the port's embankments has not yet started. According to the State Party, questions related to administrative and financial authority did not allow progress to be made on this part of the project. The State Party announces that the Ministry of Culture will invite an advisory mission. The World Heritage Centre received such an invitation on 21 March 2013 and is studying with the Advisory Bodies the feasibility of undertaking the mission by September 2013. Concerning the study of the proposed protection of the port's cliff, the Ministry of Culture has asked the Public Works Department of the Wilaya to suspend all procedures for approval of the study, pending an evaluation of the project by the above-mentioned mission. A heritage impact assessment of the proposed port enhancement, requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008), 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 35th (UNESCO, 2011) sessions, was not submitted.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the progress being made in implementing the Protection and enhancement plan for the property. They would also appreciate the opportunity to discuss the Plan's progress during the advisory mission and the proposed port enhancement with the State Party and the concerned parties on the ground, as proposed by the Ministry of Culture, in order to allow a proper assessment before detailed project designs are prepared.

**Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.45**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decisions **33 COM 7B.51** and **35 COM 7B.46**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) and 35th (UNESCO, 2011) sessions respectively,
3. Takes note of the progress made by the State Party in implementing the plan for the protection and enhancement of the property and its protected area;
4. Also takes note of the State Party's invitation of an advisory mission to the property and reiterates its request to submit to the World Heritage Centre an Heritage impact

*assessment of the proposed enhancement of Tipasa's port, before the advisory mission and prior to any commitment being made;*

5. *Requests the State Party to submit further details on the protection and enhancement works foreseen at the property;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2015, 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 39th session in 2015.*

## **46. Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1992

Criteria  
(ii) (v)

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/565/documents>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 87,600  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/565/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
September 2001: World Heritage Centre reactive monitoring mission; from November 2007 to 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  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/565>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2013, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party in response to Decision **35 COM 7B.47** (UNESCO, 2011). The report provides a brief overview of progress made in implementing the recommendations of the World heritage Committee.

a) *Impact of the development of the Metro on the Place des Martyrs*

The State Party had previously reported that, based on test excavations which found potentially significant archaeological remains at the Place des Martyrs, the Metro station, originally planned for a depth of 19 metres, will now be lowered to 34 metres so as not to disturb the archaeological layer. It further stated the only visual elements of the Metro at the surface level would be the access points. A museum will also be included in the development, but it will be entirely underground with access through one of the Metro access points.

In its state of conservation report, the State Party has updated this information to inform the Committee that a new, more extensive archaeological survey confirms the existence of important archaeological remains, including a basilica with polychrome mosaics and a cemetery. A detailed report of the excavations, including visual material, was submitted. Further archaeological research is to be carried out by the national authorities in cooperation with a team from France. The State Party reports that technical documents, detailed design, and development plans for the Metro station and the museum station are currently being prepared and will be forwarded to the World Heritage Centre as soon as they are completed.

b) *Information on projects envisaged 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*

The State Party reports that the urban master plan had foreseen a new memorial at the Place des Martyrs. The Ministry of Culture opposed this new urban insertion, and the report states that the Office of the Prime Minister has agreed with the position of the Ministry of Culture. The report states that the project has now been formally cancelled, and the Place des Martyrs will remain an open space with only minimal visual impacts from the access points to the Metro and museum. The State Party has recently invited an Advisory mission to review several foreseen projects. Arrangements for the mission are currently in process between the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

c) *Cadastral map*

Following the request of the World Heritage Committee, the State Party reports that it has submitted a cadastral map to the World Heritage Centre in December 2012, in the framework of the Retrospective Inventory process (see Document WHC-13/37.COM/8D).

d) *State of advancement of the Permanent Plan for the Safeguarding and Valorization of the property*

The State Party reports that the plan was approved by decree on 21 March 2012 and will be implemented by the "Agence Nationale des Secteurs Sauvegardés". This organization was created in 2011, and will begin its work with the appointment of a director in August 2013.

As noted in a previous report, a first phase of urgent conservation measures was carried out in 2011. A second phase aiming at implementing protection and enhancement activities is now underway, based on a commitment of 920 million euros, over a period of 10 years, made by the State Party in March 2012, in the framework of the 2013 Finance Act. Prioritization of the work to be carried out will include the study and restoration of buildings held in private property and will be based on a condition survey already completed, with properties in the most urgent need of restoration being given first priority.

The State party further reports that it is updating its information on the legal status of each building and has set up a communication mechanism for interaction with local owners, which will allow it to better understand their needs and points of view and to work together to find adequate solutions. Through this mechanism, there have been 266 requests for the conservation and rehabilitation of buildings, and 120 owners have expressed interest in selling their properties to the State.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the continuing efforts made by the State Party to protect the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. In particular, they note the cancellation of the planned memorial in the Place des Martyrs, the efforts made to minimise the physical and visual impacts of the proposed access to the Metro station. They also take note of the commitment of the State Party to secure substantial funding for the urgently needed rehabilitation and conservation work on the urban fabric. They further note the ongoing archaeological research being carried out, which will enhance knowledge and understanding of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies consider there is a need for a Heritage impact assessment in order to better understand the impact of the Metro station access on the attributes that sustain the OUV of the property.

### **Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.46**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.47**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party concerning measures taken to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and commends its commitment for securing substantial funding for the urgently needed rehabilitation and conservation work on the urban fabric;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to continue its efforts through the implementation of the approved Permanent Plan for the Safeguarding and Valorization of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide, **as soon as possible** and before any irreversible commitments are made, a Heritage impact assessment for the Metro station access to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, 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 39th session in 2015.*

### **47. Qal'at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun (Bahrain) (C 1192bis)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (supplementary information requested)

## 48. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

### Criteria

(i) (iii) (vi)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/87/documents>

### International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 7,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/87/assistance>

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount granted: USD 1,131,000 from the Japanese Funds-in-Trust 2002-2004 and 2008 (wall paintings restoration in the tomb of Amenophis III).

### Previous monitoring missions

2001: ICOMOS mission; 2002: hydrology expert mission; July 2006 and May 2007: World Heritage Centre missions; April 2008: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; May 2009: World Heritage Centre /ICOMOS mission.

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Raise of the underground water level;
- b) Risks of flooding (Valleys of Kings and Queens);
- c) Absence of a comprehensive Management Plan;
- d) Major infrastructure and development projects taking place or scheduled;
- e) Uncontrolled urban development;
- f) Housing and agricultural encroachment on the West Bank;
- g) Demolitions in the villages of Gurna on the West Bank of the Nile and transfer of the population.

### Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/87>

and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

A report on the state of conservation of the property was sent by the State party on 20 February 2013 as requested by the World Heritage Committee.

#### a) *Management plan*

The State Party indicated that the process for developing a management Plan for the property has started with the creation of the National Committee for World Heritage sites management, through Ministerial Decree 19. It is expected that the Committee will define and enforce, through participatory processes, diverse strategies to ensure effective management systems for World Heritage sites in Egypt. In addition, it is expected that Geographical Information System (GIS) will be utilised for the archaeological surveying of all sites to process geographic data and produce integrated maps that will be readily available to all stakeholders. Capacity building is also anticipated for archaeologists and conservators working at these sites. No specific timeframe is provided for the finalisation of the management plan.

#### b) *Implementation of conservation projects at the property*

The State Party provided a list of several maintenance and development projects that have been implemented between 2011 and 2012. These have included projects such as reduction

of groundwater levels beneath the temples, the removal of modern encroachments and houses which will result in the expansion of the buffer zone, capacity building for archaeologists and conservators through the training field school in Luxor, archaeological research, the development of storage facilities and moving of collections, etc.

The report also provides a list of actions foreseen for 2013, including the Reservation project of Luxor and Karnak temples, the restoration project for the Khnosu Temple, the road lighting project, among others, on the Eastern Bank. For the Western Bank, the development of the Valley of the Queens, in collaboration with the Getty Conservation Institute is foreseen, as well as the restoration and development works as several temples and tombs. Excavation works are expected to continue at both banks throughout 2013. No additional information was provided on the projects foreseen for the Corniche or the landing stage for cruise boats on the Western Bank.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that several infrastructure projects, such as the construction of new entrances, parking lots, and the construction of a visitor centre on the Eastern bank, were implemented without having submitted their technical specifications for review prior to their implementation. They would underscore the significance of informing about potential developments and providing technical details to ensure that the conditions of integrity continue to be met and that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is not compromised. Although they recognise the importance of continuing archaeological research and conservation work at the property, they note that these activities continue to be implemented without a management plan that would not only integrate all components of the property but that would also provide policy frameworks and guidance for all interventions.

### **Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.48**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.50**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Notes the information provided by the State Party on the implementation of projects at the property and urges the State Party to reduce interventions at the property to only essential stabilization works until the integrated management plan is fully developed and adopted;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to provide detailed information on the planning and design of proposed and on-going projects, in particular those related to infrastructure development, for review prior to implementation;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, 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 39th session in 2015.*

## 49. 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

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

### International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 467,900 For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/89/assistance>

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

Total amount granted: Special Account for the safeguarding of the cultural heritage of Egypt: USD 2,203,304 dollars for the project Urban Regeneration of Historic Cairo (URHC).

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/663>

### 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; 2009-2013: several World Heritage Centre missions for the URHC 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

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/89>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 20 February 2013, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre a report on the state of conservation of the property addressing some of the issues requested by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **36 COM 7B.51**. It indicates notably some progress in revising the existing protection measures for areas of Peculiar Value (L.119/2008, Building Law and following decrees), by the National Organisation for Urban Harmony in cooperation with the UNESCO Urban Regeneration of Historic Cairo (URHC) Project. The report also announces the creation of a National Committee for all World Heritage properties of Egypt considered as a first step toward the establishment of a management system for Historic Cairo, the definition of which is planned to be completed in the coming months in close consultation with the concerned stakeholders involved in the protection of the property, as well as with the URHC project.

No mention is made in the report of progress either in finalising the revision of the clarification of the property's boundary or in submitting a revised draft of the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The State Party's report evokes the current political situation in Egypt that so far has not allowed implementing positive changes and, on the contrary, is putting the property under threat because of the difficulties in monitoring the situation during this transitional period. In

particular, it mentions the presence of a large number of illegal buildings constructed with inconsistent materials and architectural design, mainly exceeding the heights specified in the regulation for Historic Cairo. Those illegal buildings are made up of reinforced concrete which makes them very difficult to be removed. Many decisions were taken through 2012 concerning the removal of illegal buildings within Historic Cairo, but the administrative authorities are unable to stop these irregularities or to apply the removal orders. In addition, the report presents the interventions carried out by the Ministry of Antiquities in 2012, starting from the Al Muizz project (all the listed interventions had already been presented in the 2009 state of conservation report) and the list of on-going and future restoration projects of monuments.

Separately the World Heritage Centre has received a copy of a report by the UNESCO Urban Regeneration of Historic Cairo Project (URHC), as follows:

The technical results of the first two years of the URHC project have been summarized in the First report of activities (available on web page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/663>, and <http://www.urhcproject.org>). The URHC project team confirms that the on-going uncontrolled processes of renovation are leading to the definite dilapidation of large parts of the urban fabric, seriously threatening its vitality and liveability while affecting the significance of the monuments in relation to their surrounding context. As for the archaeological areas within the World Heritage property, their present dramatic condition of maintenance (in particular the area of Fustat) definitely requires an assessment in order to verify the appropriateness of the regulatory and management measures.

The report includes an accurate and very detailed analysis of the historical evolution and transformations of the urban fabric of the property, and suggests how this could be used to define the boundaries of the property and inform the revision of its retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Both of these outcomes have been discussed with the Egyptian authorities several times during 2011 and 2012. Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that despite concerns expressed by the World Heritage Committee, very little progress has been made by the State Party in the effective protection of the property. They also note that despite the considerable effort deployed by the URHC team to develop cooperation with institutional counterparts and dialogue among the various institutions and stakeholders, the conclusions of the URHC report that lead to a logical definition of the boundaries and a basis for a revised draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value have not led to any submission by the State Party for a clarification of the boundaries or a retrospective Statement. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party in its report acknowledges that its approach is focused on monuments, rather than on urban landscape.

Whilst understanding the difficulties caused by the current situation, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to underline the impact of the absence of management measures on the protection of the property. They also note that ensuring long-term conservation and management will require considerable time and capacity-building to develop an efficient and adequate managing system. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee reiterate its requests made at previous sessions to take decisive action to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value for which Historic Cairo was recognized as a World Heritage property and to develop an adequate management system. They consider that the World Heritage Committee may wish to send a reactive monitoring mission to assess the overall state of conservation of the property and the presence of threats which could potentially warrant its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.49**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.51**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit a revised draft of the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value or clarification of the boundaries for the property and reiterates its request to the State Party for their submission;
4. Notes with concern the information provided by the State Party and the UNESCO Urban Regeneration of Historic Cairo Project (URHC) team on the alarming situation of the state of conservation of the property;
5. Strongly urges the State Party to ensure that measures are taken **as soon as possible** to stop illegal construction and to protect the archaeological areas;
6. Also urges the State Party to establish appropriate management mechanisms and prepare a management plan for the property;
7. 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 potential threats to its Outstanding Universal Value;
8. Also 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 and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014 **with a view to considering, if the ascertained or potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value is confirmed and in the absence of substantial progress in implementing the above, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

**50. 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  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/326/documents>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 147,079  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/326/assistance>

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

USD 1 million from the Italian Fund-in-Trust

### 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 and buffer zone.

### Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/326>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 1 February 2013 in response to the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011). It provides detailed information on the on-going wide range of initiatives for the conservation, protection and management of the property.

#### a) *Management arrangements and resources for operation*

The Petra Development and Tourism Region Authority (PDTRA), the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities (MoTA) and the Department of Antiquities (DoA) have strengthened working relationships and launched a series of initiatives inserted within the Petra Archaeological Park (PAP) Operational Priorities Plan (2010-2015). This was developed as a reference to articulate actions on the core functional areas of the Park, with a particular focus on conservation, protection, visitor experience, services, facility operations, maintenance and management, while the management plan is being developed. Capacity building remains a pressing need; therefore a technical training component will be included in the management plan. A Petra Advisory Committee was set up in January 2013 to review project proposals and defined priorities. Technical task force groups have been created to advise specific initiatives and a Park Ranger Force has been established. A local cooperative, comprised of representatives from six adjacent communities has been formed to engage local residents in activities at the property. The Park's Management has benefited from various technical and financial sources and a policy is in place to allocate 10% of the 35% of the collected revenues for maintenance of the property. With the definition of the operational programme, additional funding sources will be identified to secure the resources for the implementation of the conservation and management plans. In the meantime, the Strategic Master Plan for the Petra Region, mentioned in the State Party's report, identifies priority action planning for the entire region for the next 20 years. The enforcement of this Plan with regard to the PAP area and its buffer zone remains unclear.

#### b) *Risk management plan for the property*

For the development of the comprehensive risk management plan, actions implemented include the completion of the pilot methodology study for the core risk mapping, the preliminary conservation plan risk assessment, and the Siq detailed assessment. Within the Petra risk mapping project, the boundaries of the property have been identified and physically mapped for the first time. Based on the results, a Disaster Risk Reduction Plan will be drafted and integrated within the Strategic Master Plan for the Petra Region. Monitoring techniques for assessing the stability of the Siq have been identified. No timeframe for the completion of the Disaster Risk Reduction Plan has been provided.

#### c) *Integrated conservation plan*

The preparation of the Petra Conservation Plan was launched in March 2012 and is expected to be completed in the summer of 2013. Other planning tools have also been updated, including: the Heritage Site Inventory and Management System Database, the

Petra Regional Master Plan 2011-2030 (which identifies potential zoning in urban and non-urban areas), the Visitor Trails Improvement Plan, the Environmental and Social Impact assessment for the back road rehabilitation proposal. Their results will be integrated in the management plan.

d) *Archaeological excavations*

The DoA, in consultation with PDTRA, halted specific excavations and issued excavation directives to all active archaeological projects to undertake conservation, safety and interpretative measures as a priority to rectify past deficiencies. Archaeological research and excavation regulations, as well as new application guidelines, have been drafted and are currently in the process of legal review, along with new national regulations.

e) *Buffer zone for the property*

Planning studies and a consultative process have been undertaken to define the buffer zone of the PAP, following on from the work undertaken as part of the Petra Regional Master Plan and UNESCO Amman's delineation for preliminary guidelines. The legal and regulatory definition of the delineated areas is currently in progress and takes the newly developed boundaries as the reference. The PAP Buffer Zone Plan will be developed to define implementation stages. Completion is expected in May 2013.

f) *Other issues*

Other initiatives for the conservation and management of the property reported on include conservation of the Beidha Neolithic site, conservation and maintenance of the Petra (Byzantine) Church, rehabilitation of the Wadi al-Jarra Dam and the development of regulations for site use. Development initiatives to enhance Park services and amenities, such as the renewable energy project, the back road rehabilitation, the creation of restroom facilities, the rehabilitation of the visitor centre, interpretive signage and site maps, e-ticketing system, emergency clinic and an animal awareness campaign have also been undertaken.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note actions implemented by the State Party in line with the decisions of the World Heritage Committee and the recommendations of the 2010 reactive monitoring mission. They would like to underscore the need to sustain these efforts to comprehensively address long-standing concerns, particularly in relation to the efficacy of the management system, conservation of archaeological remains and visitor management and public use.

**Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.50**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.49**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the implementation of conservation and management measures to address existing conditions at the property;*
4. *Urges the State Party to sustain on-going efforts, with particular attention to the following:*
  - a) *Finalise the delineation of the buffer zone and develop adequate regulatory measures to ensure its protection, and submit a minor boundary modification*

proposal by **1 February 2014** for review by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014,

- b) *Finalise the Petra Conservation Plan and develop a comprehensive Management Plan for the property, building on previous documents and ensuring synergies with existing planning initiatives; ensure official endorsement of existing plans (e.g. Operational Priorities Plan 2010-2015 or the Strategic Master Plan 2011-2030) by the governing bodies; submit all completed plans related to the conservation and management of the property for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and undertake the necessary adoption process to ensure their effective enforcement,*
  - c) *Finalise the development of the Disaster Risk Reduction Plan and secure the necessary resources for its implementation, prioritising the stabilization of the Siq,*
  - d) *Finalise the development of a visitor management strategy, including regulations for public use, in consideration of the carrying capacity of the property,*
  - e) *Identify priority capacity building needs and implement the necessary measures to address them,*
  - f) *Ensure that Heritage Impact Assessments, in relation to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, are carried out for development works foreseen, and submit, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, project proposals and their technical specifications to the World Heritage Centre for review prior to committing to their implementation;*
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, 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 39th session in 2015.

## **51. Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2004

Criteria  
(i) (iv) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1093/documents/>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 34,750  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1093/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
Total amount granted: USD 6,000 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust

Previous monitoring missions  
March-April 2005: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; November 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS mission; March 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; July 2008: World Heritage Centre expert mission for the Stylite tower.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1093>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 4 February 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report covering the following aspects: conservation of the Stylite tower, development of the management plan, monitoring at the site and public access to the site.

a) *Stylite tower*

In response to the request made by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session regarding the finalization of a “scientifically and technically sound conservation and restoration project for the Stylite tower”, the State Party has undertaken a series of monitoring measures: accurate documentation work of the tower using laser scanning technology, installation of four special crack monitoring devices, forms to be used by the staff of the Department of Antiquities (DoA) at the site and utilization of the 2009 stone-by-stone survey. Concerning the laser scanning documentation, done in late 2012, the State Party foresees to use the data to monitor the cracks on the facades of the tower twice a year. The results of the scanning are annexed to the State Party’s report but no details are provided on the methodology relating to the monitoring. For the special crack monitoring devices, an on-site reading is foreseen four times a year and a special form has been produced by the DoA to this end but no result has come out so far.

In terms of conservation, the State Party envisages to minimize its intervention on the tower because of its fragile structural condition. An investigation of the upper room is currently being conducted (no timeframe provided for its completion) in view of possible actions: stitching of the walls where material has been lost due to cracks and installation of drainage pipes through the existing channel. This would complete the installation of a net to prevent further slippage of the top of the walls. Stainless steel needles are foreseen to protect the room from birds nesting effects. No documentation is provided to detail these proposals.

Concerning the walls of the tower, an external stainless steel belt is currently being used to block the expansion of the cracks and two additional stainless steel belts on the upper part of the tower are envisaged by the State Party which considers that this intervention is the most appropriate at this stage, in light of the resources and technologies presently available in the country. For the conservation of the facades, the State Party will rely on filling the gaps with stones and repairing smaller opens with mortar. Some information is provided about the stainless steel belts but it is not sufficient to show how the proposed system functions.

b) *Management Plan*

The State Party considers that a new management plan must be developed for the property due to a number of changes resulting from the opening of the visitor centre and the planned modification of the property’s boundaries in order to include a new component. It is not clear whether the management plan which seems to have been developed during the last years, but has not yet been finalized and submitted, will be adapted or abandoned. The State Party declares that it obtained financial support from the European Commission to develop a new management plan over an 18-month period, starting from the day of signature of the agreement (foreseen in March 2013).

c) *Monitoring (other than the one relating to the Stylite tower)*

The State Party has developed a monitoring form and attached it to the report. However, no results of the application of this tool have been provided. Archaeologists and a mosaic conservator are currently being trained, notably on monitoring issues.

d) *Public access and use*

The visitor centre, inaugurated in 2012, seems to play an important orientation and interpretation role. The State Party declares its intention to involve the local community in the elaboration of the management plan of the property.

The State Party has started a new physical condition assessment of all the components of the property. The results of this assessment, which have not been provided in the State Party's report, are expected to be evaluated in June 2013 and will lead to the definition of conservation measures.

The excavation works have been stopped at the property until proper regulations are set and the management plan is complete. The DoA issued new regulations this year for archaeological surveys and excavations. A specific article (no 17) concerning the World Heritage sites in Jordan has been included in the "Regulations for archaeological excavations and surveys in Jordan".

In the framework of the Retrospective Inventory, the State Party has submitted a map displaying the original boundaries of the property at the same time as a proposal for boundary modification in order to establish a buffer zone. However, these maps still need some adjustments and will be presented at the next session of the World Heritage Committee.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the information provided by the State Party but note as well that several issues have not been addressed yet. There is an important focus on the Stylite tower in the report but no information about other key components of the site such as the Kastrum or St. Christopher Church. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to recall that the management plan, either a thoroughly new one or building on the existing draft, should include a conservation plan, an archaeological research policy and provisions for public use. The conservation of the site as a whole has to be the priority. Finally, it is essential that all details concerning the restoration works planned at the Stylite tower be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review prior to committing to their implementation.

**Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.51**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.50**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Takes note of the progress in the implementation of conservation and monitoring measures at the Stylite tower and requests the State Party to provide additional technical details about these measures to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies;

4. Urges the State Party to complete the management plan which must include a comprehensive conservation plan as well as an archaeological research policy and a public use plan;
5. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, a progress report on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.

## 52. 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  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/299/documents>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 55,667  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/299/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
Total amount granted: USD 19,173 (1997-2001) 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; September 2012: 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  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/299>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a comprehensive state of conservation report on 18 February 2013. The report details the actions carried out in response to the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee at its previous sessions. From 8 to 14 September 2012, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out. The mission report is available at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM/documents/>

#### *a) Boundaries of the property and buffer zone*

The State Party reports on the process implemented for the review of the boundaries of the property and the definition of the buffer zone, which was discussed at length during the 2012

reactive monitoring mission. The State Party also notes that progress has been made in the identification of measures to establish the proper legal protection for the property and its setting as a whole, upon approval of the revised boundaries. This will include the drafting of an Act (inscription decree), which will override the urban planning decree for the specified area, so as to state for all concerned parties that the establishment of the buffer zone is an unambiguous protection tool. Other actions considered include the establishment of a Marine Protection Zone (MPZ) which will be officially submitted to the Council of Ministers for review. The mission noted that it was essential that the proposal for the buffer zone takes into account the geophysical survey along the Highway route and the information from the Archaeological Map. It also urged the State Party to mainstream the protection of maritime areas, within the framework of a broad consultation process on the public and private level.

A request for minor boundary modification was submitted by the State Party on 1 February 2013 which will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (see Document WHC-13/37.COM/8B).

*b) Conservation and management of the property*

In this respect, the State Party reports that it has focused its efforts on the development and implementation of the Action Plan (2012-2014) which contains twelve main objectives to enhance the overall management and conservation of the property. The Action Plan includes the identification of a prioritised list of activities, in accordance to the objectives, which consider timeframe for implementation, follow-up actions, financing agency and budgets. The State Party reports on the current status of each planned action. Progress has been made on securing additional funding, on the increase of staff for the property, on the undertaking of scientific research, on promoting capacity building, on awareness raising and outreach, and on the actions to improve the conservation and maintenance measures. The need to leverage the standards of conservation practice has been also been underscored. As for maintenance, given the limited resources that exist to date, the General Directorate of Antiquities (DGA) has agreed with the Municipality of Tyre/Sour to carry out specific activities including regular site cleaning and weeding, garbage collection, maintenance of gates and fences, among others. Tenders have also been done for the interpretation strategy project, which is expected to require a 2 year period to be concluded.

In terms of actions for the enhancement of the urban setting, the report notes that the World Bank funded project "Cultural Heritage and Urban Development" (CHUD) aims at the revitalizing the historic core of the city, therefore interventions are limited to the immediate setting of the property. The mission noted that the lack of a comprehensive management plan continues to hinder the effectiveness of implemented actions, as a coherent conservation strategy is still missing that would address the integration of heritage areas within the modern urban fabric. The mission underscores that activities currently implemented through the Action Plan can be considered as preparatory measures for the drafting of the management plan. It also highlighted the interest expressed by the Municipality of Tyre to improve planning mechanisms through the development of a long term Strategic Plan for Tyre and the integration of environmental, cultural and social aspects into a long term planning and decision making process. As for the state of conservation of the property, the mission noted that infrastructure service facilities have been improved although much remains to be done in terms of the conservation of archaeological features and decorated surfaces and in the presentation of the property. It underscored that, within the context of the formulation of the management plan, a risk preparedness plan, a coherent presentation strategy and precise guidelines for conservation interventions and measures to systematise condition assessments and monitoring practices, both for the conservation of the practice and for the efficacy of interventions, need to be developed.

*c) Coordination mechanisms and management system for the property*

The report notes that lack of coordination among the different agencies that are currently implementing projects at the property has had an impact on the efficacy of the management

of the property. Several meetings have been carried out between DGA and the CHUD Project Management Unit to identify a monitoring plan and consultation mechanisms to be implemented. The DGA is also developing a general framework and a standard process of communication and early consultations to be applied and respected by entities that have interventions planned in or around any of the five World Heritage sites in Lebanon. The State Party also reports that a proposal "Safeguard, Valorisation and Management Quality: Use of Management Models for Archaeological Sites and Urban Contexts (Archeomedsites)" has been developed for potential funding by the European Union, to improve governance processes for the protection of archaeological sites. The mission noted that insufficient staff at all units of the DGA and limited financial resources is the main reason for shortcomings in the current management system. It noted however that processes are currently in place to identify adequate means to address these issues. It underscored the pressing need to improve coordination between CHUD management and the DGA to effectively control activities at the implementation level.

*d) Legislative framework and regulatory measures*

The report highlights actions implemented to enforce the existing legislative and regulatory framework and communication with concerned stakeholders. The mission noted that although there is a legislative framework in place, large parts of the urbanised areas surrounding the archaeological sites lack regulations or government control.

*e) Documentation and inventory*

Actions have been continuously implemented to address the identified need to have updated and systematised information for the property, including underwater archaeological sites. The inventory shall assist not only monitoring of the state of conservation of the property but also provide baseline information for the interpretation and presentation of the property. The report also mentions the progress made on the completion of the Archaeological Map of Tyre and on the geophysical survey and test trenching to complete the risk map. The mission noted that the archaeological map of Tyre is being updated on a regular basis and that resources have been allocated to enhance documentation and inventories. It considers that information collected from private development projects should also be integrated into this documentation corpus.

*f) New infrastructure developments*

The State Party reports on the project proposals from the Council for Development and Reconstruction (CDR) for development of a transportation network. It notes that, given the potential impact on the unexcavated archaeological sites, the need to carry out archaeological investigations is essential. The DGA shall take a proactive approach and will request CDR to undertake Heritage Impact Assessments so that informed decisions can be made in regard to potential rerouting or other needed actions before projects are tendered for implementation. The mission underscored that the moratorium on building on State owned properties, although not officially renewed, is still in place. However, it noted its concern on existing proposals that might impact the property, mainly the National South Highway and the Highway crossing at Tell el Maachouk. For the first case, no heritage impact assessment has been carried out that would take into account not only potential impacts on above ground remains but also considerations from derived traffic. A traffic study was recommended to this effect. As for the Highway crossing at Tell el Maachouk, the mission considers that technical information that includes indications of the existence of all archaeological remains, as well as elevations and sections is needed. The mission considers that until the status of the planned secondary city street network and roundabouts is clarified and the heritage impact assessment undertaken, the decision to implement this exit should be abandoned.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee welcome the commitment of the State Party in the implementation of measures to address

pressing concerns at the property, particularly the consistent implementation of the Action Plan (2012-2014). Although progress has been achieved to date, they consider that much remains to be done in regard to the conservation, protection and management of the property. The recommendations made by the 2012 reactive monitoring mission provide a clear course of action for the property in the short term.

**Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.52**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.52**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Acknowledges the comprehensive information provided by the State Party on the implementation of actions to address pressing conservation and management concerns and urges it to continue with the systematic implementation of the 2012-2014 Action Plan;*
4. *Takes note of the September 2012 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and also urges that the State Party implement its recommendations, with particular attention to the following:*
  - a) *Undertake a planning process for the development of a management plan for the property and include provisions for a conservation strategy, risk preparedness, presentation and interpretation as well as for regulatory measures,*
  - b) *Ensure that the management structure becomes fully operational by securing adequate resources for all aspects of documentation, conservation and monitoring,*
  - c) *Establish a maritime protection zone around the seashores of Tyre,*
  - d) *Improve on-going maintenance practices for vegetation control and put in place measures for fire prevention and adequate drainage and sewage systems,*
  - e) *Establish a recovery programme for detached mosaics and ensure their protection until a decision is made on their conservation and restoration,*
  - f) *Monitor conservation interventions to assess their efficacy and use the monitor results to inform the development of the conservation strategy,*
  - g) *Further develop and implement the framework for coordination of the Baalbek and Tyre Archaeological Project (BTAP) and enhance cooperation between the General Directorate of Antiquities (DGA), the “Cultural Heritage and Urban Development” (CHUD), the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to effectively monitor the design and implementation of the project;*
5. *Requests the State Party to carry out a comprehensive traffic study that clarifies all projected street networks and roundabouts, including Heritage Impact Assessments for the South Highway and its crossing at Tel el Maachouk, and to submit this study to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, 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 39th session in 2015.*

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

### **55. Ancient *Ksour* of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1996

Criteria  
(iii) (iv) (v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/750/documents>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 166,000  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/750/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
Total amount granted: USD 44,166 in the framework of the France-UNESCO Convention; USD 40,860 for the supervision of the World Bank/Mauritanian Government/UNESCO tripartite project (USD 1,245,000).

Previous monitoring missions  
April 2001: World Heritage Centre; 2002-2004: six World Heritage Centre missions in the framework of the World Bank project; December 2006: France-UNESCO mission and joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Socio-economic and climatic changes;
- b) Gradual abandonment of the towns;
- c) Transformations made to houses affecting their authenticity;
- d) Tourism pressure;
- e) No technical conservation capacities;
- f) No management mechanism (including legal);
- g) Lack of human and financial resources;
- h) Weak institutional coordination.

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/750>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 30 December 2012, the State Party submitted the state of conservation report requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012. This report indicates that in general the ksour have not undergone much change affecting in a significant way the state of conservation of the property, that can be considered as satisfactory. Information is provided below for each ksar:

- a) At Chinguetti, the silting problem persists;
- b) At Ouadane, the destruction of some parts due to heavy rain as well as the use of cement, paint and the installation of ventilation windows have a visual impact on the town;
- c) At Tichitt, the multiplication of new cement constructions outside the listed area as well as the introduction of power lines and the development of gas kitchens detract in some places from the original harmony of the area;
- d) At Oualata, although silting remains the primary factor affecting the site, especially around the mosque, in comparison to the other ksour, the state of conservation is the most satisfactory of all.

The State Party has not transmitted the technical report on the restoration of the Tichitt Mosque requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session. Nor has it transmitted the progress report on the preparation of the management plan undertaken by the National Foundation for the Ancient Towns.

However, the report indicates significant progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee such as the establishment of a financial fund and the national conservation programme, and the enhancement of the cultural and natural heritage of the Ancient Towns and various awareness raising activities, including the Annual Festival of the Ancient Towns.

### Conclusion

With regard to the implementation of Decision **36 COM 7B.56**, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are satisfied with the establishment of the national conservation programme and the enhancement of the cultural and natural heritage of the *ksour*, as well as the creation of a fund for safeguarding operations. However, it is with regret that they note that the State Party had not provided details on progress achieved in the setting up of legal protection measures and the preparation of the Management Plan. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee takes note the important efforts accomplished by the State Party.

### Draft Decision:      **37 COM 7B.55**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.56**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Takes note of the establishment of the national conservation programme and the enhancement of the cultural and natural heritage of the Ancient Towns and the creation of a fund to finance all the conservation activities and enhancement of the property,

4. *Also notes the progress achieved by the State Party in the implementation of some of its recommendations;*
5. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to transmit to the World Heritage Centre a technical report on the restoration of the Tichitt Mosque and details of its conservation projects for the Town;*
6. *Encourages the State Party to pursue its action in directly involving the local populations in the sustainable management of the ksour;*
7. *Urges the State Party to complete the Management and Conservation Plan of the property, through an International Assistance request, if need be;*
8. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2015**, an updated report on the implementation of the above points.*

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (State Party report on the state of conservation of the property not received)

#### **57. World Heritage properties of Syria**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late request to the State Party for a global report on the state of conservation of the properties)

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

## ASIA-PACIFIC

### 59. Historic Centre of Macao (China) (C 1110)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2005

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1110/documents>

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
a) Possible negative impacts of development projects in areas surrounding the buffer zones on the visual integrity of the property;  
b) Apparent inadequacy of the current management system.

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1110/>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

#### Current conservation issues

On 25 January 2013, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted to the World Heritage Centre by the State Party in response to Decision **35 COM 7B.64** (UNESCO, 2011). The State Party's report is comprised of summaries of the current status and anticipated directions for the overall strategy for the protection of cultural heritage as well as legal and planning instruments and new administrative collaborations and procedures.

#### a) *Overall strategy for the protection of cultural heritage, including a Management Plan*

The State Party's report notes the implementation of Directives (2006, 2008 and 2009) that have expanded the protected areas of the Historic Centre, and the completion of several urban design studies on the interconnections of the Historic Centre with neighbouring districts in the wider setting. The report summarises a number of initiatives that have been undertaken under the guidance of a multi-disciplinary management system with a view to fostering a clearer understanding of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. The State Party provides some examples on the conservation projects that reinforce the identity of the historic trade port. A widened scope of protection will be introduced in the property's forthcoming Management Plan, in the form of broader control-planning instruments with its structure expected to be published as part of the new Heritage Law. Details related to the Management Plan have also been shared in the report. The Plan's publication date is not specified.

b) *Legal and planning instruments*

The State Party's report recalls the instruments enacted as a result of past decisions of the World Heritage Committee, including the 2008 Chief Executive Directive 83/2008, setting building height limits for sensitive areas adjoining the buffer zones and the 2009 Regulatory Decree aimed at preserving the urban harbour and the visual linkages between the Historic Centre and the western riverside. The report states that the property's legally protected areas have now been enlarged beyond the limits of the buffer zones to cover nearly all of the eastern and western side of the Macao Peninsula, with the intent of protecting the property from adverse developmental pressures. The local administration has already implemented these legal instruments. The State Party also reports that the structure for the new Macao Heritage Law was approved by the Legislative Assembly in October 2012, and the Law is expected to be published in August 2013. Its enhancements are to include, among others, multi-disciplinary coordination; legally binding technical appraisals; incentives and penalties; protection of the built heritage inside the buffer zones; and protection of both tangible and intangible heritage. The new Law stipulates that Detailed Heritage District Plans (partial plans) can be implemented before the Management Plan is finalized. The State Party emphasizes that, under the new Heritage Law, heritage conservation goals will always take precedence over all other urban plans. The State Party further reports that the final public consultation phase of the correlated new Urban Planning Law was concluded in June 2012. The draft was subsequently approved and is now awaiting evaluation by the Legislative Assembly of the Macao SAR Government.

c) *Administrative collaborations and procedures*

The State Party describes the forthcoming creation of a new multidisciplinary Cultural Heritage Council, which will have as one of its main responsibilities the articulation and balancing of any eventual negative impact deriving from large-scale projects outside the buffer zones. The report also describes a move towards broader collaborations. These include the Cultural Affairs Bureau and the Urban Planning Department of the Public Works Bureau cooperating more closely in the process of producing Official Alignment Plans (PAO) for sensitive sites outside the buffer zones, consultation of Building Design Regulations, which has been mitigating projects with potentially high impacts; the Cultural Affairs Bureau having direct member participation in various urban design committees; and consultative committees having representatives from both the public and private sectors. The adjustment in the Macao SAR administration's procedures has literally controlled negative impact of projects by avoiding adverse design decisions being made at preliminary designed stages.

d) *Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

The Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) for the property, as requested by the Committee, has been submitted for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013 under item 8 of the Agenda.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee welcome the progress made by the State Party in addressing the continuing inadequacy of the current management system. They nevertheless wish to point out their concern about the pace of finalising the Management Plan in order to address potential threats to the attributes that maintain the OUV of the property. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee request the State Party to finalise the Management Plan, in compliance with the adopted Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, as well as with the new Macao Heritage Law, the correlated new Urban Planning Law and other legal and planning instruments.

**Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.59**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.64**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Takes note of the progress made in addressing the continuing inadequacy of the current management system in providing effective protection of, and addressing potential threats to, the attributes that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
4. Also takes note of the State Party's efforts to establish appropriate legal and planning instruments to protect, *inter alia*, the visual linkages between the inscribed property and the wider urban landscape and seascape of Macao;
5. Requests the State Party to finalise the Management Plan by **1 February 2015** in compliance with the new Macao Heritage Law, the correlated new Urban Planning Law and other legal and planning instruments, and to submit the plan to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies.

**60. Ancient Building Complex in the Wudang Mountains (China) (C 705)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1994

Criteria  
(i)(ii)(vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/705/documents/>

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
Proposed lift-up project of Yuzhen Palace at the property.

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/705>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

In response to reports received on the raising up of the structure of the Yuzhen Palace, the World Heritage Centre requested information on this project. This was provided by the State Party in a state of conservation report submitted on 28 January 2013.

Built between the 15th and 17th centuries, the Yuzhen Palace is part of the exceptionally large and well-preserved Taoist building complex within a picturesque mountain setting. Alongside the stone-walled Forbidden City, the Purple Heaven Palace, the Nanyang Palace and the Zhishi-Xuanyue Gateway, the Yuzhen Palace is one of the most notable of the 53 buildings spread across the slopes of Wudang Mountains.

The Yuzhen Palace lies on flat ground at the foot of the mountain and will be affected by the expansion of the Danjiangkou Reservoir in the framework of South-North Water Diversion Project implemented by the Government of China to optimize the allocation of water resources. As a result of raising the height of the Danjiangkou Dam, the water levels in the reservoir will rise between 8-19 meters and the Yuzhen Palace and other buildings will be in the submerged area. In order to 'save' the Palace, the South-North Water Diversion Project administration worked with cultural heritage departments of Hubei Province to formulate plans. Planning of the project started in 2007. Various options were considered including installing a cofferdam, in-situ lift-up and relocation. Taking account of the principles of conservation, safety, technical difficulties in construction, project cost, project risk and operability, and other constraints, the in-situ lift-up option was selected. This means that the Yuzhen Palace and its surrounding land will be elevated by 11-15 metres to exceed normal water level.

In 2010, once the lift option had been agreed in principle, the Wudang Mountains Special Zone of Hubei Province, the Architectural Design and Research Institute of Tsinghua University and the Wuhan Changjiang Institute of Survey, Planning, Design and Research jointly designed the project.

Three small-sized independent buildings, namely the main gate, the gates of the east and west palaces, will be lifted by 15 metres, while the other buildings will be dismantled and then reconstructed.

At the conclusion of the project, the Palace complex and its immediate surroundings will become an island of about 85,000 square metres within the reservoir. The area inside the wall of the Palace covers an area of 28,000 square metres, including the east palace ruins of 7,700 square metres, the west palace ruins of 11,822 square metres, and the central palace accounting for 8,400 square metres.

Work on the project has started, as the first phase of the reservoir project that would lead to the increase in water levels is due for completion by the end of 2013.

### *Other matters*

The State Party reports that since 2004, they have initiated and completed over 10 major maintenance projects, such as the Tablet Tower of Yuxu Palace, Xuanyue Memorial Gateway etc. These projects not only addressed potential safety hazards, but also strengthened the conservation team and allowed to accumulate experience on project management. They have been carried out with advice of consultants from the Central South Architectural Design Institute, and from universities. The report also provides details on other activities carried out at the property.

The State Party also reports that the Wudang Mountains Special Tourism and Economic Zone, under the support of State Administration of Cultural Heritage, has contracted the Chinese Academy of Cultural Heritage and Ancient Architecture Protection Centre of Hubei Province to develop a *Master Plan for the Protection of Cultural Heritage in the Wudang Mountains*.

## Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that although the Yuzhen Palace project has been planned since 2007, no details were provided to the World Heritage Committee before work commenced in summer 2012, as provided for by Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. Thus there has been no opportunity for the Advisory Bodies to comment on this project before work is almost complete.

Although the structure of the Yuzhen Palace will be saved, its relationship with the surroundings will be altered. When built, it was surrounded by mountains and looked out across farmland to a channel of the Shuimo River. It was also the centre of a large monastic complex. After the conclusion of the project, the Palace will become an island in the waters of the reservoir. In spite of it being stated that the project will preserve the integrity and authenticity of the Palace, the relationship of the Palace to the other components of the property and to the overall landscape would be compromised by these alterations.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note that the State Party is considering inviting an advisory mission to the property. They believe that a dialogue is needed on site as soon as possible, either through an advisory mission or through a reactive monitoring mission after the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee, to allow a full understanding of the potential negative impact of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, notwithstanding the care with which the mechanics of the project have been addressed, in relation to the component parts of the Palace. Such a mission should also address how the issues that have been raised by this project, in connection with the inter-relationship of the buildings within the property to each other and to the landscape, can be addressed within the proposed Management Plan.

## **Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.60**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **28 COM 15B.62**, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),*
3. *Notes with concern that a project to raise the Yuzhen Palace above the levels of the raised Danjiangkou Reservoir was planned in 2007 and implemented since 2012 without details being provided to the World Heritage Committee, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of Operational Guidelines;*
4. *Also notes that as result of the project, the Yuzhen Palace will become an island within the enlarged reservoir instead of being connected to the foot of the mountain, and that its relationship with the landscape and with other buildings within the property would be compromised;*
5. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to assess the potential negative impact of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value, including authenticity and integrity of the property and to review the management system for the property as well as progress with the implementation of a Management Plan;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.*

## 61. Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1986

Criteria  
(i) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
1999-2006

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/241/documents/>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 109,740  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/241/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds  
Total amount granted: 25,000 EUR under the France-UNESCO Co-operation Agreement for expert missions (2003, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2011).

Previous monitoring missions  
2000: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; 2001: expert technical assessment mission; 2003 and 2004: World Heritage Centre and expert advisory missions; August 2005: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission; February 2006: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission; January 2007: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; March 2009: UNESCO New Delhi Office technical mission to the property.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
a) Lack of an operational site management plan;  
b) Lack of traffic regulations limiting heavy duty vehicular traffic;  
c) Construction project for two cable-suspended bridges in the property.

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/241>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, which provides the following information on the progress achieved with regard to the recommendations outlined in Decision **35 COM 7B.66**. The State Party had also submitted information on 22 February 2012 in response to a request for information on demolitions at the Bazaar.

- a) *Demolition and removal of the remaining debris, pillars and carriageway of the collapsed bridge*

The Department of Public Works and Ports and Inland Water Works, Government of Karnataka, has initiated the mandatory administrative process for a tender to remove the remaining debris.

- b) *Appropriate decisions of a new more suitable location for a vehicular bridge outside the current and possible future boundaries of the property*

Alternate locations for the carriage way outside the current buffer zone have been identified and proposed in concurrence with the Integrated Management Plan (IMP), and will be implemented once the necessary impact assessments have been completed.

- c) *Proposal for the extension of the buffer zone boundaries of the property*

The proposal for the extension of the buffer zone was submitted and approved by the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee (Decision **36 COM 8B.51**).

- d) *Completed Integrated Management Plan together with a synthesis and a prioritisation of existing recommendations and intentions*

The State Party reports that the completion of the Integrated Management Plan (IMP) is an ongoing process since 2005 (with a draft submitted to the World Heritage Centre in 2006), involving mandated agencies and stakeholders at local, regional and national levels. Several sectoral studies and plans, which have been completed and submitted to the World Heritage Centre, form the basis for the finalization of the IMP together with the Joint Conservation Programme. The IMP will be submitted once it has been approved by the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) and the Government of Karnataka.

- e) *Confirmation that the finalized and approved Integrated Management Plan is fully resourced, and will be implemented;*

Provision of funds to implement and operationalize the IMP has been a continuous commitment of the Government since 2005. The State Party reports that funds have been obtained annually through government schemes, programmes and internal budgets available to the mandated agencies.

- f) *Demolition of encroachments at Hampi Bazaar*

In response to reports received concerning the demolition of contemporary commercial and residential structures at Hampi bazaar on 29 July 2011, the World Heritage Centre requested additional information which was provided by the State Party on 22 February 2012. The explanatory note indicated that the demolitions of July 2011 were initiated by the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) and the State Government of Karnataka following an order of the High Court of Karnataka and the illegal constructions at Hampi bazaar had been cleared. The State Party stated at the time that further demolitions were planned and that these would be carried out under careful supervision and with full protection of the historic *mandapas* to which some of the contemporary structures are connected. The State Party further explained that the complete demolition and relocation of the contemporary structures would promote a better understanding of the medieval bazaar near the Virupaksha temple and thereby the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

With regard to the reported removal of the encroachments and the subsequently initiated rehabilitation programme, the State Party clarified in its 2013 state of conservation report that a compensation package for affected families has been drawn up by the Government of Karnataka and that the compensation of these families is in progress.

- g) *Other conservation issues*

The State Party report includes information on a number of conservation works carried out by ASI within the protected area, and measures taken to address notably the security of the monuments, signage and solid waste management.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the steps initiated for the removal the debris of the collapsed bridge and the proposed location of the vehicular bridge, although no timeframe for their completion have been provided.

Despite the commitment expressed by the State Party with regard to the finalisation and full implementation of the Integrated Management Plan since 2005, progress remains very slow. Furthermore, the State Party report does not fully clarify the modalities of its implementation and no information concerning the sustainability of its funding has been provided.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the living function of the Virupaksha temple needs to be recognized as supporting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They are of the view that the relationship between modern use and protection of the fabric and setting of the Virupaksha temple needs to be managed with the utmost sensitivity. Therefore, they suggest that the Committee may wish to recommend the State Party to elaborate, in close cooperation with the local community, a strategy and action plan for the Hampi bazaar area to: (1) develop within the Integrated Management Plan (IMP) necessary legal and planning tools to prevent any further encroachments at the Hampi bazaar; (2) develop a conservation strategy for the protection of the historic *mandapas* near the Virupaksha temple, in line with the IMP.

In view of the above, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the World Heritage Committee expresses its concerns with regard to the slow progress with the Integrated Management Plan and request a reactive monitoring mission to the property to review the steps taken to implement the 2007 reactive monitoring mission recommendations, and the implementation of previous Committee Decisions.

**Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.61**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.66** adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Acknowledges the steps taken by the State Party to address the removal of debris of the collapsed bridge and the relocation of the vehicular bridge outside of the property and urges the authorities to provide a timetable for the completion of these works;*
4. *Expresses its concern about the slow progress made with regard to the finalisation, adoption and implementation of the Integrated Management Plan (IMP), despite the efforts invested since 2005, and reiterates its request to the State Party to:*
  - a) *Submit to the World Heritage Centre the completed Integrated Management Plan together with a synthesis and a prioritisation of existing recommendations and intentions, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies,*
  - b) *Provide information on sustainable funding sources for the finalized and approved IMP, as well as an implementation plan;*
5. *Also acknowledges the information provided by the State Party concerning the demolition works in the Hampi bazaar area following a decision of the High Court of Karnataka and the compensation scheme for affected families;*
6. *Recommends the State Party to elaborate, in close cooperation with the local community, a strategy and action plan for the bazaar area to:*
  - a) *Develop within the IMP necessary legal and planning tools to prevent any further encroachments at the Hampi bazaar,*
  - b) *develop a conservation strategy for the protection of the historic mandapas near the Virupaksha temple, in line with the IMP.*

7. Requests the State Party to invite a joint ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to the property to consider the progress achieved in the implementation of the 2007 reactive monitoring mission recommendations and the previous Committee Decisions;
8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, an updated report on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.

**62. Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (State Party report on the state of conservation of the property not received)

**63. Masjed-e Jame of Isfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 1397)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (State Party report on the state of conservation of the property not received)

**64. Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi (Kazakhstan) (C 1103)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

**65. Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1979

Criteria  
(iii) (iv) (vi)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger  
2003-2007

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/121/documents/>

#### International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 374,287 (1980 to 2006) for technical co-operation

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/121/assistance/>

#### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 10 million (1979-2001) from the International Safeguarding Campaign; USD 45,000 (2005) and USD 20,000 (2011) from Netherlands Funds-in-Trust.

#### Previous monitoring missions

February 2003: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS high-level mission; April 2007: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; March 2011: UNESCO international expert advisory mission; November 2011: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

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

- a) Uncontrolled urban development resulting in the loss of traditional urban fabric, in particular privately-owned houses;
- b) Lack of coordinated management mechanism;
- c) Construction of forest road, project for tunnel road in Pashupati Monument Zone;
- d) Project for the extension of the Kathmandu International Airport.

#### Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/121>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

#### Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report in response to Decision **36 COM 7B.66** and recommendations of the November 2011 reactive monitoring mission.

##### *a) The proposed Tunnel/Road Construction at Pashupati Monument Zone*

The State Party confirms the cancellation of the Tilganga-Tamranganga tunnel and road construction, which would have bifurcated the Pashupati Monument Zone. It has established a committee with stakeholders from the Tribhuvan International airport, Pashupati Area Development Trust, Departments of Roads and of Archaeology, and the Nepal Army to consider alternative routes. A proposed alternative route along the eastern border of the Pashupati Monument Zone has also been abandoned; it is now proposed that the Mitrapark-Gothatar road and the road east of the airport should be developed as the new route with a new connecting bridge on the Bagmati river. No clear information was provided on the effective closure of the abandoned road and it is not certain that natural regeneration of the route will occur if the road retains an informal use for traffic. This requires further monitoring.

Furthermore the State Party reports that a budget for ecological restoration of the Pashupati Monument Zone has been allocated especially for the Mrigasthali deer park; measures to prevent soil erosion, renew and protect indigenous tree species and manage deer by fencing have been designed; it is considered that natural regeneration will restore the deforested area affected by road construction. A programme has been undertaken to raise public awareness of the proposals.

##### *b) Urban Transport Strategy, Improved Development Control and Coordination*

The State Party reports that it has initiated discussions with the Kathmandu Valley Development Authority to develop an urban transport strategy and strengthen development control as requested.

It further states that a budget has been proposed for next year for developing regulations to ensure that Heritage Impact Assessments are attached to all development proposals, as well as for the preparation of a Disaster Risk Management Plan. The Integrated Management Plan (IMP) will be reviewed. The State Party confirms that the Department of Archaeology is

ensuring collaboration and coordination with other government departments, local authorities and stakeholders in work affecting the property. The Coordinative Working Committee considers such collaboration to be a priority.

*c) Conservation Standards and Funding*

The report lists the documents used for guidance on conservation standards and confirms that internationally agreed standards are adhered to, except for projects where traditional techniques are required. Periodic training and educational programmes are being organised in monument zones to promote conservation skills.

*d) Mitigation of impact of new development and reduction of military presence*

The owner of the inappropriate new structure adjacent to the Pujari Math in the Bhaktapur Monument Zone has been instructed by the Department of Archaeology to make necessary modifications to the building to mitigate its impact; the owner has apparently agreed to carry these out. There is no mention of any reduction in military presence in the Pashupati Monument Zone of the property.

*e) Review of the Integrated Management Plan and implementation of the 2011 mission recommendations*

A budget has been allocated by the Department of Archaeology to review the 2007 Integrated Management Plan, initial review meetings have been held and a questionnaire sent to all seven monument zones. The opportunity will be taken to consider the 2011 mission recommendations as the review progresses. It is proposed that the review process will be completed by July 2013.

*f) Submission of all major new projects with accompanying Heritage Impact Assessments*

As the planning for the new road in the Pashupati Monument Zone continues, Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) will be prepared. An HIA for a proposed new crematorium is attached and the State Party confirms that it will send all major new development proposals to the World Heritage Committee. It states that the process of renovation and rebuilding at Bhaidegah Temple in the Patan Monument Zone is not progressing for the time being.

*g) Conservation and repair*

The report provides statistics for permits issued by the Department of Archaeology for renovation and reconstruction of private residences in the property (51 in year 2011-12) and details of World Heritage educational and awareness raising events at two schools (200 individuals with 14 teachers) in Changu Narayan and Patan Monument Zones and training events for women and young people; further similar events are envisaged in the following years.

Lists of conservation projects in all seven monument zones are given. The reports make it clear that the responsible bodies are aware of conservation principles which are generally adhered to under the supervision of the Department of Archaeology

*h) Heritage Impact Assessment of Crematorium, Pashupati Monument Zone*

An HIA is attached to the report, though belated, as construction began in 2011. The electric crematorium is on the southern edge of the property boundary close to the modern ring road, on land previously built on by unplanned concrete houses, now cleared. It should reduce environmental damage (the area is important for religious reasons for cremation and is already heavily used, but using the traditional wood pyre method). The building design conforms in height, façade finishes and materials to the concepts and guidelines within the Integrated Management Plan, though the HIA considers the scale of ornamentation may be too prominent. The 30m high chimney with external access ladder, however, will be a dominant feature with a visual impact upon the Outstanding Universal Value; it does not conform to the Building By-laws for the monument zone, which restricts buildings to 10,67

metres. It should be designed to be removable once technology allows and its impact mitigated by colour, texture etc.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the State Party's confirmation of the abandonment of the Tilganga-Tamranganga new road/tunnel scheme and the work towards finding an alternative solution. Nonetheless, they consider the status of the now abandoned route is unclear and further assurance by the State Party that the abandoned road has been effectively closed to traffic and its route allowed to regenerate. They consider that proposals for re-routing the road should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies at the earliest opportunity, preferably initially at the conceptual stage, and before any commitments have been made.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the information provided by the State Party on progress with the updating the IMP, the Disaster Risk Management Plan and the HIA for the crematorium. They also take note of the list of conservation projects, though it is unclear over what period the projects have been achieved. The conservation requirements are on a large scale but the State Party is to be commended for the work undertaken so far.

They further note that the HIA for the crematorium in the Pashupati Monument Zone is the first to be produced and should be a model for future development. It was produced too late in the process to affect position, design and layout of the facility and this procedural omission must be rectified in the future. It is clear that the 30m chimney will have a severe visual impact upon the property and a detailed scheme of mitigation should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies.

### **Draft Decision      37 COM 7B.65**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.66**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Welcomes the State Party's progress in finding an alternative route for the new Tilganga-Tamranganga tunnel and road;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to submit details of alternative routes for the road to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, at the earliest opportunity, preferably at the concept stage and before irreversible commitments are made;*
5. *Notes the adoption of ecological measures to manage environmental damage in the Mrigasthali deer park and on the route of the abandoned road through the Pashupati Monument Zone;*
6. *Also welcomes the progress with review and update of the 2007 Integrated Management Plan (IMP); the Disaster Risk Management Plan; and the formulation of regulations to ensure that Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs) are produced for all significant developments within the property;*

7. Also notes the considerable conservation efforts evident in the list of recent projects undertaken, the awareness of and adherence to good conservation principles and the monitoring by the Department of Archaeology;
8. Regrets that the HIA of the new electric crematorium concurrently under construction in the Pashupati Monument Zone, was not undertaken on time to improve its design and position, especially with regard to the 30m high chimney which will have an adverse visual impact on the property;
9. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, a scheme of mitigation of the impact of the crematorium chimney, including its position, colour and fabric, potential for screening and assurances that its construction method would allow removal;
10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies:
  - a) Information concerning verification of the closure of the abandoned road,
  - b) Information on progress on the review of the IMP and the development of a Disaster Risk Management Plan,
  - c) HIAs of all significant development proposals in the property, including visitor and parking provisions mentioned in the Pashupati Master Plan, the extension to the airport and the route of the new road, and of any major conservation or reconstruction project, in particular the Bhaidegah temple, before approval for the schemes is granted, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
11. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, 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 39th session in 2015.

## 66. Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1981

### Criteria

(iii)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/143/documents/>

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 30,000 from UNESCO Regular Programme Funds for condition survey of Jam Nizzammuddin tomb (2011).

### Previous monitoring missions

November-December 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive mission; October 2010: World Heritage Centre fact-finding mission to the property following the major flood that devastated the area in August 2010; May 2012: joint UNESCO/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Significant decay of the property caused by local climatic conditions and alluvial erosion;
- b) Stability of the foundations (earth mechanics) of the Jam Nizamuddin tomb;
- c) Lack of definition of boundaries of the property and buffer zone of the necropolis;
- d) Lack of monitoring.

### Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/143>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 22 February 2013, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012).

#### *a) Conservation actions*

The Culture Department, Government of Sindh, has prepared a project proposal (called “PC-I”) to the Planning Commission of Pakistan for the Protection, Preservation, Promotion and Development of the World Heritage property of the Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta, with an implementation cost of approximately USD 4,810,000. The major components include: detailed survey of the site, including baseline data, condition surveys, documentation and topographic surveys; preparation of a master plan (outsourced to a consultancy firm in December 2012), Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), International Seminar on Makli; capacity building for technical staff; implementation of interpretation measures (signage, brochures, leaflets); water supply; construction of visitor pathways; and conservation of monuments in the short, medium and long term. Although it is reported that condition surveys have commenced, no specific information has been provided on whether the funds have been secured for the full implementation of the “PC-I” nor on the timeframe for its completion.

Annexed to the state of conservation report is a condition report providing an analysis of the general factors impacting the conservation and protection of property together with future actions proposed to address the issues. This document is similar to the one provided in the state of conservation report for the property in 2012 and there are no indications on the status of implementation of the provisions made. In addition, it is not clear what the timeframe for implementation is or whether resources have been allocated for it.

The State Party also reports that a strategy has been developed to prevent Internally Displaced People (IDP) to take shelter within the property. Recent heavy rain falls in lower Sindh have led to the displacement of people but they have been accommodated outside the property. In terms of security, it is proposed to erect boundary pillars and protection walls to ensure that no encroachment occurs. Additional guards shall be assigned to ensure monitoring of vulnerable entry points.

#### *b) Preparation of the Comprehensive Master Plan*

The State Party reports that this action is included in the “PC-I” developed for the property. The planning process is underway and expected to be completed by March 2013 for subsequent approval by the authorities. The report includes the objectives of the Master Plan and the scope of activities to be undertaken by the consultancy firm.

c) *Boundaries of the property*

As part of the planning process, the boundaries of the inscribed property and its buffer zone will be identified and adequate regulatory measures defined to ensure the adequate protection and management of the property. The State Party report includes the preliminary map developed by the Heritage Foundation, taking into account guidelines and comments made by the May 2012 reactive monitoring mission that has yet to be revised.

d) *Conservation of Tomb of Jam Nizamuddin*

Work has continued at the Tomb in collaboration with the Heritage Foundation of Pakistan, including the undertaking of geo-technical studies. No additional information has been provided on additional research to assess stability problems, the installation of a crack monitoring system, or whether or not the preliminary assessment has been updated. No technical specifications have been provided on specific conservation measures implemented to date.

e) *Management of the property*

The State Party reports that the Directorate of Archaeology and Museums Sindh has allocated a regular budget for the conservation, preservation and maintenance of the monuments. There are eight Conservation Schemes identified for some of the monuments as well as provisions made in the Master Plan. It is noted that staff will need to be increased for the optimal implementation. The May 2012 mission considered that the present capacity of the Directorate is insufficient and needs further strengthening, being the custodian of over more than 1200 monuments in the Province.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the commitment made by the State Party in supporting the implementation of measures to address the factors that constitute a serious threat to the property. They further note that serious problems are still facing the property and that sustained measures will be required. The lack of an effective management system, capacity building, risk preparedness and clarification of the boundaries are a matter of concern.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies suggest that the Committee may wish to encourage the State Party to invite an ICOMOS/ICCROM advisory mission to the property to assist in: a) developing a comprehensive programme for conservation and stabilisation of the most threatened monuments; b) defining the boundaries of the property and its buffer zones; c) defining the objectives of a Management Plan for the property to address its critical issues, including disaster risk management and public use; d) developing a capacity building strategy with a view to reinforcing national capacity in the field of heritage conservation and management.

**Draft Decision:            37 COM 7B.66**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.66**, adopted at its 36th session (SaintPetersburg, 2012),*
3. *Acknowledges the efforts made by the State Party in addressing the conservation issues of the property but expresses its concerns that significant threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property have yet to be fully addressed;*

4. *Encourages the State Party to invite an ICOMOS/ICCROM advisory mission to the property to assist in the following:*
  - a) *Develop a comprehensive programme for conservation and stabilisation of the most threatened monuments,*
  - b) *Finalise the boundaries of the property and its buffer zones,*
  - c) *Define the objectives of a Management Plan for the property to address critical issues, including disaster risk management and public use,*
  - d) *Elaborate a capacity building strategy with a view to reinforcing national capacity in the field of heritage conservation and management;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2015, 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 39th session in 2015.*

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

#### **69. Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603rev)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2001

Criteria  
(i) (ii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/603/documents/>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 29,800  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/603/assistance/>

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 50,000 from the Spanish Funds-in-Trust

### Previous monitoring missions

April 2005: UNESCO Tashkent Office/ICOMOS expert mission; March 2006: UNESCO Tashkent Office/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; October 2006: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; December 2007: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; March 2009: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of strategic approach to urban conservation;
- b) Lack of a proper management plan;
- c) Detrimental impact of new roads;
- d) Conservation of urban fabric.

### Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/603> and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report detailing the progress made in response to Decision **36 COM 7B.69** and recommendations of the 2007 reactive monitoring mission. In addition, the report also includes the completed Management Plan and draft Traffic Scheme.

#### a) *Management Plan*

The approved Management Plan named “Document on Management Frameworks and Processes for the World Heritage Property of Samarkand – Crossroad of Cultures” has been developed and submitted for approval to the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee. This coherent urban conservation and planning policy for the management of the property and the buffer zone, provides clear principles for the preservation and use of the property. It sets out the management frameworks and processes and contains guidelines for conservation and restoration, as well as monitoring and reporting principles.

The conservation principles contained in the Management Plan present a systematic approach to the different conservation and preservation issues at the property. The World Heritage property consists of three morphologically different parts, namely the ancient city of Afrosiab, the Timurid city and the European city. The procedures and methods of conservation and utilization of the monuments, the traditional living environment and the historic urban fabric, vary depending on their location. The main conservation principle for the property is to safeguard all the attributes that directly express or contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). Measures and procedures for the preservation have also been defined for the three monument ensembles that form part of the property, but are separate enclaves within the buffer zone. The conservation of these ensembles requires specific approaches that are determined according to the character of the individual enclave. Procedures for daily maintenance and systematic monitoring of monuments ensure timely removal of possible negative impacts on the property, as well as examining the state of conservation of the monuments.

#### b) *Draft Traffic Scheme*

Upon the request of the local authorities and with the agreement of the Board of Monuments of the Ministry of Culture and Sports, a Master Plan to improve road network and traffic regulation within the property is currently being developed. It addresses the following issues:

- The rehabilitation of original historic structures of streets to re-establish the streetscape based on historical evidence. The Master Plan is under development and will be submitted to the World Heritage Committee prior to its finalization and adoption;
- Road improvement and repairs of neighborhood areas to allow occasional transport services to residents (ambulances, delivery of goods, etc). No changes are foreseen to the architectural facades and buildings of the medieval city;
- Designated parking areas established for residents and tourist services at a suitable distance from monuments. The draft traffic scheme has been submitted with this report;
- Development of a traffic scheme foreseeing the creation of bypass and ring roads outside of the buffer zone along with dead end approaches to the World Heritage property to be carried out within the next 20 years. The traffic schemes are being developed taking into account the requirements under the *World Heritage Convention* and the OUV of the property;
- Repair and reconstruction works are carried out on sections of Dagbitskaya and Pehjikentskaya through demolition of unauthorized constructions not related to the historic environment. The works are coordinated with the Board of Monuments and the regional authorities and they do not affect the OUV of the property.

The State Party asserts that the World Heritage Committee will be notified of any infrastructure planning projects prior to their approval. The draft traffic scheme will be provided to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for approval.

c) *Conservation projects within the State Programme up to 2015*

Works planned in the framework of the “Programme on research, conservation, restoration and adaptation for modern utilisation of cultural heritage property of Samarkand until 2015” shall prioritise the preservation of specific monuments, neighbourhood mosques and historic housing within the traditional centre of *Mahalla Guzars* and will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee commend the State Party for the efforts made in responding to the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee and the 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and consider that the Management Plan provides coherent and comprehensive planning and conservation principles for the preservation of the property.

The “Document on Management Frameworks and Processes for the World Heritage Property of Samarkand – Crossroad of Cultures”, together with the Reference Document containing conservation guidelines, provides a coherent contribution to the management. However, the conservation of traditional houses may need to be elaborated in more detail, e.g. in the “Programme on research, conservation, restoration and adaptation for modern utilisation of cultural heritage property of Samarkand until 2015”, only two houses are listed which are for tourist services. In addition, a scientific monitoring system, as a part of the conservation strategy, should be put in place and site management should be fully operational.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note progress with the development of a draft traffic scheme to provide strategic solutions to the impact of traffic within the property. They note that the traffic scheme has yet to be completed and adopted by the Cabinet of Ministers. As this is a crucial project for the city, they consider that on-going dialogue with the State Party would be desirable as the project evolves further.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies propose that the State Party also takes into consideration the principle recommendations of the 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, namely technical assistance to the inhabitants for the conservation of the urban fabric; the development of structural restoration projects; and training of technical staff for surface restoration.

In terms of sustainability of the Management Plan and the traffic scheme, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would appreciate receiving confirmation from the State Party that their implementation is assured through adequate human and financial resources within the responsible government bodies.

**Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.69**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.69**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Acknowledges the submission of the Management Plan and commends the efforts by State Party to address the issues affecting the property;*
4. *Considers that the management framework and conservation principles for restoration and conservation presented in the Management Plan provide a clear and sound basis for preservation of the property and its buffer zone;*
5. *Urges the State Party to officially adopt the Management Plan and secure adequate human and financial resources to ensure its implementation;*
6. *Takes note of the development of the draft traffic scheme that is a crucial project for the city and recommends on-going dialogue between the State Party and the Advisory Bodies as the project evolves further;*
7. *Notes that construction and infrastructure projects are anticipated within the framework of the traffic scheme and the Management Plan and reiterates that the World Heritage Committee shall be notified prior to any major restorations or new constructions which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse, in accordance to the Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
8. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2015** 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 39th session in 2015.*

## EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

### 70. Historic Centres of Berat and Gjirokastra (Albania) (C 569bis)

#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005, extension in 2008

#### Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

N/A

#### Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/569/documents/>

#### International Assistance

N/A

#### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount granted: USD 1,367,014 is provided by the Albanian Government within the framework of the project 933 ALB 4000 "Safeguarding and restoration of selected monuments within the World Heritage site of the Old City of Gjirokastra – Albania"

#### Previous monitoring missions

November 2012: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

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

- a) Illegal construction dating from the late 1990s;
- b) Lack of specific monitoring indicators;
- c) Lack of programme of archaeological excavations;
- d) Lack of adequate fire fighting arrangements in the historic urban zone;
- e) Lack of detailed tourism development plan.

#### Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/569>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

#### Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation, which in effect included two separate reports, one for each of the property's components - Berat and Gjirokastra. The two reports address the issues identified by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011).

From 10 to 14 November 2012, an ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011). The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/36COM/>.

#### a) *Illegal constructions*

For Gjirokastra, the State Party provided a list of 244 illegal constructions, out of which 68 are entirely new buildings. The State Party informed about the setting up of a committee composed of specialists, for the review of all illegal buildings in order to reach a professional conclusion on individual cases. The authorities have also drawn up a plan to address the illegal constructions, through demolition or mitigation, but so far it has not been implemented.

In some instances, the illegal constructions considerably degrade the street image or hinder basic movement on the road network. The mission identified a number of such critical cases.

For Berat, a list of 38 illegal constructions was provided, along with a list of planned works to adapt illegal constructions over the next three years. The State Party reports that in 2013 the Institute of Cultural Monuments will create a unit to deal with the control of the property and the execution of restoration projects in Berat. It further reports that progress has been made in terms of photographic monitoring of the illegal constructions through comparison with archive photographs in the property and the buffer zone. In the framework of the digital re-registration of all properties on Albanian territory, property-owners are required to obtain a certificate from the Regional Directorate of National Culture, demonstrating that no partial or complete illegal building activity has occurred. To obtain the document, residents are obliged to prove that they have reversed any illegal interventions. Owners lacking such document cannot register their property in the Official Property Registry.

The mission noted that the overall control system of the illegal constructions is still not adequate. The mission identified, as an underlying cause, the lack of adequate legal protection. There is an urgent need to improve legislation and planning procedures. The existing "Law on Cultural Heritage" is too general and insufficient for effective protection of the two historic centres. There are no detailed rules to be used by the relevant bodies concerned with heritage at a local and central level, which in turn generates an uncertainty as to which procedures must be followed by the citizens when submitting requests for new development projects in the protected areas. The forthcoming "Regulation for the Historic Centre of Berat and its buffer zone" is absolutely necessary and its implementation should not be delayed. A similar Regulation should be drafted for the historic centre of Gjirokastra.

The mission report further included a number of recommendations on how to strengthen the legal framework.

The State Party further reports that meetings are held in Berat to raise awareness among residents concerning legal procedures for restoration projects. The mission noted that the protection of the property continues to be jeopardised by the lack of awareness of the community to protect the wider historic urban landscape. The mission highlighted the need to motivate the citizens to live and work in the respective historic centres through the provision of adequate public facilities and services.

#### b) *Management Systems*

As Berat and Gjirokastra form one property, it is essential to put in place a single overarching management structure for ensuring co-ordinated management in line with the *Operational Guidelines*.

The mission suggested that the Institute of Cultural Monuments (IMK) - a scientific state institution - become the responsible body for the conservation and management of the two components as one unit. It also recommended that the IMK could be responsible for the monitoring and demolishing or adapting the illegal constructions, as well as for permission requests of any new construction or development in the two historic centres.

The mission noted that the lack of trained specialists impacted on the proper management of the property and that there was a need for capacity-building and recommended to use the training facilities established by the UNESCO extra-budgetary project "Safeguarding and restoration of selected monuments within the World Heritage site of the Old City of Gjirokastra – Albania". In addition, as financial resources for restoration and preservation of cultural heritage were also few, the mission recommended that consideration should be given to the preparation of applications to the EU funding programmes.

#### c) *Development of detailed monitoring indicators related to Outstanding Universal Value*

For Gjirokastra, the State Party proposes to add to the existing indicators (number of restorations of separate monuments and annual funds allocated for restoration) two further

indicators: the number of planned or implemented projects from EU and other, and the work undertaken by local institutions concerning the promotion and development of tourism. Little information is provided concerning Berat.

The mission confirmed that detailed monitoring indicators related to the Outstanding Universal Value still do not exist. There is an urgent need to define them as part of the efforts to control illegal building activities and they should also serve to underpin the management of the property.

d) *Fire prevention strategy*

For Gjirokastra, the State Party reports that since the 1990s there has been a drastic reduction of fire hydrants from thirty to three. In 2005, with support from the European PHARE program, 5 new hydrants were installed. A civil emergency group has been set up to prevent and manage problematic situations. The need for two or more small size fire fighting vehicles that can easily access the narrow alleys of the city is highlighted, and a stronger cooperation is necessary in this regard between Municipality and Prefecture.

For Berat, the State Party provides details of a project financed by the European Union and undertaken in the Kala quarter in 2011 which includes the installation of fire hydrants. For Gorica and Mangalem quarters, there is so far no fire protection as noted by the mission.

The mission concluded that there is progress for Berat as a fire response plan has been completed, while a fire response report has been drafted for Gjirokastra but with little progress in terms of implementation due to the lack of funds.

e) *Archaeological excavation programme for development projects*

The State Party reports that the Institute of Archaeology has made no archaeological excavations in the castle of Gjirokastra in the last five years, but that archaeological supervision accompanies the major restoration works, such as at Berat castle.

f) *Development of a Tourism Strategy, Gjirokastra*

For Gjirokastra, the State Party reports that the Municipality of Gjirokastra has not yet developed a medium-term tourism development plan but it provides an abstract of an Action Plan for developing a tourism development strategy.

The mission noted that there is an overall need for the correlation of the Management Plans, the Tourism Strategy Plans as well as the Urban Development Plans. All of them should aim to strike a balance between the creation of economic activity and the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value.

g) *Restoration work at the Berat Castle*

The mission noted that no detailed plans were provided before the first phase of work on the Berat Castle commenced, as requested by the Committee. A second phase of restoration has been planned for the Castle. It includes: (a) the restoration of the Castle Walls, (b) the restoration (instead of reconstruction) of certain building facades and (c) the creation of a promenade outside the City Walls. Plans are still not available and this phase remains unfunded. The mission provided recommendations on the need for better documentation before further planning and did not consider the construction of the promenade justified.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the scale of illegal constructions in Gjirokastra is alarming and note the lack of progress with implementing an Action Plan. In Berat the scale of the problem is smaller as some first measures have been implemented to reverse the damage incurred by illegal constructions.

They note that the mission considered that progress in stopping illegal activities is hindered by the lack of adequate legal tools, by the lack of an overall authority for the property with a

relevant mandate, and by the lack of awareness amongst the local community about World Heritage status; all of which need to be addressed urgently.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that there is a need to strengthen the management of the property as a whole and put in place one over-arching authority (i.e. the Institute of Cultural Monuments) to become the responsible body for the conservation and management of the two cities as one unit. Such a body could also be responsible for the strategies to address monitoring and the adaptation of the illegal constructions and ensure parity of management approaches across the property.

The management of the property needs to be underpinned by a more comprehensive understanding of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value and by a more focused set of monitoring indicators that clearly relate to Outstanding Universal Value, which would significantly strengthen the process of monitoring and development control.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that work has begun in Berat to provide water hydrants for a sizeable part of the city. Whereas in Gjirokastra the number of fire hydrants is still insufficient and needs to be increased through a similar project as is being implemented in Berat, if the vulnerable timber-framed buildings are to have adequate protection.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that a second phase of restoration is planned for Berat Castle. It is essential that detailed plans are provided before work commences. These plans need to respect the recommendations of the mission with regards to the restoration of the Castle Walls, the restoration of certain buildings facades and the lack of justification for a promenade outside the City Walls. They highlight the need to clearly differentiate between restoration and reconstruction.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the conclusion of the mission concerning the willingness of the competent institutions to comply with the conservation requirements for the World Heritage property. They nevertheless note that the mission considered that the property was highly vulnerable to the impact of further degradation from illegal building works and the lack of measures to address existing violations. They therefore recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to proceed promptly with the implementation of the recommended Action Plan of the mission report, before the end of 2014, in order to avoid the emergence of serious dangers to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property that might warrant the Committee considering inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.70**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.82**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Notes the details of illegal buildings provided by the State Party for both Berat and Gjirokastra, and expresses its serious concern about its scale in Gjirokastra and the lack of progress in developing and implementing an Action Plan to deal with these violations;*
4. *Also notes the lack of adequate legal tools that would stop illegal interventions, urges the State Party to approve and implement the 'Regulation for the Historic Centre of Berat and its buffer zone' as soon as possible, and requests it to introduce a similar regulation for Gjirokastra;*

5. Further notes the report of the 2012 ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and that the two historic cities of Berat and Gjirokastra are not managed as a single property and also urges the State Party to put in place as soon as possible an over-arching management structure for the property that has responsibility for monitoring and adaptation of illegal constructions and for ensuring parity of management approaches across the property;
6. Stresses the need for the State Party to underpin the management of the property, and particularly the processes of monitoring and controlling development, by a clearer articulation of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value and by a focused set of monitoring indicators that clearly relate to it;
7. Also requests the State Party to address urgently the need for further fire hydrants to be provided at Gjirokastra and for those parts of Berat not covered by the on-going EU-funded project;
8. Encourages the State Party to continue measures to raise awareness of World Heritage status amongst local communities in Berat and Gjirokastra;
9. Further requests the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre details of the second phase of work at Berat Castle, taking into account the mission's views, in advance of project approval, for review by the Advisory Bodies in line with Paragraph 172 of Operational Guidelines;
10. Further urges the State Party to address all the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission and implement the recommended Action Plan, **by the end of 2014**, in order to reverse the decline within the property and ensure its vulnerabilities do not increase to a degree that would threaten its Outstanding Universal Value;
11. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014** and **1 February 2015** respectively, updated reports on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.

## 71. World Heritage properties of Vienna (Austria)

- Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786)

- Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn: 1996

Historic Centre of Vienna: 2001

### Criteria

Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn: (i) (iv)

Historic Centre of Vienna: (ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1033/documents/>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/786/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the "Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn"; September 2012: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the "Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn" and "Historic Centre of Vienna"

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) High-rise construction projects in Central Vienna;
- b) High-rise construction project of Vienna Main Train Station.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/786>, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1033>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 28 January 2013, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation for the two properties in Vienna, the Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn and the Historic Centre of Vienna. The report highlights new urban restructuring opportunities in the area of the Vienna Ice-Skating Club, Intercontinental Hotel and Vienna Music-Konzerthaus.

Between 17 and 20 September 2012 a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012), visited the two properties and inspected all of the developments considered previously by the World Heritage Committee as part of state of conservation reports.

*a) High-rise projects in Central Vienna*

The *Forum Schönbrunn* has been completed. Although it is visible from the Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn, the impact is limited to a viewpoint at the entrance of the main building and is strong only in fall and winter time. The *Urban Development along Danube Canal* remains critical. Therefore since the existing developments have already impacted the setting of the Historic Centre of Vienna, strict height limitations for future proposals and restrictions for illuminated advertisements on the existing buildings seem essential. In this context, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS reiterate their request to include night time visualization in the visual impact assessments as existing buildings with (licensed) advertisement billboards constitute a negative impact on night views from within the property.

*b) Developments around Vienna Main Train Station*

For the site SEESTE (60m height) work began in early 2013, for ERSTE (26-50m height) in 2011 and for the Intercity Section (55 and 60m height) in 2012. The construction of the tallest buildings in the complex, the corporate headquarters of the Österreichische Bundesbahnen (ÖBB) (up to 88m height) has also commenced in 2011. Although all complexes have been reduced in height as result of earlier negotiations, they will have a visual impact on the properties' setting. The impact has been reduced to a certain extent since the highest towers were moved out of the Belvedere's direct sight axis but the volumes, density and position of the buildings of the block closest to Belvedere do still raise concern. A more suitable, lighter and airy design would be preferable to avoid blocking completely the view from Belvedere.

### *c) Urban Restructuring at Intercontinental Hotel*

The latest development proposal concerns a building block, which accommodates the Intercontinental Hotel, the Vienna Ice-Skating Club and the Music Hall (Konzerthaus). In this particular location at the edge of the property, the visual relationships between the Belvedere Gardens and the Historic City are essential and are already disturbed by the existing hotel. Yet, the approach selected by the city is very promising and may even reduce the previous visual impact towards a better use of the plot in terms of urban and community function. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note the opportunity to improve the quality of this neighborhood and perhaps even reduce the existing visual impact of the Intercontinental Hotel. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS also note the State Party's participatory approach chosen to find solutions.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are of the view that the State Party should continue further exploring the new more proactive and participatory approach to urban planning selected for the plot of the Intercontinental Hotel. Such approaches should be based on strengthened legislation for visual protection. It is also recommended that item no 46 of Vienna's Urban Development Guidelines, which addresses high-rise developments, is revised to include requirements for comprehensive visual impact assessments, comprising a variety of variables, seasonal and light situations.

In the case of Vienna, most individual projects have a limited impact on the skyline and sight relations but the accumulated impact of a number of projects over several years raises concerns. To prevent future risks that the accumulation reaches a stage where the Outstanding Universal Value may be irreversibly affected, Vienna requires strong and definite political commitment and its translation into strictly applied regulations and urban planning policies.

### **Draft Decision      37 COM 7B.71**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **35COM 7B.84** adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Notes that a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property took place in September 2012 and requests the State Party to implement the recommendations of the mission;
4. Takes note of the information provided by the State Party concerning a new project proposed in and around the Intercontinental Hotel, also notes the proactive and participatory approach selected, as well as the aim to reduce the height of older structures, and urges the State Party to ensure that any redevelopment is lower than existing structures in order to reduce the negative impact on views;
5. Regrets the remaining visual impact of the developments at Vienna Main Train Station on the immediate and wider setting of the properties and also requests the State Party to endorse planning policies, in particular through amending item 46 of Vienna's Urban Development Guidelines, to prevent similar developments in the future;
6. Further requests the State Party to integrate standard requirements for comprehensive visual impact assessments in relation to the Outstanding Universal Value of the

*properties in its urban planning policies (including regulations for night-time impacts caused by illuminated advertisements);*

7. *Requests furthermore the State Party to inform, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, the World Heritage Centre of any additional urban development projects as well as amendments to current projects that may have a negative impact on the World Heritage properties, before any planning permissions are granted;*
8. *Finally requests the State Party to provide a report to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2014, on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above.*

## **72. Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late advisory mission)

## **73. 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  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/217/documents/>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 17,000  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/217/assistance>

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) Lack of a management plan (issue resolved);
- b) Urban development pressure;
- c) Lack of an urban master plan and of a conservation master plan of monuments and archaeological sites;
- d) Illegal constructions.

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/217/>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 28 January 2013, the State Party submitted a detailed and comprehensive state of conservation report. An ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited the property from 20 to 24 November 2012 as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011). The mission report is available online at the following web address:

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM>.

#### a) *Management system for the property*

The State Party reports that the Management Plan for the property has been completed with a broad participatory process. It identifies a conservation policy to protect the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property and seeks to integrate different planning tools at the urban and regional level. It includes projects for immediate implementation to address long-standing issues at the property. Mechanisms to ensure adequate funding are included and the review of legislative and regulatory measures is considered to ensure a fully operational management system. For management arrangements, it has provisions for reforming the current institutional framework, for improving mechanisms for coordination and control as well as for strengthening the role of the state and local government, which are being discussed at the state level. An administrative unit has been established at the Municipality for the protection of cultural heritage and the implementation of the Management Plan. Two regional inspectors have been appointed at the Ministry of Culture to monitor the property. Comprehensive condition monitoring, including the identification of violations to the Cultural Heritage Act, has been carried out and monitoring maps were prepared. Working meetings with civil society have been convened to draft a project for the protection of the property and its buffer zone. The authorities also report that in November 2012, the Minister of Culture issued an Ordinance on the procedure for identification, declaration and provision of a status and determination of the category of the immovable cultural properties for the National Register of the Immovable Cultural Properties. This includes the process for the creation and adoption of regimes for the protection of heritage within the boundaries and buffer zones.

The mission considered the Management Plan as a crucial step and recommends its full adoption. It notes that the further development and adoption of Urban Master Plan with provisions for land use, for the rehabilitation of infrastructure, zoning controls (including no build zones), as well as a precise conservation plan is needed to ensure the long-term protection of the property.

#### b) *Regulations for tourism activities and components of urban infrastructure*

The State Party reports that the current situation of tourism was evaluated. The Management Plan suggests basic guidelines for the development of an Integrated Multi-Institutional Tourism Strategy. "Rules for tourism activities, movable sites and elements of urban infrastructure, advertising and commercial outdoor activity" are in the process of finalization. In coordination with the Municipal Council, the Ministry of Culture developed scheme concepts for advertising and information elements. Work was also carried out to remove movable street trade at the property to clear public spaces around the medieval churches.

#### c) *Monitoring of the property*

The State Party reports that since 2010, the property and its buffer zone were monitored as part of the condition assessment. Results have been used to identify priority measures, which have been integrated in the Management Plan.

The mission verified the on-going mechanisms for the monitoring of the property and recommended that capacities and resources be increased to continue with their systematic implementation.

- d) *Removal of illegal constructions within the property, protection of the buffer zone and the sea coastline*

The State Party reports that although the buffer zone is regulated by national law since 1991, no provision for its protection was granted until 2012; these have also been included in the Management Plan. It also notes that a minor boundary modification will be submitted for consideration by the World Heritage Committee. As for the moratorium on constructions in the buffer zone and coastal areas, it reports that until all legal provisions are adopted and enforced, the moratorium will remain. Also, the review process for projects has been enhanced and there is now greater coordination among the local state and municipal authorities for regular inspection of the property and the identification of projects subject to fines. Assessment of cases of illegal constructions was carried out and violations to existing regulations identified. Follow-up procedures on the specific cases are on-going to address their removal.

The mission reported that there are constructions currently occurring in contradiction to the moratorium. The mission recommended that mitigation measures be identified for those already constructed and that Heritage Impact Assessments be carried out for the existing proposals, particularly for the construction of pontoons and yachts at the port to ensure that there is no impact on the OUV of the property. The mission took detailed note of the areas where violations to existing regulations have occurred and recommended that they be promptly addressed.

#### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made by the State Party in addressing the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee and welcome the development of the Management Plan. They recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to continue its efforts to improve current conservation, management and protection conditions.

They also underline that the moratorium on any new constructions needs to be maintained and authorization of new construction permits within the World Heritage property, its surroundings and sea coastline area be halted until the Urban Master Plan and Conservation Plan are developed and adopted.

#### **Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.73**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.87**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Welcomes the progress made by the State Party in the implementation of its previous decisions and urges the State Party to adopt and implement the Management Plan;*
4. *Takes note of the results of the November 2012 ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property and requests the State Party to implement its recommendations, in particular:*
  - a) *Approve effective legislative and regulatory measures, including those for new construction and development, for the management of the buffer zone and the surrounding sea coastline and for the regulation of tourism activities,*

- b) *Maintain the moratorium on any new constructions within the World Heritage property, its buffer zone and at the surrounding sea coastline until the development and approval of an Urban Master Plan and a Conservation Plan,*
  - c) *Strengthen the protection status of the sea coastline and include mandatory heritage impact assessments for proposed developments,*
  - d) *Make operational the proposed management system, including adequate staffing and resources for the implementation of the proposed projects,*
  - e) *Implement priority conservation and maintenance works, as identified in the Management Plan, for the historic buildings and archaeological sites, and prepare a technical manual for conservation, rehabilitation and restoration,*
  - f) *Develop capacity building activities for all professional staff involved with the conservation, protection and management of the property;*
5. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above.

#### **74. Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (C 85)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1979

Criteria  
(i) (iii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/85/documents/>

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-Budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous Monitoring Missions  
2006: World Heritage Centre site visit; March 2009: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
Micro-organisms: outbreaks of mould and bacterial spores on the surface of the cave paintings of Lascaux.

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/85>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

#### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 31 January 2013, as requested by World Heritage Committee in its Decision **35 COM 7B.92**.

a) *Research and Recording*

The report details the research and work undertaken over the past two years on establishing better understanding of the problems of mould and bacterial spores in the caves. Strictly limited access to the most important caves has resulted in a stabilisation of the atmospheric conditions and hence the bacterial attack; improved equipment put in place in 2012 permits greater precision in controlling of humidity, air quality, water and temperature. Research work has led to the identification of the micro-organisms responsible and the processes behind micro-organism attack. Those results, along with the mapping of areas at risk, were presented to the Scientific Council in March 2012. The Council now intends to undertake further work on the hydro-climatic conditions in the caves, on recording and mapping of areas most severely affected by micro-organism attack, on experimental methods of control, and eventually to undertake measures to control the atmosphere of the caves themselves. The Council has established a group charged with the responsibility for undertaking this work and will be inviting tenders in the first third of 2013.

Further non-invasive studies of the colour of the paintings by automatic means, specially designed for the site and thereby reducing human presence in the caves, have been embarked upon to ensure the constant condition of the rock walls. The 2009 studies on movement of water and carbon dioxide are continuing and older installations in the cave made from inappropriate and damaging material have been removed. A new campaign of 3D modelling will permit a greatly enhanced record of the Lascaux cave to allow greater public information, multimedia outlets and reconstructions. The sharing of the information deriving from these studies will enable better understanding of risks of actions at similar caves where preventative measures may be better developed.

b) *Public Awareness and Communication*

A website for the purpose of sharing information within the Scientific Council has been set up and a project to make available all documentation deriving from the studies is commencing in 2013. Meetings of the scientific community, seminars and papers in international journals and available on line have widened awareness of the work to concerned bodies. Filming of the conservation and recording has been made available to the public and a series of press releases have raised awareness of the amelioration of the condition of the caves.

c) *Protection and Isolation of the Hill*

The State Party reports progress on the work towards removing unsightly infrastructure from the hill and the protection of setting, while still allowing public appreciation – this year 250,000 visitors came to the reconstruction of Lascaux II. The 2011 feasibility study for a new road and car park before closing the existing facilities will allow work to begin in 2013.

d) *The Scientific Council*

This independent and international council has met on eleven occasions since its inauguration by the Minister of Culture and Communications in 2010. It has various sub-groups responsible for specific functions. Independent from the Ministry of Culture, it nonetheless assures synergy by the representation of those responsible for the management of the caves - conservators, inspectors and managers. The minutes of the Council meetings are available online. It advises on and approves research and programmes of conservation for the caves, and a document with such details was sent to UNESCO in February 2011.

*Conclusion*

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the State Party has made important progress in identifying micro-organisms responsible for the mould outbreak, and in stabilising the atmospheric conditions by limiting access.

They note that these steps forward will be followed by further work on analysing hydro-climatic conditions and on recording and mapping of areas most severely affected, which

could lead to measures being developed to control the atmosphere of the caves. The Council has established a group charged with the responsibility for undertaking this work and will be inviting tenders in the first quarter of 2013.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note the work undertaken to record and monitor the colour of paintings, the programme for dissemination of research and educational facilities, and the progress made towards clearing the property of tourist infrastructure and replacing it with better planned roads and car parks.

**Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.74**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.92**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Welcomes the important progress in identifying micro-organisms responsible for the mould outbreak, and in stabilising of the atmospheric conditions through limiting access;*
4. *Notes that these steps forward will be followed by further work on the hydro-climatic conditions starting in 2013, for the recording and mapping of areas most severely affected, which could lead to development of measures being developed to control the atmosphere of the caves;*
5. *Commends the State Party for the significant improvements in communicating both results of its research to the scientific community and the educational aspects to the general public by means of publication, websites and exhibitions;*
6. *Also notes the progress made by the State Party towards the removal of undesirable infrastructure from the property and its replacement with new roads and car parks further from the focus of the property,*
7. *Further notes the enhancement of the system of management of the caves;*
8. *Requests the State Party to provide details of the proposed new developments at the property, especially the development of the new reconstruction, new road and car park with appropriate Heritage Impact Assessments before their implementation, in accordance with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, 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 39th session in 2015.*

**75. Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (supplementary information required)

**76. Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400bis)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late mission)

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

**78. Portovenere, Cinque Terre and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto) (Italy) (C 826)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1997

Criteria  
(ii)(iv)(v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/826/documents/>

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
October 2012: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Advisory Mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
Floods, landslides

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/826/>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

Reports on the state of conservation of the World Heritage property “Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto)” were submitted by the State Party in October 2012 and February 2013. From 8 to 11 October 2012, the State Party invited a World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission to assess the state of conservation of the property and to provide technical advice on remedial measures and risk preparedness in response to the damages caused by severe floods and landslides in October 2011. The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM/documents>.

#### a) *Damages caused by floods*

The province of La Spezia was widely affected by the flooding on 25 October 2011, particularly the two villages of Monterosso and Vernazza, both within the boundaries of the property. Floods and landslides caused damages to buildings, infrastructure, roads and railway lines. In the wider landscape, various vineyard terraces collapsed or became unstable.

The emergency actions were efficiently coordinated by the Regional Government. Long term improvement projects are planned for implementation after the rescue phase is completed, such as the Vernazza tunnel that will divert overflow water from the Torrente Vernazzola directly into the sea.

The advisory mission noted the extraordinary efforts made jointly by the authorities, local communities, individuals and associations during and after the disaster, all of which has strengthened a feeling of solidarity in the whole region and made the fast recovery possible. The mission confirmed that the emergency measures taken were timely and the recovery actions were of a high technical level.

The mission advised that for all major recuperation and improvement projects in the property Heritage Impact Assessments would be required. They also highlighted the opportunities offered by the recovery works to improve the environmental quality of the infrastructure and to improve ecology standards.

The State Party has provided information on a proposed major project to redevelop public spaces in Vernazza. It is reported that the project could start in March 2013.

#### b) *Main challenges for the property and management priorities*

The mission noted that the disaster had revealed the vulnerability of the property and considerable on-going threats to its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). The slow process of degradation of the cultural landscape is due to increasing socio-economic pressures rather than to the outcome of natural disasters. In the mission’s view, the main challenge concerns the long-term management of the living vineyard landscape.

The mission stressed the importance of establishing a fully revised management plan based on an agreed list of attributes that convey the OUV. It must include strategies for tourism, agriculture, landscape and socio-economic issues as well as conservation of towns and terraces. The State Party informed that coordination work for preparation of the new Management Plan started in January 2013.

In addition, the definition of a buffer zone would strengthen the integrity of the property and be a support for a more comprehensive management approach, including environmental protection, as well as socio-economic and tourism development opportunities.

#### c) *Reducing the impact of potential natural disasters*

Despite the recovery works, the property remains highly vulnerable to further disasters. A detailed risk management strategy for the property is also a priority issue and should be integrated in the management process. The first and foremost step to address natural disasters should be the commitment and involvement of citizens, politicians and technicians,

both on the local and the regional/national level. Recognition and dissemination of knowledge about traditional land uses and traditional means of facing natural disasters are essential.

### Conclusion

The OUV of the property has not been affected by the recent floods and landslides. However, the natural disaster revealed the vulnerability of the property as a living landscape. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that there is an urgency to put in place a coordinated and balanced management system that focuses on sustaining the living vineyard landscape. There is also an urgency to revise the Management Plan alongside the development of a sustainable tourism strategy and a risk management strategy, with the overall aim of strengthening the long term sustainability of the cultural landscape.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge that the disaster could provide the catalyst for major improvement projects such as the one being planned for Vernazza, as well as large scale recuperation projects. They consider that all such projects need to be carefully considered for their impact on the OUV, through Heritage Impact Assessments and appropriate evaluation of the plans by the Advisory Bodies before commitments are made.

### **Draft Decision      37 COM 7B.78**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.77** adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Takes note of the emergency response provided by the State Party and commends the authorities for the steps undertaken for the safeguarding of the property;*
4. *Notes that a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission to the property, invited by the State Party, took place in October 2012;*
5. *Requests the State Party to implement the recommendations of the mission and more particularly:*
  - a) *Review the management system for the entire property, involving all the stakeholders, including local communities and focusing on the necessity to face the increasing socio-economic pressure, with a living landscape approach that recognizes and promotes the knowledge of traditional land uses in the property,*
  - b) *Revise the Management Plan and incorporate within it a sustainable tourism strategy for the property, and an integrated risk management strategy,*
  - c) *Define a buffer zone for the appropriate protection of the wider landscape and officially submit the proposal to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, in accordance with Paragraphs 163-165 of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to carry out Heritage Impact Assessment studies on the major recuperation and improvement projects in the property, including the construction of the tunnel and the project to upgrade the public spaces in the Municipality of Vernazza, and to submit these with details of the plans to the World Heritage Centre,*

for review by the Advisory Bodies, before any irreversible commitments are made, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;

7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above.

## 79. Alto Douro Wine Region (Portugal) (C 1046)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2001

Criteria  
(iii) (iv) (v)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1046/documents/>

International Assistance  
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
April 2011: ICOMOS advisory mission; July/August 2012: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
Construction of a hydro-electric dam at Foz Tua

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1046>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the property from 30 July to 3 August 2012 to assess the potential impact of the revised Foz Tua Hydro-Electric Dam project on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, its boundaries, as well as the property's management system, the protection of the setting, and the overall state of conservation of the property. The report of the mission is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM/documents>.

The mission made a number of recommendations on the revision of the Foz Tua Hydro-Electric Dam project and on the management of the property. As requested by Decision **36 COM 7B.81**, the Director-General of UNESCO, in consultation with the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, subsequently endorsed the recommendations of the mission.

On 14 December 2012, on 31 January 2013 and on 28 March 2013, the State Party provided updated reports on the revision of the Foz Tua Hydro-Electric Dam project in line with the mission recommendations. It also provided details of the proposed routes of the high voltage power lines, of the navigation channel at the Douro entrance, and of the Landscape Master

Plan, and preliminary studies for the revision of the Management Plan as well as a report on the overall state of conservation of the property with comprehensive annexes including an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Heritage Impact Study on the power lines.

a) *Overall state of conservation and management*

The mission highlighted the fact that the property is vulnerable to incremental changes, to infrastructure development and to the lack of appropriate planning and management structures.

The mission considered that the revision and update of the Management Plan was of the utmost priority. The mission furthermore considered that the revised Management Plan should make special provisions for relevant documents, including the *National Plan for the Douro River Basin*, and the *National Programme of Dams of High Hydroelectric Power Potential*. The revision process for the Management Plan is currently underway.

Following the mission's recommendations, the State Party informed that it has undertaken measures to clarify and reinforce the role of the management body, the so-called Douro Mission Structure (EMD). A Douro Mission Advisory Committee was established in December 2012 engaging 32 institutions involved in the management of the region, including the national authorities concerned. The Douro Mission Advisory Committee mandated the EMD to coordinate the overall management of the property and the revision of the Management Plan.

The State Party has also confirmed that the process to revise the Management Plan was launched on 18 March 2013.

b) *Foz Tua Hydro-Electric Dam Project*

The State Party has ensured that the pace of the construction works has remained slow since the last Committee's Decision, and as requested by the Director-General of UNESCO. A timetable for the completion of the dam construction was provided indicating the steps until the beginning of commercial operation scheduled for the third quarter of 2016.

The State Party informed that 60% of the works on the navigation channel have been completed and that they are currently suspended until the start of the dry season. It further informed that small scale simulations of future flow conditions have been undertaken that have confirmed the results of previous studies of fluvial hydraulics. Based on these findings, it has been determined that the Foz Tua Dam would be compatible with the navigability of the River Douro. In addition, already existing submerged rocky outcrops at the mouth of Tua River would be removed in order to ensure safe navigation conditions.

The State Party further submitted a scoping study for the EIA, including a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), for the high voltage transmission lines. While three out of nine alternative solutions were retained after the HIA, the Commission for Environmental Assessment has requested that the EIA be developed for all alternatives previously proposed and additional ones suggested by the Commission. The EIA is expected to be completed in Summer 2013 and will then be submitted to the authorities for evaluation and opened for public consultation with a view to issuing the Environmental Impact Statement to allow construction works for the power line to start in 2014.

A Landscape Master Plan has been developed for the entire area of the Foz Tua Hydro-Electric Dam project. It includes both an overall vision of the landscape protection and concrete proposals for action and mitigation measures.

c) *Other issues*

While recognizing that the property is inscribed under cultural criteria only, the mission noted that in relation to natural values of the project area the EIA drawn up in 2007 and approved in 2009, did not take into account two important facts. Firstly, the Management Plan of the property, provided by the State Party at the time of the property's nomination, noted that

some areas (including the Foz Tua Dam project area) are declared National Ecological Reserve (REN). These REN are defined by the State Party as biophysical structures which integrate the various systems which are subject to special protection due to their value and/or ecological sensitivity or because of their exposure or susceptibility to natural risks. Secondly, in Article 1 of the Management Plan's "Normative Guidelines", the alteration of river margin morphology and the partial or total destruction of riparian vegetation are considered prohibited actions. Both these points should have been priority considerations in the EIA, but the mission noted that this did not appear to have been the case.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission concluded that the OUV of the property has not been irreversibly affected by the Foz Tua Hydro-Electric Dam project as amended following the recommendations of the mission, and that the overall state of conservation of the property is satisfactory but vulnerable to incremental change and to infrastructural projects.

In order to address these issues, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the following actions need to be taken to strengthen the protection and management of the property: 1. To ensure the operational stability of the reinforced management entity EMD, finalize the revised Management Plan as a matter of priority; 2. Abstain from large infrastructure projects within the boundaries of the property; 3. Provide as a matter of urgency the EIA for the proposed high voltage transmission lines; and 4. Suspend further excavation of the navigation channel until hydraulic studies have been finalized and demonstrate that the lay-out of the proposed navigation channel is satisfactory in respect to its impact on the flow of the River Douro.

### Draft Decision:      **37 COM 7B.79**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.81**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Takes note of the conclusions and recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission, and thanks the Director-General of UNESCO for endorsing the recommendations of the mission;*
4. *Notes with satisfaction the comprehensive documentation provided by the State Party in response to the mission's recommendations;*
5. *Requests the State Party to continue to implement the recommendations of the joint reactive monitoring mission regarding the Foz Tua Hydro-Electric Dam project and in particular to:*
  - a) *Provide the Environmental Impact Assessment for the high voltage transmission lines by **1 September 2013** to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, before any decision on their trajectory is taken,*
  - b) *Suspend further excavation of the navigation channel until hydraulic studies have been finalized and demonstrate that its lay-out is satisfactory in respect to its impact on the flow of the River Douro;*

6. *Also requests the State Party to submit the revised World Heritage Management Plan of the Alto Douro Wine Region by **1 February 2014** for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above.*

**80. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late mission)

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (State Party report on the state of conservation of the property not received)

**82. Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (State Party report on the state of conservation of the property not received)

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (State Party report on the state of conservation of the property not received)

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

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

### Criteria

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

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/383/documents/>

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

November 2011: ICOMOS Advisory Mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) High-rise development in the vicinity of the property (Torre Pelli-Cajasol);
- b) Inappropriate protection for the wider setting and buffer zone to address development pressures.

### Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/383>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 31 January 2013, informing on the progress on some of the requests of the Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012).

#### a) *Progress with Special Protection Plans, buffer zone and protection of the wider setting*

The extended Conjunto Histórico, which was declared by Royal Decree on 2 November 2009, covers 783.5 hectares, including the historic city and the modern city – with 19th and 20th century extensions. As it was considered unfeasible to prepare an encompassing Special Protection Plan, it has been divided into 27 sectors and an approved plan is required for each. The 2011 mission noted that it is important for the Special Protection Plans to be completed and approved for all ‘sectors’. Some sectors are so complex that they have been divided into smaller sub-sectors for which plans are to be approved separately.

The State Party report provides a useful analysis of the progress with the plans for all these sectors. Four sectors are considered to be sufficiently protected by the Heritage of Cultural Interest (HCI) legislation, as they fall within an HCI or are adjacent to one; these are Sector 6 “Royal Alcázar”, Sector 11 “Hospital de las Cinco Llagas”, Sector 15 “La Cartuja”, and Sector 26 “Ibero-American Exhibition enclosure”.

Concerning other 16 sectors, some of them are at the approval stage for the Special Protection Plan, while others are still in an earlier stage (previous steps as organizational standards and/or cataloguing, etc). Therefore there are 7 sectors which have specific issues and require a more detailed analysis and a new Special Protection Plan. It is expected that all the Special Protection Plans will have been developed and definitively approved within the first six months of 2013.

The State Party reports that the current buffer zone does not have specific protection but its area will be covered by the Special Protection Plans that should provide adequate control.

The value of these sectors that make up the buffer zone has been identified in terms of their intrinsic value rather than of their relationship to the property. Nevertheless, as previously reported to the Committee, an extensive survey has been carried out of the area surrounding the property to allow a full understanding of how it relates to its immediate setting.

The State Party report sets out details as to how controls of height, voids, archaeology, urban spaces, visual pollution and other pertinent issues are dealt with. It also stresses the fact that most of the buildings in the buffer zone are listed, and there are few urban voids which means that urban developments that could impact on the property are not expected.

The protection for the wider setting is not specifically dealt with in the State Party report but the information provided on development projects includes control measures.

b) *Details of all major building projects that might impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV)*

Three potential high-rise developments are mentioned in the State Party report. These are taller than the average and are all to the south of the property, at a distance varying from 2.6 to 5km from the property. Currently none have licences and the projects are not likely to become active in the short to medium term. In each of the cases the conclusion drawn is that the distance between the development and the property means that there will be no visual impact.

In general terms, the State Party reports that it is not possible to determine the building heights in the areas of projected growth based solely on the assessments of the current General Plan. Therefore, to avoid future urban developments which could visually impact on the property, the State Party reports that adequate control measures will be implemented through the Municipality and specifically the Urban Directorate, who will request an Impact Study with appropriate images and photographs for all buildings over 20 storeys high in order to confirm that there will be no visual impact.

c) *Other matters*

The request by the Committee for the State Party to collaborate with ICOMOS on studies necessary to avoid further high-rise buildings that would impact adversely on the OUV was not addressed in the State Party report. However, in a letter from the State Party dated 11 April 2013, ICOMOS has been requested to collaborate with the Spanish authorities on this matter.

The Spanish authorities informed the World Heritage Centre that an international expert meeting in Seville on historic urban landscapes and contemporary architecture (Decision **36 COM 7B.88**) will be held in September 2013.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress with finalising and approving the Special Protection Plans and also note that these are due for completion during 2013. The buffer zone will be entirely covered by Special Protection Plans. Taking also into account the density of protected structures and the lack of areas for development, all these elements provide a basis for its protection.

Although the specific measures to control the wider setting of the property are not mentioned, it appears that controls will be put in place by the authorities to limit the height of buildings that might impact adversely on the OUV of the property. It should be ensured that Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) are undertaken in line with the ICOMOS Guidance on HIAs for new constructions that could potentially impact the OUV of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee remind the State Party of the importance of collaborating with the Advisory Bodies on studies necessary to avoid further high-rise buildings that would impact adversely on the OUV.

**Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.84**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.88**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Notes the progress with finalising and approving Special Protection Plans for sectors of the Conjunto Histórico, due for completion in 2013;*
4. *Also notes that the buffer zone will be completely covered by these Plans which should provide it with adequate protection;*
5. *Further notes that for the wider setting, the local authorities will be tasked with establishing adequate control measures for new constructions;*
6. *Considers that impact assessments for new constructions which can potentially impact the Outstanding Universal Value should be carried out in line with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments;*
7. *Takes note that no collaboration with ICOMOS has so far been undertaken on studies necessary to avoid further high-rise buildings that would impact adversely on the Outstanding Universal Value, but notes furthermore the request made by the State Party to ICOMOS to start this process;*
8. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, a progress report on the implementation of the above.*

**85. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (finalization of the mission report)

**86. Neolithic Site of Çatalhöyük (Turkey) (C 1405)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2012

Criteria  
(iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1405/documents>

International Assistance:

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of completed integrated management plan (issue resolved)
- b) Lack of a financial strategy

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1405>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, including “The Draft Management Plan of Çatalhöyük Neolithic Site”. In accordance with the relevant regulations, the draft plan is currently in the process of submission to the Executive and Monitoring Council for evaluation and approval. Following the approval of the Executive and Monitoring Council, the final Management Plan will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre before the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee. At the time of the preparation of this report, the final version of the plan had not been received by the World Heritage Centre.

#### a) *Finalization and implementation of the Management Plan*

The State Party submitted the updated draft Management Plan, which aims to ensure the recognition and conservation of the significance and values of the property by all stakeholders, including visitors. The main management issues have been defined based on the analysis of the situation and information derived from a stakeholder consultation. Management policies and actions are planned around a series of key issues: Archaeological Excavations and Research, Visitor Management and Presentation, Tourism and Promotion, Accessibility, Education, Participation, Local Development, and Risk Management.

The required actions have been prioritized, the duration of their implementation estimated, and parties responsible for implementation identified; the requirement for strengthening legal powers and financial provision for effective implementation is prioritized for 2013-2014.

#### b) *Defining, besides the Çatalhöyük Research Project, the national and local entities responsible for the custody of the inventories and documentation on the property*

This issue has been addressed in the draft Management Plan, which states that all collections, inventories and documentation are managed and regulated by the Directorate General for Cultural Heritage and Museums through the Directorate of Konya Museum. Storage facilities on site have recently been significantly enhanced and further work is in progress to strengthen documentation including compiling visual sources and written materials in different languages related to Çatalhöyük (excavation reports, photographs, related articles etc.). It is planned to store and present the compiled literature in one of the sections of the Konya Museum.

- c) *Including amongst the monitoring indicators, the evaluation of environmental and climatic impacts, as well as those related to the effects of agriculture, tourism or other developments, which might affect the property*

All of these issues have been addressed in the draft Management Plan and appropriate actions identified.

- d) *Financial strategy for the conservation and maintenance of the property*

The Action Plan has identified priorities and the agencies responsible for implementation. In addition, the source of finance for each of the actions is identified.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee express its satisfaction with the progress made by the State Party in response to the Committee decision.

However, they note that while a number of the actions listed within the Action Plan refer to monitoring, no monitoring indicators have been identified. There is a need for a monitoring plan with appropriate indicators in order to ensure that the implementation of conservation and management objectives proves effective.

They also point out that it is not clear how many of the activities are already funded, and whether there is a need to seek additional funding for some of the activities (in particular prioritised activities). It would, therefore, be useful to develop a complete financial strategy.

The draft Management Plan has been completed; however this document needs final approval by the relevant agencies in order for its implementation to move forward.

### Draft Decision:      **37 COM 7B.86**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 8B.36**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Welcomes the progress made by the State Party in updating the Management Plan;*
4. *Urges the State Party to:*
  - a) *Elaborate further the actions listed in the Management Plan, including suitable monitoring indicators to enable the State Party to monitor the conservation and management of the property adequately,*
  - b) *Provide assurance that the legal underpinning of the Plan is secured, and*
  - c) *Provide a more detailed financial strategy to ensure that adequate funding is in place for all necessary actions;*
5. *Requests the State Party to proceed with the necessary final approval for the management plan, taking into account the above mentioned request, and to provide three printed and electronic copies to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2014**, for review by the Advisory Bodies.*

## 87. L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C 865bis)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1998

### Criteria

(ii) (v)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/865/documents/>

### International Assistance

N/A

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

2004: ICOMOS-German World Heritage Foundation mission; March 2010: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) New constructions within the historic centre;
- b) Lack of valid detailed planning documents;
- c) Inadequate infrastructure including the sewage system

### Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/865/>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2012 and 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted state of conservation reports, in response to Decision **35 COM 7B.113**. A reactive monitoring mission to the property took place from 7 to 15 May 2012 and the mission report is available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM/>.

The two State Party reports largely consist of lists of conservation projects. The 2012 report mentions the adoption of “Integrated Concept of the Development of the Centre of L’viv” (a document for the planning in the historic centre), “Rules regarding placement of outside advertisements in L’viv”, and the “Guide to the city”, providing guidance about the historical architecture and methods of reconstruction and repair. It confirms that new constructions which could have adversely impacted on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property were stopped, specifically the proposed new hotel on the Citadel and of the Franciscan monastery. The 2013 report confirms the completion of the digitised mapping of the property. Neither report addresses the development of the Strategic Management Plan, the establishment of the Independent Advisory Board, the development of a plan for traffic and parking nor other problems of management and statutory development control raised by the 2010 mission.

The 2012 ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission raised significant concerns in all areas and noted the following:

- a) Legislation: recent modifications have resulted in some laws being contradictory and overly complicated and the legal powers of the Minister of Culture have weakened. Regulation for protection is over-centralised and guidance for developers, where it exists, is generalised, subjective, and not specifically geared to historic repair or appropriate regeneration. The legal protection of Ukraine’s World Heritage properties in general, and that of L’viv and its buffer zone in particular, is inadequate.

- b) Management systems: the powers of the Minister of Culture are weak in relation to redevelopment issues. No independent advisory board has been set up and there has been no progress with the formulation of the Management Plan. With no Site Manager and gaps in the legal framework, there is no clear system to ensure the effective management of the property.
- c) Plans, systems and mechanisms: The General Plan for L'viv, adopted in 2010, is an adequate tool to address some issues regarding management and protection. However, issues such as development potential and traffic congestion continue to be serious. The Mayor has attempted to address these problems by decentralising offices and banning traffic from the historic centre, but the General Plan lacks precision in the historic zoning of the city, in the identification of heritage buildings and ensembles and in their regulation. The requirement for the "Historic and Architectural Justification", subject to approval from the Minister of Culture is in effect the only procedure for restricting development but it is largely unsystematic and lacks precise criteria or guidance.
- d) State of conservation: Funding for restoration projects is insufficient, though jointly funded projects with international cooperation (Germany, Poland and Norway), have led to adequate interventions such as those at the Jesuit and Armenian Cathedrals, the monasteries of Saint Yura and Saint Onufre, and a programme of repair of windows, doors, staircases and balconies. However, the mission noted examples of buildings in a very poor state of repair and of poor conservation practice – lack of pre-development research, inaccurate or fanciful reconstruction - and a lack of awareness of the need for archaeological excavation. The future of the Citadel and the Bernadine Monastery, despite a stop to construction works to the new controversial building, remains uncertain as do other potential or actual development sites, such as a hotel at Krakovska. It is often public pressure, rather than formal regulation, that prevents inappropriate development. The mission noted three projects that potentially affected OUV, which should be halted to allow further scrutiny.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the report of the 2012 ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission raises significant concerns with the legal protection, management systems and protective mechanisms, and the state of conservation of the property and its buffer zone.

While progress has been recognised in a few areas - namely the conservation of several important monuments, the digitised mapping of the World Heritage property, and the production of the Integrated Concept for the Historic Centre of L'viv - the strength of legislative and management powers for protection has lessened and no progress has been reported in the production of Management, or area plans. In addition, pressures from development projects continue to grow and proposals that could potentially impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the property have been underscored.

### **Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.87**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision 35 COM 7B.113, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),

3. *Acknowledges the halting of the development of the Citadel and Bernadine monastery, the adoption of the Integrated Concept for the Redevelopment of the Centre of L'viv and of the Regulations for placing announcements in the city of L'viv, and the completion of the digitised mapping of the property;*
4. *Takes note of the 2012 reactive monitoring mission and urges the State Party to implement its recommendations and more particularly, address pressing conservation and management issues through the following:*
  - a) *Formalise the statutory basis for measures of protection of the city's Historic Zone, the property and buffer zone, and ensure that development projects are supported by adequate archaeological investigation and recording,*
  - b) *Establish regulations for restoration and redevelopment, underpinned by detailed studies of the attributes contributing to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and introduce a system of Visual Impact Studies for new development proposals,*
  - c) *Establish a management body, with wide representation to include non-governmental organisations, to oversee the management of the property,*
  - d) *Prepare a Strategic Management Plan for the property and its buffer zone, including provisions for zoning with specific area plans for important ensembles, for archaeological conservation and for traffic management;*
5. *Also urges the State Party to halt work on developments at the Hotel complex (Fedorova 23-15), at the Residence of the Minister of Interior (Krivonosa 1) and at the Residential complex (Dovboucha 15), allowing the development of Heritage Impact Assessments and their review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with the Operational Guidelines, Paragraph 172, details of all new major developments within the property, with appropriate Heritage Impact Assessments, for review by the Advisory Bodies;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, an updated report on the State of Conservation of the property and the progress on the implementation of the above for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.*

**88. Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1990

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/527/documents>

#### International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 39,720 and USD 5,000 (approved in 2009 but cancelled).  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/527/assistance>

#### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

#### Previous monitoring missions

May 1999: ICOMOS expert mission; April 2006: expert mission (Italian Funds-in-Trust); November 2007: World Heritage Centre information meeting for site managers; March 2009 and November 2010: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions.

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

- a) Urban development pressure;
- b) High-rise buildings that could compromise the panorama of the historical monastic Dnieper river landscape;
- c) Lack of legal protection and planning mechanisms;
- d) Lack of management system and mechanisms of coordination between all stakeholders including the City Municipality.

#### Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/527>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

#### Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2013, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party in response to Decision **36 COM 7B.90** (Saint-Petersburg, 2012). A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was invited to visit the property from 15 to 19 April 2013, regrettably too late to allow its observations and recommendations to be included in this state of conservation report. The mission report will be available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/527/documents>.

In addition, on 8 October 2012, a project dossier for a new building at No. 10 Mikhailivska Street in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property was submitted by the State Party, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. On 14 February 2013, ICOMOS comments on this project dossier were transmitted to the State Party.

##### *a) High-rise and non-conforming buildings*

The World Heritage Committee had requested the State Party to impose a moratorium on all high-rise and non-conforming buildings until a survey has been conducted of the overall monastic river landscape panorama, and to implement, in coordination with the City Administration, all necessary measures to reduce their adverse effect by modifying projects and by demolishing constructed levels to an appropriate scale. The State Party reports that the question of a moratorium has been discussed by Kiev City Council, and a draft decision is under consideration. On 26 November 2012, the Ministry of Culture requested the city authorities to impose a moratorium on the construction of new houses and the reconstruction/expansion of existing buildings within the property's buffer zone.

The State Party reports that in order to reduce the negative impact of the proposed tall building at Klovsky descent, it has considered requesting the proprietor to provide a plate glass façade 'to make the building less materialized'.

##### *b) Monastic river landscape panorama*

The World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to undertake a survey of the visual perspectives and panorama of the property in the wider context of the overall monastic Dnieper river landscape as a basis for planning and impact assessment. The State Party reports that in January 2013 the Ministry of Culture requested an independent expert assessment of the monastic panorama of the right bank of the Dnieper river, and an analysis

of high-rise buildings that could affect the attributes that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property.

*c) Protective, regulatory, urban planning and practical mechanisms*

The State Party note the envisaged new urban development Master Plan for the development of Kiev until 2025. The specified land use in the buffer zone and historical areas will come into force upon approval of this Master Plan.

*d) Management plan, and unified system of management*

The State Party reports that in November 2011 the two components of the World Heritage property were placed under the direct control of a single State authority, the Ministry of Culture. This move, according to the State Party, was the most effective in terms of the available organizational, technical, and budgetary resources, and the management system will gradually be improved. It also reports that the Ministry of Culture agrees with the necessity of forming a special council to review all major construction projects and the proposed planning control mechanisms. The Ministry will appeal to the concerned authorities to form such a joint council.

*e) Ongoing projects, including the Varangian caves*

The State Party reports that a Conservation Program concept was approved by an Order of the Ministry of Culture dated 14 November 2012. The concept states that conservation measures should be carried out in two stages from 2012 to 2015, and involve scientific research, planning and survey work, urgent emergency measures, and engineered drainage networks to ensure preservation of the caves and the historical landscape above them.

*f) A national strategy for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Ukraine*

No progress has been reported on this initiative.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that a moratorium on all high-rise and non-conforming buildings in the buffer zone is under consideration by Kiev City Council, and is supported by the Ministry of Culture. They also note the decision by the State Party to undertake an independent expert assessment of the overall monastic Dnieper river landscape, and request the State Party to complete and submit this assessment on an urgent basis.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recall that the 150 m high-rise building in the buffer zone on Klovisky descent was mentioned in the 2010 reactive monitoring mission report. At that time it was stated that, as this threatened the dominance of the property's silhouette along the river, the Scientific Methodical Council of State Cultural Heritage had passed a resolution to review the project. This building was one of the reasons why the Committee in 2011 requested a moratorium on all high-rise buildings along the Dnieper River until a survey had been undertaken. In 2012 the Committee urged the State Party to take all necessary measures to reduce their adverse effects of tall buildings such as the one on Klovisky descent, by modifying projects and by demolishing constructed levels to an appropriate scale. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that cladding the 150 m tall building in glass cannot be seen as eliminating its adverse impact.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note the continuing progress in the development of an urban development Master Plan for Kiev, and urge the State Party to finalise, approve, and submit it, on an urgent basis. They recommend that the Committee welcome the placement of the World Heritage property under the direct control of a single State authority in order to create a unified system of management. They note however that no unified management plan has been provided, and underscore the need to address this

issue as a matter of urgency. They also take note of the proposal to create a special national council in order to enhance collaboration between all stakeholders concerned.

**Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.88**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.90**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Notes that a moratorium on all high-rise and non-conforming buildings is under consideration by Kiev City Council and supported by the Ministry of Culture and reiterates its request to the State Party to implement such moratorium and to take all necessary measures to reduce their adverse effect by modifying projects and by demolishing constructed levels to an appropriate scale;
4. Also notes the decision by the State Party to undertake an independent expert assessment of the overall monastic Dnieper river landscape as a basis for planning and impact assessment, and requests the State Party to complete and submit the assessment to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**;
5. Expresses its concern that proposals are being considered to clad in glass the 150m building on Klovsky descent rather than modify its height as requested by the Committee at its last session and also requests the State Party to immediately halt its construction and to reduce its adverse effect by demolishing constructed levels to an appropriate scale;
6. Further notes the continuing progress in the development of an urban development Master Plan for Kiev, and urges the State Party to finalise and approve soon as possible;
7. Regrets the apparent lack of progress in defining a protected historic urban area and related conservation master plan for central Kiev, and in developing special Area Plans for the property, its buffer zone, and its setting, and also reiterates its request to the State Party to complete and submit such strengthened protective and planning mechanisms, as a matter of urgency;
8. Welcomes the placement of the World Heritage property under the direct control of a single State authority in order to create a unified system of management but also regrets that no unified management plan has been provided, and also urges the State Party to address this issue as a matter of urgency;
9. Also welcomes the State Party's proposal to create a special national council in order to enhance collaboration between all stakeholders concerned;
10. Further urges the State Party, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to make available detailed information on major restorations projects or new constructions which may affect the attributes that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse;
11. Reminds the State Party, in line with Paragraph 110 of the Operational Guidelines and in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidelines on Heritage Impact Assessments for World

*Heritage cultural properties, that impact assessments for proposed interventions are essential for all World Heritage properties;*

12. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.*

**89. Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1215)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (supplementary information required)

**90. Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 426bis)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of new information)

## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

### 92. Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia, Plurinational State of) (C 567rev)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

### 93. Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1987

Criteria  
(i) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/445/documents/>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 42,000  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/445/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds  
N/A

Previous Monitoring Missions  
November 2001: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS Joint mission; March 2012: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
a) Urban pressure that may affect the original city plan (*Plano Piloto*) that warranted inscription in the World Heritage List;  
b) Lack of a Master Plan.

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/445>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 11 February 2013, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, which provides information on the actions implemented further to Decision **36 COM 7B.97**.

a) *Preservation Plan of the Brasilia Urban Area (Plano de Preservação do Conjunto Urbanístico de Brasília - PPCUB)*

The State Party reports that the measures that guarantee the preservation of the original spirit and characteristics of the *Plano Piloto* designed by Lucio Costa, are currently protected both at the District and Federal levels under the provisions of District Decree GDF no. 10.829/87 and IPHAN Rule no. 314/92. In addition, Institute of National Artistic and Historical heritage (IPHAN) has defined a buffer zone with Ordinance no 68/2012.

The Preservation Plan of the Brasilia Urban Area (PPCUB), defined by the Secretariat for Housing, Property Regularization and Urban Development of the Federal District, was completed in 2012. IPHAN evaluated the Plan and made several recommendations to ensure that the essential elements of the Lucio Costa *Plano Piloto* were preserved. These were partially adopted with the inclusion of guidelines in the Draft Complementary Law (PLC 52/2012) that refers to the current definition of urbanistic scales established by District Decree GDF no. 10.829/87 and IPHAN Rule no. 314/92 and which distinguish between determining, incorporated, and complementary elements. Notwithstanding these modifications, the State Party reports that the sectorization proposed in the PPCUB was not revised and therefore there is limited linkage between the definition of heritage area and the proposed Areas and Units of Preservation (AP and UP).

The PPCUB was approved by the Urban and Territorial Planning Council of the Federal District (CONPLAN) in October 2012 and sent to the related Legislative Body. IPHAN has requested that voting is postponed until revisions can be made, by the first semester of 2013. To that effect, a working group has been formed to revise the text so that adequate provisions be included in the PPCUB to ensure the conservation and protection of the attributes that warranted inscription on the World Heritage List. As underlined by the 2012 reactive monitoring mission, this question is fundamental to ensure avoiding any alterations in zoning and land use that could prove detrimental to the conservation and protection of the characteristics and spirit of the original *Plano Piloto*.

b) *Management system*

The State Party reports that the Ministry of Culture, the Presidency of IPHAN and the Governor of the Federal District have agreed in 2012 on the need for a concept for a normative instrument to regulate the adoption of plans for interventions. As for the proposed management system, PPCUB, the proposal recommends a local management structure that includes consultative measures to ensure participation by different entities and civil society. The proposal aims to ensure to the implementation of the Plan, the integration and articulation of the system with other entities at the District level, to identify areas of shared responsibility, the integration of measures for collective decision-making and the introduction of monitoring measures to reduce infractions. The State Party reports on how the management arrangements would operate through the creation of different bodies and commissions to enhance cooperation and address decision making in regard to heritage conservation and management. IPHAN will continue to analyse the proposal and provide recommendations for review so that an agreement among all parties can be reached by the end of 2013. This will be essential to avoid the duplication of mandates and roles of the different bodies and commissions proposed as well as ensure the adequate composition of commissions in accordance to existing mandates at the legal level and to areas of competence.

The State Party also reports that resources required for the implementation of the PPCUB are included in the Federal District's Multi-year plan, the Budgetary Guidelines and the

Annual Budgetary Law. Additional sources of funding include the Federal District Urban Development Fund which allocates 15% of its budget to the preservation, protection and promotion of the Brasilia Urban Area.

Finally, the report notes that the operational capacity of IPHAN's Federal District Superintendence has been increased with the hiring of additional staff. The increase in institutional capacity is crucial for the implementation of activities pertaining to the identification, protection, conservation and promotion of the property.

c) *Mechanisms for approval of projects at the property*

The State Party reports that there are procedures in place at the local and district level for the approval and implementation of projects at the property. The PPCUB integrates the existing rules and procedures and has also included a "Neighbourhood Impact Study" which requires the evaluation of potential impacts of a project on the preservation of heritage values. In addition, environmental legislation provides for different categories of environmental impact studies. No information is provided about land use planning for the property as requested by the 2012 reactive monitoring mission.

d) *Infrastructure development at the Stadium and its surroundings*

The State Party reports that the Mané Garrincha National Stadium has the objective of promoting the renovation of the Northern Public Recreation Sector through landscape transformation and vehicle and pedestrian access projects. The project reports that significant interventions are needed to effectively integrate the *Plano Piloto's* northern and southern parks, including the creation of access points, parking, link with different transportation modes and construction of an underground connection beneath the Monumental Axis. IPHAN has not received the plans for the interventions surrounding the Stadium. These will be submitted for consideration and review to the World Heritage Centre as soon as they are available for evaluation by the Advisory Bodies.

The State Party also notes that the proposal of the Government of the Federal District for the use and occupation of quadrant 901, which would have resulted in significant alterations of the central sector and impacts on the integrity of the property, has been rejected by IPHAN in 2012.

e) *Regulations to prohibit the construction of new buildings in open spaces and maintenance of characteristics of each urban scale*

The State Party reports that IPHAN Rule no. 314/92, referring to the *non-aedificandi* spaces, is adopted in principle in the PPCUB. However, the report also notes that some of the solutions in the PPCUB proposed to resolve urban problems that have endured in the *Plano Piloto* are in contradiction with the aforementioned IPHAN rule. As part of the review process, it is expected that these conflicts will be addressed through the updated analysis of open spaces and the existing conditions at each urban scale and the precise definitions of policies will be based on the analysis.

f) *Public transportation strategy*

The State Party reports that the Government of the Federal District approved by Law n°4.566 of 2011 the Director Plan for Urban Transportation of the Federal District and its Surroundings (PDTU/DF). It articulates various modes and networks of transportation that prioritize collective and non-motorized means of transit and takes into account the principles set forth in the National Urban Mobility Policy. The programme is structured around six primary collective transportation axes (west, south, southwest, north, east, central area). The report provides details about the service areas to be included and descriptions of the expected infrastructure development, including the potential to operate light rail trails (VLT) on W3 North and South. No additional information is provided on the measures foreseen to avoid further deterioration of the W3 Avenue sector and the alteration in appearance and scale of the attached houses which have been changed from residential use. Furthermore,

no details on the precise location of infrastructure development, on the technical specifications or Heritage Impact Assessments are provided as requested by decisions **35 COM 7B.121** and **36 COM 7B.97** adopted by the World Heritage Committee respectively in 2011 and 2012.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the information provided by the State Party in response to the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee. They recommend that the Committee express its concern that the issues that have been highlighted in previous state of conservation reports and in the 2012 reactive monitoring mission report remain only partially addressed. They also note that the potential way forward to address these conditions depends on the approval of the Preservation Plan of the Brasilia Urban Area (PPCUB) which, as noted in the report, still needs significant revisions in order to ensure that an adequate management system is in place, one that will protect the attributes that embody the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

They wish to draw the Committee's attention to their concern that no technical details or specifications have been submitted regarding potential infrastructure development and that no information was included concerning any Heritage Impact Assessments being carried out.

### **Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.93**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.97**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2012 reactive monitoring mission and notes with concern that the legal, technical and institutional requests were not sufficiently addressed;*
4. *Urges the State Party to:*
  - a) *Finalize the review of the Preservation Plan of the Brasilia Urban Area (PPCUB) and ensure that adequate provisions are included to conserve and protect the attributes of the World Heritage property,*
  - b) *Ensure that adequate regulations exist for the use of open spaces defined by the Plano in the review of the Preservation Plan of the Brasilia Urban Area (PPCUB),*
  - c) *Formally establish and put in place the proposed Management Structure;*
5. *Reiterates its requests to the State Party to submit, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to the World Heritage Centre the proposals for infrastructure development at the Stadium and its surroundings, as well as those related to the Public Transportation Strategy, for review by the Advisory Bodies, prior to making commitments of approval or construction;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.*

## 94. Churches of Chiloé (Chile) (C 971)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2000

Criteria  
(ii) (iii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/971/documents/>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 50,000  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/971/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
N/A

Illustrative material  
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/971>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

In February 2012, information was received by the World Heritage Centre on the construction of a shopping mall, in the vicinity of the Castro Church, a component part of the inscribed serial property. In conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, technical information was requested from the State Party on 8 March 2012. The State Party submitted the requested information on 12 February 2013. This information includes a Technical Report on the shopping mall, as well as copies of the legal instruments mentioned in the report and twenty-five blueprints of floor plans and sections of the shopping mall building.

Furthermore, the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) has been finalized by the State Party.

#### a) *Project background*

The State Party reports on the municipal regulation applicable to the church setting. The town of Castro has a communal regulatory plan that includes a zoning plan. The area where the Castro shopping mall is located corresponds to the central zone of Castro. Existing regulations only allow a maximum construction height of 10 meters. The communal plan does not include provisions for protecting the character of the city, its urban heritage and setting.

The Technical Report provides a description of the background of the construction project and the legal course of actions for its approval. The construction permit for the shopping mall was granted in April 2008. The project involves the construction of five story building over an

area of 24,137 square meters and 149 parking spaces. In November 2011, the construction company was fined by the Municipality for constructing in the adjacent lots without a permit. In February 2012, suspension of works was requested by the Municipality because construction exceeded the authorised surface and modifications had been made with respect to the limitations of the permit initially granted. In spite of this request, works continued and further fines were imposed for not suspending works. In April 2012, the Municipality of Castro and the owner of the shopping mall signed a Transaction Contract to end illegal processes and to regularise the construction permits.

b) *Project evaluation*

The construction process was evaluated by the General Comptroller of the Republic, at its Ruling No. 61211 on 3 October 2012, which ascertained the legal flaws and irregularities, particularly in the Transaction Contract. There is no indication as to when a final permit might be issued that would regularise all works already constructed, and would approve new ones for the parking areas, in a single project.

The National Monuments Council has expressed a negative opinion on the initiative of the Municipality of Castro for building underground parking lots, and has requested official information on this matter, for submission to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. However, the National Monuments Council has limited mandates in regard to development and new construction outside the areas legally recognised as heritage, consequently the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property cannot be ensured.

The size, scale and location (on the limits of a natural plateau at the peninsula) of the shopping mall make it a dominant element of the landscape of Castro, particularly in light of the characteristics of its traditional constructions and the scale of the setting. From the sea, the new mall is a prevailing element of the Castro skyline, competing transversally against the inscribed component part, with the dominant silhouettes of the towers of the Church of Castro, and with the traditional setting.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the buffer zones of the component parts of property are limited to encompass only the adjacent square areas or plazas. In addition, there are no legal provisions or regulatory measures in place to ensure the protection of the buffer zone and the setting of each of the inscribed components. It should also be noted that there are no legal provisions requiring environmental or heritage impact assessments for these types of constructions.

Moreover, the limited mandate of the National Monuments Council is insufficient to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in respect to developments within the setting of the property. This lack of protection is reflected in the process that led to the approval of the construction of the shopping mall at Castro, which has a significant negative impact on the visual characteristics of the component part of the inscribed property and its context.

**Draft Decision:            37 COM 7B.94**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37COM/7B,*
2. *Takes note of the comprehensive information submitted by the State Party but regrets that the information was submitted almost a year after having been requested;*

3. Deeply regrets that the shopping mall was constructed, given its negative impact on the setting and skyline of Castro;
4. Requests the State Party to invite, as soon as possible, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to address the following elements:
  - a) The definition of the characteristics of the wider setting for all component parts, in relation to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and put in place appropriate protection, including the review of the buffer zones and regulatory measures for the protection of the setting of the Churches of Chiloe,
  - b) The review of the current protection and management arrangements for the property and the required measures to improve the legal framework and permit granting processes between types of preservation and institutional competences,
  - c) The update and enforcement of legislative and regulatory measures to ensure that the defined characteristics of the wider setting are adequately protected and that new development takes into account the visual relations between the inscribed property and its setting,
  - d) The measures to mitigate the visual impact of the Castro shopping mall on the component part, including the consideration to partially demolish the upper stories so that the building does not exceed the 10 meter height indicated in the existing regulations as well as other measures to improve the facades to better integrate it with the existing setting;
5. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.

## 95. Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso (Chile) (C 959rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
2003

Criteria  
(iii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions  
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/959/documents/>

International Assistance  
Total amount granted: USD 140,688  
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/959/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds  
N/A

Previous monitoring missions  
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports  
N/A

*Illustrative material*

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/959>  
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

*Current conservation issues*

On 31 January 2012, the World Heritage Centre received a letter signed by 24 local institutions (academic, civil society and trade unions) and 1000 citizens of Valparaiso against the interventions planned at the port, such as the Barón Port and the Prat Dock, as well as for touristic facilities and real estate projects. The World Heritage Centre requested from the State Party information on the intended interventions and, when submitted, ICOMOS provided an evaluation and subsequently requested additional information that was provided by the State Party. In November 2012, the private enterprise Mall Plaza requested an interview to present the project of Puerto Barón and the meeting was attended by representatives of the Permanent Delegation of Chile to UNESCO and staff from the World Heritage Centre.

The National Monuments Council, on the occasion of the final meeting of the Periodic Reporting in Latin America and Caribbean Region, convened a one-day working session on 6 December 2012 between national authorities, civil society associations, private sector, representatives from the Cabinet of the President of Chile, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. As agreed at the meeting, additional information was requested on the updated Management Plan, as well as the entire technical project of the intervention in the port area.

The World Heritage Centre has received letters from public institutions, such as the Official College of Architects of Valparaiso, academic institutions and civil society associations which express their concern on the transformation of the port area.

The State Party submitted a report on 12 March 2013 including information on four main concerns related to the conservation of the property. More specifically, the Plan for the Management of Urban Heritage in Valparaiso Phase II, the Management Plan for the Seaport of Valparaiso finalized by the Valparaiso Port Enterprise, a comprehensive cartography with the settings, zoning and interventions planned within the property and its buffer zone. Additionally, comprehensive documentation on the *Puerto Barón* project was provided. In parallel, the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been approved by the State Party. The file was completed by the *Plan Comunal Regulador* and information on the transportation system. On 14 March 2013 the World Heritage Centre, after discussion with ICOMOS, sent an official letter to communicate that a state of conservation report should be presented to the World Heritage Committee.

The report reveals the difficulties in articulating protective regulations and their related responsible national agencies and Ministries so as to provide the property with proper instruments to manage the preservation of the city and its port as a whole.

a) *Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

According to the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the Seaport of Valparaiso is considered the leading commercial port on the sea routes of the Pacific coast of South America over the last two centuries. Its role as a port, and the setting of the city's amphitheatre-like shape, constitute two important pillars that articulate the values of the property. In terms of integrity the city has preserved, over the last two centuries, all the attributes that convey its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). Its values have been maintained in spite of the constant challenges inherent to a living port city relating to the transformation of its fabric, its functions, the renewal of industrial uses and the scale and nature of the contemporary utilization of the port. In terms of authenticity, the property has largely retained the key features of its heyday in the late 19th and early 20th centuries,

including its urban elements, its architecture, its transportation systems and parts of its port infrastructure.

However at the time of inscription in 2003, no comprehensive conservation management plan was submitted. The need for such a plan, to reconcile the current planning with the property's national monument status, was raised when the site was inscribed on the World Heritage List as along with the need to address urban planning regulations on the port's heritage, some of which is in the buffer zone of the property. According to the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, the 23.2 ha property and much of its 44.5 ha buffer zone was designated as a National Monument, and therefore overseen by the National Monuments Council of Chile. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Development also supervises the entire area by virtue of the Historic Preservation Zone. The area extends beyond the boundaries of both the property and the buffer zone, and is predominantly commercial in character and marked by the presence of the Port.

b) *The implementation of the Master Plan for Heritage Management of the World Heritage property of Valparaiso*

The State Party has submitted the final comprehensive version of the Management Plan for the World Heritage of Valparaiso, defining the monitoring system, the institutional framework and the financing strategy. One of the specific aims of the Management Plan is to develop, comprehensively and sustainably, the urban heritage conservation strategy by focusing on the quality and use of public spaces, the visual quality and the protection of green areas. The Management Plan also focuses the participatory nature of the management system for the property and includes a comparative analysis on urban management with several historic cities inscribed on the World Heritage List. Information on technical and financial indicators for future projects approval, policies on rehabilitation and urban transportation, carrying capacity studies related to commercial or housing developments and educational programmes are also included in the Plan. Moreover, specific technical and graphic information has been provided on the methodology used to assess the visual quality of the Plaza Aníbal Pinto, which could be taken as a reference for urban studies on visual quality requested by the World Heritage Committee.

c) *A Master plan for the Seaport of Valparaiso and its related physical and functioning transformations*

As for the management of the Seaport of Valparaiso, the State Party submitted the Management Plan proposal developed by the Port enterprise of Valparaiso. Since May 2012 the proposal has undergone adjustments and has been approved by the Ministry of Transports and Communications. The transformation includes two main areas, Terminal 1 and Terminal 2 and the North Sector of San Antonio. The document insists on the necessity for the Seaport of Valparaiso to face an increased commercial demand according to the industrial development of Chile as well as the needs for an increased scale of commercial and touristic areas in a context of increasing commercial and touristic activity in the Pacific.

The Management Plan reports on the works on the South Access as well as a list of projects of additional infrastructure works for the next five years. Works have already begun in the ZEAL (Zone for Extension and Logistic Supply), and additional capacity for loading and container storage is planned to be constructed on the docks, and especially in the Costanera area. The Management Plan also foresees the need for planning works for additional capacity in Yolanda and San Mateo areas before 2031. Additional access is being planned in the North Sector to deal with the developments and transformations foreseen in the Yolanda area. The Management Plan furthermore contains a brief assessment of the environmental impact of the Seaport, based on the existing national legal framework for the protection of the environment, with potential mitigation measures.

d) *The Barón Port project*

The State Party submitted legal, technical and graphic information on the project for redesigning the Barón Port area for public leisure and commercial use. The project was authorized by the Ministry of Housing and Urbanism on 18 January 2013 and by the City Council of Valparaiso on 14 February 2013. By municipal ordinance of 15 June 2009, the City Council amended the Municipal Regulatory Plan for Borde Costero area, Sector Zones A1-A3 and B1, Barón Dock, fixing maximum building height at 10.8 meters, which is equivalent to a 20% increase from the precedent maximum building height.

The current *Puerto Barón* project consists of the construction of the Mall Plaza Barón, which has a surface area of 132,808.30 m<sup>2</sup>, distributed over four floors and two basements. The project also includes the redesigning of Bodega Simon Bolivar, a nationally classified historic building, for commercial use. The Controlaria General de la Republica has concluded that the Bodega Simon Bolivar project does not need to pass any national environmental impact control prior to its approval and implementation. Furthermore, the Barón Port project includes a new seafront promenade for leisure and commercial use, over a total surface area of 71,512 m<sup>2</sup>, at Barón Dock. The architectural project presented by the private initiative insists on the visual and landscape interest of the project, which includes watch towers, promenades and public green spaces and spaces to practice nautical and maritime activities.

The State Party has also submitted information on mitigation measures, including local redesigning of access for vehicles and pedestrians, as well as an evaluation on risk and prevention for tsunamis and evacuation.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recognise the significant effort made by the State Party, in particular the Municipality of Valparaiso, to put forward the Master Plan for Heritage Management of the World Heritage property of Valparaiso, Phase II. They would like to underline the methodology put forth on the visual quality of the historic centre and consider this approach suitable for adaptation to urban heritage studies.

While the comprehensive information confirms the commitment of the State Party to find the best solution for interventions at the port area, the fragmentation of competencies and mandates by sectors and by different levels of government, as well as by the different types of specific protection and use of different areas, does not currently allow for the management of the property with respect to its Outstanding Universal Value and within a broader perspective to include a territorial framework and all of the impacts that the transformation of the area could generate. Moreover given the scale and character of the transformation of the port area, of its seafront and its related areas, it needs to be subject to Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) in accordance to ICOMOS guidelines.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee requests a reactive monitoring mission be carried out to meet with all the stakeholders and national authorities and make specific recommendations on the planned interventions as well as legal, technical and institutional measures to be taken to ensure the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the port-city of Valparaiso. They also recommend that the Committee request the State Party to halt any concession or approval of the foreseen interventions in the port area and seafront until the World Heritage Committee has evaluated the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission.

Finally, it is recommended that the terms of reference for the reactive monitoring mission include an evaluation of the overlapping of institutional mandates and of the diversity of protective types, as well as an assessment of social, economic and heritage impacts of the new proposals concerning physical connectivity. A risk assessment, with a particular focus on environmental risks, should be carried out as well. The reactive monitoring mission should also assess the impacts of touristic cruises activity, of the transformation of the traditional fishing sector, taking particular attention to evaluate the significance of underwater

archaeology. Moreover, the mission should also address the question of the balance between heritage and development, including the feasibility of spaces for social dialogue and institutional platforms for properly implementing the regulation.

**Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.95**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Takes note of the coordinating meeting organized by the National Monuments Council on 6 December 2012 with stakeholders and also notes the efforts made by national and municipal authorities to submit the plans and comprehensive technical documentation;
3. Further notes the active role of the civil society in the preservation of the values of the seaport city of Valparaiso and its contribution to create a social dialogue for the conservation of the property;
4. Notes with concern the complexity of the legal procedures for interventions, as well as the lack of clarity in the distribution of responsibilities between national and local authorities and the Ministries and National agencies involved in the preservation and development of the city;
5. Urges the State Party to undertake as soon as possible a Heritage Impact Assessment to consider the impact of all the related planned projects on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidelines on the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments as a basis for discussion for the proposed mission;
6. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to assess the current state of conservation and overall management and protection of the property and the potential impacts of the different on-going projects on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
7. Also requests the State Party to halt interventions in Puerto Barón and the Seaport area, until the recommendations of the mission are examined by the World Heritage Committee;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.

**96. Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526)**

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List  
1990

Criteria  
(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/526/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 82,207

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/526/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

August 2001: ICOMOS monitoring mission; December 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Undefined and unregulated buffer zone leading to urban development pressure and inadequate control of land use;
- b) Pressures derived from tourism;
- c) Inadequate and inefficient management and conservation arrangements (including legislation, regulatory measures, technical capacity for conservation and service infrastructure);
- d) Lack of interpretation and presentation of the property;
- e) Natural vulnerability to earthquakes and hurricanes;
- f) Deterioration of historic structures derived from natural and social factors (including environmental pollution and lack of sensitisation of local residents);
- g) SANSOUCI Urban development project.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/526>

and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

As requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 1 February 2013.

a) *Sansouci project*

The State Party reports that, in consideration of the recommendations made by the 2009 reactive monitoring mission and by the technical review of the project proposal, the Ministry of Culture has undertaken an assessment of the view shed from the Colonial City to the area of proposed development for the Sansouci project. The assessment will allow evaluating clearly the potential impact on the inscribed property. The report includes simulations of the four analysed view sheds. In these simulations, the potential impact from the project proposal for development on the existing view sheds between the Colonial City and the Ozama River and its left bank are evidenced.

b) *Definition of height regulations and buffer zone for Santo Domingo East*

The State Party reports that the Ministry of Culture has requested the Municipality of Santo Domingo East about the progress made in the definition of the buffer zone for the east of the Colonial City. Documentation was received by the World Heritage Centre in July 2012 and included a topographic survey, the existing land use and construction heights at the predetermined and neighbouring zones. No information is provided on whether regulations have been formulated and adopted for the area or a timeframe for completing the establishment of the buffer zone at this sector. The State Party also reports that until 2012, no project that could have a negative visual impact on the Colonial City has been implemented at the Santo Domingo East area.

c) *New Law for the protection, safeguarding and development of cultural heritage and regulations for archaeological investigations*

The State Party reports that in April 2012, the draft Law for the protection, safeguarding and development of cultural heritage was submitted to the Office of the Legal Council of the Executive Power. Comments are still pending given the change of governmental administration in August 2012. In regard to the regulations for archaeological investigations, the Office of the Legal Council of the Executive Power recommended the revision, prior to the approval, of Law 41-00, which set up the Ministry of Culture according to the new provisions of the Constitution of the Republic, proclaimed in January 2010. No timeframe for when the new law and the regulations might be passed for enforcement has been provided.

d) *Strategic Plan for the Integral Revitalization of the Colonial City of Santo Domingo*

The State Party reports that in June 2012, the Tourism Ministry started the implementation of the Programme for the promotion of tourism at the Colonial City, which is based on the Strategic Plan for the Integral Revitalization of the Colonial City. The programme, financed by a loan from the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), has a USD 30 million budget and will cover three main components: development of the touristic offer, the integration of the local population in the development of tourism and the strengthening of tourism management. A consultant has been contracted for the project design for the holistic renovation of the most emblematic streets of the Colonial City. No additional information is provided on whether the Strategic Plan has been formally approved or whether additional resources have been secured for its sustained implementation.

e) *Management of the property*

The review of regulations regarding the Steering Committee for the Colonial City of Santo Domingo by the new national authorities is pending. No timeframe for when the management entity is expected to be fully operational has been provided.

The State Party has included Ordinance 03-2011 adopted by the Municipality of the National District on 23 May 2011 which approves the zoning regulations for land use and for interventions at the Colonial City. The ordinance also includes the definition of the buffer zone in its jurisdiction. Additional Ordinances by the same municipality concern management of solid waste and circulation of heavy weight vehicles at the Colonial City.

f) *Other issues*

The State Party also reports on additional projects that have been implemented. These include the renovation of infrastructure for water supply, sewage and drainage for rain water at the Santa Barbara quarter. Work on streets and public spaces at the same quarter are also foreseen for 2013. The pilot plan ReViMe has also started in coordination with the cities of Habana and Port au Prince to raise awareness on the issue of recycling for historic cities. The construction of a vertical garden in El Conde Street and the first edition of Santo Domingo Colonial Fest in October 2012 were also mentioned in the report.

The State Party reports also on the project of a subway line through the Colonial City. Soil analysis was carried out in July 2012 to assess the feasibility of constructing Line 3 of the Santo Domingo subway, which would have an extension of 3.2 km. If constructed, stations are foreseen at three locations at the Colonial City: Parque Independencia, Parque Colon (nearby the cathedral) and at Plaza de España, nearby the Alcazar de Colon. The State Party indicates that the project is currently under study and only the potential route was included in the report.

### Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the visual relationship between the Colonial City, the Ozama River and its left bank and the sea is an essential component of the property. If the Sansouci development were to occur at the proposed area, alternative

designs would be needed that take into account the results from the visual studies carried out as well as the existing scale of the property.

They also consider that the approval of Municipal Ordinances to regulate zoning and land use is a crucial step in ensuring the conservation and protection of the property. They would recommend that the Committee reiterate the importance of having an operational management system in place to ensure consistent decision-making, avoid duplication of mandates and enhance synergies between the different agencies currently implementing projects.

**Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.96**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.123**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the State Party on the actions carried out in response to the decisions made by the World Heritage Committee and urges the State Party to continue its work, with particular attention to:*
  - a) *Formal establishment of the buffer zone at Santo Domingo East and approval of regulations for construction heights,*
  - b) *Approval and implementation of the Strategic Plan for the Integral Revitalization of the Colonial City of Santo Domingo,*
  - c) *Approval of regulations for the Steering Committee to ensure that the management system becomes fully operational,*
  - d) *Finalization of the approval process for the new law for the protection, safeguarding and development of cultural heritage and the regulations for archaeological investigation;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to submit, according to paragraphs 163-165 of the Operational Guidelines, the designated buffer zone as a minor boundary modification to allow a clear understanding for the protection of the visually sensitive areas around the property;*
5. *Notes with concern the results of the view shed studies for the proposed Sansouci development at the left bank of the Ozama River and reiterates its request to develop alternative designs which take into account the attributes and scale of the inscribed property;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit, to the World Heritage Centre the project proposal, technical specifications and heritage impact assessment for the potential subway line and associated infrastructure, for review by the Advisory Bodies prior to making commitments to its construction, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.*

## 97. City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1978

### Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/2/documents/>

### International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 384,800

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/2/assistance/>

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

March 2009: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Development pressures which impact the authenticity of the site;
- b) Weaknesses in the decision-making process regarding conservation;
- c) Works in the Tower of the Complex of the Society of Jesus

### Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/2>

and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report includes comprehensive information about the current conditions at the property and the measures being implemented. It also includes a report about the proposed project for the Quito subway as well as current proposals for interventions at the architectural ensemble of the Society of Jesus.

#### a) *Management of the property*

The State Party indicates that provisions for the management of the property are inserted in the planning processes of the Municipality of the Metropolitan District of Quito. The Municipality has in place, since 1988, a comprehensive planning system to respond to urban, socioeconomic, environmental and natural factors under three basic principles: democratization, decentralization and participation. The territory is divided into eight metropolitan zones; the Historic Centre of Quito falls under the Administration Zone Centre "Manuela Saenz" which is the operating and implementing body of the local government. In practice, it is responsible for the maintenance and development of public spaces and buildings, for the preservation of the environment, the promotion of sustainable development and for ensuring public participation, which are in turn supervised by different thematic offices at the municipal level (for example, the culture secretariat, the social inclusion secretariat, etc). The Metropolitan Institute of Cultural Heritage, a special unit added to the organic structure of the Municipality, plays a significant role as a technical unit with administrative and financial autonomy. This entity has the competencies and specific mandates in terms of restoration, conservation and protection of historic, artistic and religious cultural properties at the Metropolitan District of Quito. The National Institute for Cultural Heritage (INPC) maintains a supervisory role, as mandated by national level legislation.

The management arrangements in place consider a territorial model, with concrete mechanisms to ensure citizens' participation. The Special Plan for the Historic Centre of Quito, published in 2003, continues to be the principal management framework to guide decision-making at the historic centre. Additional planning tools include the land use plan, the development plan for the district territory and the comprehensive programs for intervention. In addition to this, in 2012, the Municipality of the Metropolitan District of Quito, the Coordinating Ministry of Heritage and the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development developed a framework for interagency cooperation which seeks the holistic revitalization of the historic Centre. Work has subsequently been undertaken to identify appropriate management mechanisms and the implementation of the action plan that would entail significant interventions at the Historic Centre.

The State Party notes the different funding sources that exist today. It also notes that with the management model, alternatives for financing have been explored not only at the institutional level but with respect to the creation of alliances with the private sector, leading to the adoption of an associative public-private model.

b) *Interventions at the property*

Throughout the years, conservation and rehabilitation works have been implemented at the different historic buildings. With the recently created interagency alliance, and consequently the streamlining of resources, it is expected that investments will be made. The Programme for the Revitalization of the Historic Centre of Quito is also intended to strengthen interventions at the property, incorporated within the dimensions of social and economic development. It identifies five main areas for interventions in which actions geared toward the following will be implemented: public space and equipment; housing; mobility, public safety; communication and promotion; culture, heritage and education; social management; economic sustainability, private investment and tourism. The State Party has provided a chart for investments for 2013 which include projects for interventions at several sectors that include heritage buildings.

In addition, the Metropolitan Development Plan 2012-2020 has also been developed which includes provisions for the protection of cultural heritage, public spaces, social housing, among others. Among the actions foreseen, the painting of facades, the improvement of sidewalks, street lighting, waste management, restoration of heritage buildings for social housing, are mentioned. It is also noted that the Metropolitan Heritage Institute has updated the inventory of heritage buildings and their state of conservation, which will be used as the basis for the identification of priority interventions.

c) *Quito subway project*

A comprehensive report on the Quito Subway at the Historic Centre was annexed to the state of conservation report submitted by the State Party. It provides details on the proposal for the first line to be constructed, particularly on the aspects that pertain to the inscribed property. The foreseen duration of the project is 3 years and the estimated cost is 1,386 million dollars. Feasibility, engineering and archaeological surveys have already been carried out to assist in the decision making for the definition of potential routes. As it stands, the proposed route does not pass below heritage buildings and, given the depth, it does not affect monuments or other public and urban spaces. In the provided documentation, specifications for mitigation measures before, during and after construction have been identified as part of the studies. There will be one metro station to service the historic centre and several alternatives for its proposed location were explored. Given the results derived from the studies, only 2 choices were considered as viable options: one to be located at Plaza de San Francisco or another to be at the Plaza del Teatro. However, the subsequent sections only focus on the analysis of Plaza de San Francisco and no clear explanation is provided on why the second option was not analysed in depth. The study concludes that the works to be carried out for the construction of Line 1 of the Quito Subway would not have impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. The proposed designs

and mitigation and management measures take into account the attributes of the property and its conditions of authenticity and integrity. Nevertheless, the potential impacts associated to the option for a station at Plaza del Teatro, instead of Plaza de San Francisco was not considered. Given the particular characteristics of the latter, its role as an emblematic part of the World Heritage property, and the anticipated flow of 24,000 people per day, it would be important to consider the location at Plaza del Teatro as a main option.

d) *Project proposals for the architectural ensemble of the Society of Jesus*

The State Party also submitted technical information for two project proposals for the architectural ensemble of the Society of Jesus. The first of these is for the rehabilitation of space to be used as a hotel. The technical information submitted includes an updated assessment of the current conservation conditions and the interventions that are foreseen at all levels, from actions to address structural conditions to those related to the existing decorated surfaces and carpentry works. For the construction of the hotel, two sublevels would need to be added under the south patio for the infrastructure needed for the hotel operation. Significant structural modifications and adaptations, within the northern portion of the ensemble, are foreseen to create a third level by breaking up the heights of the second level. The proposal also notes the creation of a Jesuit Cultural Centre that will integrate the Church of the Society of Jesus, the bell tower and the Chapels of St. Joseph, of the Miracles and of the Knights, all of them significant architectural and religious components of the ensemble.

The second project proposal pertains to the volumetric and formal recovery of the bell tower. With the interventions, it is also proposed that the bell tower would be used for tourism purposes, serving as an observation tower for the historic centre. Therefore, the project proposal still considers the incorporation of an elevator. For the project, a preliminary assessment has been carried out of the conditions at the property and of the history of the bell tower. The current proposal entails the conservation of the existing remains plus the construction of additional 7 meters to finish the top of the tower.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the cooperation between the major institutions and the definition of the revitalization programme. However, they recommend that the Committee express its concern about some of the activities proposed that include demolition and new construction. They consider it is essential that the State Party provides further details on the precise location of the areas and on the scope of the activities foreseen so that adequate guidance can be provided. They also consider that additional information should be presented on whether all planning tools developed to date will be integrated into a single management plan for the property, in particular, a comprehensive conservation plan.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the technical information provided for both projects foreseen for the architectural ensemble of the Society of Jesus. However, no specific heritage impact assessments were included which are particularly relevant in light of the extensive interventions foreseen for the rehabilitation of architectural spaces of the hotel. These studies are necessary for informed decision-making and to ascertain what the adequate course of action would be for each sector and phase of the project. They also note that the project for the bell tower has reduced the proposal for construction of additional floors and would now only include the finish for the top of the tower. This would be more appropriate in terms of the existing skyline of the historic centre. They however would mention that an elevator is still foreseen and that no technical specifications for security measures have been included.

**Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.97**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.124**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2010),
3. Takes notes of the information provided by the State Party on the actions implemented in terms of enhancing the conservation and management of the property;
4. Recommends that the State Party consider the implementation of the following measures:
  - a) *Integration of all existing planning tools into a management plan, with a clear management structure,*
  - b) *Development of a single comprehensive conservation plan, with details on costs and timeframes for implementation at different heritage sectors, on the established guidelines and criteria for interventions on the anticipated changes in use,*
  - c) *Development of a Heritage Impact Assessment concerning the option of a metro station at Plaza del Teatro and submission of the study to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, before a final decision is made on the location of the subway station to serve the Historic Centre,*
  - d) *Development of a heritage impact assessment, in accordance with ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties, for the proposed interventions at the architectural ensemble of the Compañía de Jesús;*
5. Also recommends that the State Party invite an ICOMOS advisory mission to evaluate the state of conservation of the property and the alternatives for location of the metro station and its related infrastructure and provide guidance on the development of the conservation plan and the integration of the planning tools;
6. Urges the State Party to halt any process of approval or interventions on the subway station for the historic centre until an advisory mission is carried out and the World Heritage Committee examines its recommendation;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

## 99. Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

### Criteria

(iv) (vi)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/129/documents/>

### International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 226, 513

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/129/assistance/>

### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

### Previous monitoring missions

2003: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; 2005: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; November 2011: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) The foreseen construction of an airport in the vicinity of the World Heritage property in a national protected area;
- b) Deterioration of construction materials due to natural decay phenomena;
- c) Risk of structural failure of archaeological complexes resulting from tunnels excavated for archaeological purposes;
- d) Deterioration derived from uncontrolled visitation and potential to exceed carrying capacity at specific time periods;
- e) Legal issues concerning the ownership of the land in the property and its buffer zone and the delimitation of the property and its buffer zone.

### Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/129> and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

A report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted on 31 January 2013. The report also includes several annexes related to the visitor carrying capacity study for the property and several reports that had already been submitted in previous state of conservation reports pertaining to Rio Amarillo archaeological site, the hieroglyphic stairway, etc.

The State Party submitted a draft proposal for minor modification of the boundaries of the property and the World Heritage Centre informed the State Party of the complete requirements and related required cartography. The final proposal has not been submitted yet.

#### a) *Construction of the Rio Amarillo Aerodrome*

The State Party reports that the Environmental Impact Assessment for the project that was developed by ASP Consultants, and included a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), was considered satisfactory and has been accepted by the national authorities. It is not clear from the information provided if this study was updated as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) and if the HIA considered the guidance developed by ICOMOS for such assessments. The State Party indicates that the operation license for the project has been granted and that the contract between the

Honduran Institute of Tourism and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment for the implementation of environmental impact mitigation measures has been signed. It also reports that provisions of the Management and Public Use Plan for the Rio Amarillo Archaeological Park include mitigation measures for archaeological components which compensate the development in the area. Concerning the updating of the Management and Public Use Plan of the Archaeological zone of Copan to respond to potential impacts derived from the construction of the aerodrome, the visitor carrying capacity study was carried out. The preliminary report including an assessment of the existing management system and current public use issues as well as the potential methodology to be used to assess carrying capacity, was provided in the annexes. The study will be completed by 2014.

b) *Conservation strategy for the tunnels and conservation guidelines for interventions*

The State Party considers that the overall strategy for the tunnels and the preservation guidelines are based on the permanent monitoring implemented by staff at the property. Results of this monitoring have been used as the basis for decision-making. The report also notes interventions that have already been implemented, such as exchanging yellow lights for white ones in order to promote conditions that discourage decay of the property. Waterproofing the surface of the Acropolis is also foreseen to mitigate water filtration and prevent the risk of collapse from saturation.

c) *Management Plan*

The State Party reports that a contract was signed in October 2012 for the development of a Public Use Plan in addition to the review and update of the Management Plan. It is expected that the conservation strategy for the tunnels and preservation guidelines for interventions, as well as the definition of zones with appropriate regulatory measures, will be developed in the context of this process. It is also noted that once the Public Use Plan and Management Plan are completed, they will be integrated with planning tools at the territorial level, in conjunction with regional development strategies

The plan should be completed by 2013. However, as noted before, the carrying capacity study will be finalised in 2014, therefore it is unclear how these results will be integrated in the provisions for the Public Use Plan.

d) *Protective shelter for the Hieroglyphic Stairway*

The State Party reports that the analysis from the "sails" design prototype is on-going and that final report will be made available in mid-2014. No plans have been made yet to replace the existing protective shelter.

e) *Other issues*

The State Party also reports that extensive repairs are needed for the Visitor Centre which will involve the creation and implementation of an area for cultural interpretation. Other actions will include the improvement of trails, holding awareness raising workshops, training of guides and the implementation of the interpretation plan.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the actions being implemented at the property and the decision made by the State Party to proceed with the construction of the Aerodrome at Rio Amarillo. Given the significant issues that are expected to be addressed through the review and updating of the management plan, they recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to complete the updating process in a timely manner.

**Draft Decision:      37 COM 7B.99**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.100**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012),
3. Takes note of the information provided concerning the actions being implemented for the conservation of the property, and the decision made by the State Party to proceed with the construction of the aerodrome at Rio Amarillo and requests the State Party to ensure that the construction of the runway be limited to 1200 meters in order to avoid any possible impacts on the Archaeological site of Piedras Negras;
4. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review the complete cartographic information for the buffer zone of the property in the framework of the Retrospective Inventory;
5. Reiterates its request to the State Party to update the Environmental Impact Assessment and carry out a Heritage Impact Assessment in conformity with ICOMOS guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties;
6. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies by **May 2014** three printed copies in addition to an electronic copy of the updated Management Plan for the property, which should include:
  - a) Zoning and regulatory measures for the different use zones, and measures taken for a coherent territorial planning, accompanied by adequate cartographic material,
  - b) Public use provisions based on the results from the carrying capacity study, including detailed information on appropriate measures to ensure that no impacts occur as a result of the increased touristic visitation,
  - c) Guidelines for conservation and restoration interventions, in particular concerning tunnels, as well as an action plan that includes a monitoring system for their conservation and maintenance,
  - d) Final prototype of the protective shelter for the Hieroglyphic Stairs for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
7. Requests furthermore that the State Party submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, 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 39th session in 2015.

**100. Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of additional information)

## 101. Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)

### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2000

### Criteria

(i) (iv)

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

N/A

### Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1016/documents/>

### International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 75,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1016/assistance/>

### UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

### Previous Monitoring Missions

February 2000: ICOMOS Expert Mission; April/May 2008: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

### Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a Disaster Preparedness Plan;
- b) Planned and ongoing development projects which impact the Historic Centre, such as the planned construction of the Chilina Bridge;
- c) Illegal demolitions involving historic buildings;
- d) Urban sprawl.

### Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1016> and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

### Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property that includes information on the progress made on the recommendations formulated by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012).

#### a) *Risk Preparedness plan for the property*

The State Party notes that approximately 80% of the Prevention and Risk Management Plan has been developed at the time when the report was submitted. The draft included in the annexes considers the general assessment of conditions at the territory, as well as hazards, vulnerability and a risk assessment that includes both human and natural factors. Risk scenarios have also been developed in order to prioritise actions to be undertaken in case of disaster risk. Information from the assessments and potential courses of action has been validated through the implementation of technical workshops. The proposed plan is related to the National System for the Management of Risk Disasters (SINAGERD), created on 19 February 2011, and it is expected that the final provisions will be articulated with the new Master Plan for the Historical Centre. The State Party reports that 80% of the activities have been conducted and it expects to conclude the Prevention and Risk Management Plan in March 2013.

#### b) *Delimitation of the property and definition of the buffer zone*

The State Party notes that Ordinance 01-2000 "Ordinance for the Historic Centre and the Area of Monuments of Arequipa" defines the perimeter for the Historical Centre and the Area of Monuments. However, it recognises that the boundaries need to be redefined and a buffer

zone clearly outlined so that areas of protection are clearly established and there is clarity in terms of regulations currently applicable, given the different denominations that currently exist for the protected area. It is expected this review will also assist in the definition of zoning and land use within the historic centre to better manage potential growth and development. The revised boundaries will also include elements of the setting, as recommended by the World Heritage Committee, that are crucial to sustaining the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. The area of Monuments of Yanahuara has already been gazetted through Supreme Resolution 2900-72-ED as a portion of the Historic Centre. The revised maps, along with the pertinent regulatory measures to ensure protection, have yet to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies. No further information is provided on whether the proposals made to date have been formally approved.

c) *Updating of the Master Plan for the property*

A new Master Plan for the property is currently being developed. Progress achieved to date includes the updated assessment, the proposed new boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, the proposal for zoning and use, the definition of parameters for intervention, proposal for new treatment of areas, proposal for new usage index and the completion Schedule. The general information presented in the draft document included in the annex seems appropriate and responsive to the existing conditions, particularly in terms of zoning and the definition of projects. No timeframe for the expected completion date has been provided.

d) *Chilina Bridge*

The State Party submitted, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, the technical evaluation of the Project for the construction of the interconnection trunk road between the districts of Miraflores, Alto Selva Alegre, Yanahuara, Cayama and Cerro Colorado. As has been noted in previous state of conservation reports, the Project approved by the Regional Government of Arequipa through Regional Management Resolution in 2009 encompasses 11 components. Concerns have been raised regarding the potential impact from the Chilina Bridge and the components pertaining to connection roads that could affect the setting of the property. The submitted technical evaluation focuses on the Chilina bridge and concludes, in general terms that the construction of the bridge will not significantly address traffic problems and will have a negative impact on the landscape of the property. The documentation reviewed in 2012 did not include an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and that the photo montages did not consider the potential bridge in relation to view sheds from the protected area. Therefore, a comprehensive and informed analysis of the potential impact could not be carried out. Requests for this pending information were made in January 2013 and will be made available to the Advisory Bodies for review upon receipt.

As for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the complete Interconnection Trunk Road, the State Party reports that these have been requested for development on December 2012. Once the Provincial Municipality of Arequipa categorizes the type of studies that should be executed for the missing section of the Interconnection Trunk Road, the selection process to appoint the consultant who will conduct the studies will begin. No timeframe for its completion has been provided.

e) *Other issues*

The State Party includes information in the annexes of the report on the assessment carried out to identify significant heritage buildings at risk, as well as data on the proposed projects for implementation. It also provides documentation of the works implemented at the property, including interventions and additional activities such as training and dissemination, as well as proposals for new municipal ordinances for regulating the use of advertising, for public use, among others.

## Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that limited progress has been made by the State Party in addressing the recommendations made by World Heritage Committee, given that essential planning tools for the property continue to remain at the planning stages and no clear timeframe has been given for their finalisation. Although many heritage buildings have been identified as being at risk and actions have been proposed, these continue to be implemented on an *ad hoc* basis, without a clear framework for action or articulated within the broader management of the property.

## **Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.101**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.104**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party on the actions taken to implement the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee and reiterates its concern that measures to ensure the conservation and protection of the property continue to be at the planning stages;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to finalize the following and to submit them to the World Heritage Centre by **30 November 2013**, for evaluation:*
  - a) *Risk Preparedness plan for the property,*
  - b) *Delineation of the buffer zone and approval of adequate regulatory measures,*
  - c) *Master Plan for the property in three printed copies, in addition to an electronic, to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies,*
  - d) *Proposal for a minor boundary modification, according to the procedure established by the Operational Guidelines;*
5. *Urges the State Party to finalize the management plan for the property as it has been requested by the World Heritage Committee since 2009 and submit three copies to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies by **1 February 2014**;*
6. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment, including Heritage Impact Assessments for the Via Troncal Interconectora project as a whole, including the assessment of potential impacts on the landscape areas of Lari Lari, Los Tucos, Cayma and Yanahuara and the identification of mitigation measures, and submit the assessment study to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, prior to the approval and implementation of the project;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, 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 38th session in 2014.*

**102. Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500bis)**

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

### **III. OMNIBUS DECISION**

See Document WHC.13/37.COM/7B.Add