



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.Add

Paris, 17 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. EMERGING TRENDS AND GENERAL ISSUES.....	5
Impacts on World Heritage from conflict and civil unrest.....	5
Poaching and illegal trade: cooperation with CITES	6
Establishment of effective legal frameworks for World Heritage	7
Fires (Disaster risk reduction).....	7
Threats from extractive industries.....	8
Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment	9
Space Technology.....	11
II. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	14
NATURAL PROPERTIES.....	14
AFRICA.....	14
1. Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407).....	14
2. Sangha Trinational (Cameroun / Central African Republic / Congo) (N 1380rev)..	20
4. Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis).....	21
5. Lake Malawi National Park (Malawi) (N 289)	22
ARAB STATES.....	25
8. Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)	25
9. Socotra Archipelago (Yemen) (N 1263).....	28
ASIA-PACIFIC.....	33
12. Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Area (China) (N 1083bis).....	33
13. Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955).....	38
16. Ha Long Bay (Viet Nam) (N 672bis)	43
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	47
17. Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225bis)	47
18. Gros Morne National Park (Canada) (N 419).....	50
22. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)	52
25. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation (N 768rev)	56
26. Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany (Germany, Slovakia, Ukraine) (N 1133bis).....	60
28. Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (N 369)	63
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	67
29. Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1035).....	67
31. Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) (N 1138 rev).....	71

32. Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161).....	74
MIXED PROPERTIES.....	79
AFRICA.....	79
33. Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lopé-Okanda (Gabon) (C/N 1147rev)	79
34. Cliffs of Bandiagara (Land of the Dogons), Mali (C/N 516)	81
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	85
35. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)	85
CULTURAL PROPERTIES	91
AFRICA.....	91
36. Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323 bis).....	91
39. Lower Valley of the Omo (Ethiopia) (C 17)	95
40. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055).....	97
44. Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai, and Environs (South Africa) (C 915bis)	100
ARAB STATES.....	104
47. Qal'at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun (Bahrain) (C 1192) ..	104
53. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libya) (C 190).....	106
54. Rock Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libya) (C 287)	109
56. Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) (C 1073)	111
57. World Heritage properties in Syria (Syrian Arab Republic)	114
58. Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) (C 385)	118
ASIA-PACIFIC.....	121
62. Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115).....	121
63. Masjed-e Jāmé of Isfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 1397).....	122
64. Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi (Kazakhstan) (C 1103).....	125
67. Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451)	127
68. Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan) (C 602rev)	130
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	133
72. Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784).....	133
75. Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066).....	136
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).....	144
80. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544).....	147
81. Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation) (C 1170)	151
82. Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632).....	153

83. Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545).....	156
85. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356).....	158
89. Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1215)	163
90. Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 426bis).....	168
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	173
91. City of Potosi (Bolivia) (C 420).....	173
92. Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia) (C 567rev).....	176
98. National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180).....	180
100. Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis)	184
102. Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500 bis)	190
III. OMNIBUS DECISION	194
NATURAL PROPERTIES.....	195
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	195
Monte San Giorgio (Italy / Switzerland) (N 1090bis)	195
CULTURAL PROPERTIES	195
AFRICA	195
Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26).....	195
ASIA – PACIFIC	196
Old Town of Lijiang (China) (C 811 bis).....	196
Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C 707ter)	196
Taj Mahal (India) (C 252); Agra Fort (India) (C 251); Fatehpur Sikri (India) (C 255).....	197
Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India) (C 1101)	197
Prambanan Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C 642).....	198
Melaka and George Town, Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca (Malaysia) (C 1223bis)	198
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	199
Historic Centre of Český Krumlov (Czech Republic) (C 617)	199
Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape (Hungary) (C 1063).....	199
Vilnius Historic centre (Lithuania) (C 541bis)	200
Churches of Moldavia (Romania) (C 598bis)	200
Ensemble of the Ferrapontov Monastery (Russian Federation) (C 982)	200
Works of Antoni Gaudi (Spain) (C 320bis)	201
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	201
San Augustin Archaeological Park (Colombia) (C 744).....	201
Historic centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412)	202

Camino real de Tierra Adentro (Mexico) (C 1351)	203
Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru) (C 700)	203
City of Cuzco (Peru) (C 273)	203

I. EMERGING TRENDS AND GENERAL ISSUES

IMPACTS ON WORLD HERITAGE FROM CONFLICT AND CIVIL UNREST

At its 36 session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012), the World Heritage Committee inscribed the site of Timbuktu (Mali) and the Tomb of the Askia (Mali) on the List of World Heritage in Danger because of the on-going destructions of some of the monuments by the rebel forces occupying the area. During the same session, the Okapi Wildlife Reserve (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (DRC) was attacked by an armed group engaged in elephant poaching and illegal mining in the Reserve. The attack left several people dead, including 2 park staff and resulted in the pillage of the reserve infrastructure and the killing of all 14 okapi at the captive breeding station. What is especially worrying is that in both cases, the impacts on the site were not collateral damage as a result of a larger conflict but the attackers were specifically aiming to destroy the heritage and to affect the people in charge of protecting it.

In both cases, the World Heritage Centre tried to intervene rapidly, within the limits of its means, to ensure that impacts were minimized and to bring the necessary support.

In the case of the Okapi Wildlife Reserve, the World Heritage Centre contacted the United Nations (UN) forces in DRC to send a military mission together with the DRC army to secure the area and worked with the management authority to mobilize funding to address the emergency situation through the Rapid Response Facility, the World Heritage Fund and extrabudgetary resources.

In the case of Timbuktu and the Tomb of Askia (Mali), UNESCO prepared a Heritage map and a passport which were printed in about 8,000 copies and distributed to all the armed forces that intervened in January 2013. The preparation of these documents has contributed to preserve the World Heritage properties from further destruction during the military interventions. The Director-General has also created a UNESCO special fund to help rehabilitate the World Heritage properties once peace is ensured.

In addition, since the 36th session, conflict has impacted the sites in Syria and in the east of the DRC. Impact from conflict is today the single most important reason that sites are inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In addition, several sites have been inscribed on this List because of the difficulty of the State Party to control the threats as a result of political instability, civil unrest or because the management authority has problems managing the property as a result of insecurity due to the presence of armed bandits, such as narco-traffickers.

The examples of Mali and DRC demonstrate how the *Convention* can play a role to try to minimize the impacts of conflicts on their Outstanding Universal Value. Experience has shown the importance to try to maintain a presence of site management on-site, for example by providing direct financial assistance. At the same time, the *Convention* can play an important role in raising the awareness of the heritage values amongst the parties engaged in the conflict. At the same time, the clear limitations of these interventions also have to be recognized. At best, they can minimize or slow down the degradation of the heritage values. A return of security is a prerequisite to ensure their protection. A key challenge for the *World Heritage Convention* is to ensure that the protection of the World Heritage properties is recognized as a high priority for all parties in the conflict and including interventions by the international community (for example through the 1954 Hague Convention and its Second Protocol of 1999), in the context of the many other humanitarian challenges faced during such situations. For example, in spite of many efforts, it has been extremely challenging to engage UN peace keeping forces in heritage protection activities, as this is not always included in their mandate. It is therefore important for the international community to explore further how this could be ensured in the future.

POACHING AND ILLEGAL TRADE: COOPERATION WITH CITES

Natural World Heritage properties protect some of the most important remaining elephant and rhinoceros populations in the world. Selous Game Reserve (Tanzania), as part of the greater Selous ecosystem and the connected Niassa Game Reserve in Mozambique, ensure the conservation of the largest remaining savanna elephant population in the world. The Sangha Trinational (Cameroun, Central African Republic, Congo) and its surrounding buffer zones, inscribed in 2012, protects one of the largest and healthiest forest elephant populations. Garamba National Park (DRC) was home to the last population of Northern White Rhinoceros in the world, while Ujong Kulon National Park (Indonesia) protects the single last remaining population of Javan Rhinoceros, estimated at less than 50 rhinos. Kaziranga National Park (India) has today the most important and healthy population of Indian Rhinoceros – a species once on the edge of extinction.

However, increasingly elephant and rhino poaching has been identified as a serious conservation threat at several World Heritage properties. This trend has been correlated with a growing illicit trade to Asia, fuelled by soaring prices for rhino horn and ivory, and with organized crime involved in this lucrative business.

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) Secretariat, in cooperation with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), IUCN and the Wildlife Trade Monitoring Network (TRAFFIC), released a new report at its 16th Conference of the Parties (COP16) on the current African elephant crisis. The report is available at http://www.cites.org/common/resources/pub/Elephants_in_the_dust.pdf. The report presents the most recent African elephant population status information (collected by IUCN), and the latest analyses of trends in African elephant poaching and illegal trade in ivory. Data on the illegal killing of African elephants was gathered under the CITES-led programme, “Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants” (MIKE). Since 2002, MIKE has been monitoring the proportion of illegally killed elephants across 50 protected areas in 29 African countries where elephants are found. Fourteen of these MIKE sites are also World Heritage properties. The report shows a clear upward trend in both poaching of African elephants and illicit ivory trade since 2007. In 2011, poaching in Africa’s MIKE sites reached their highest levels since 2002, with 7.4 percent of their elephants illegally killed. Elephants are now killed faster than they can breed in much of their range, and if the current trend continues, poaching will lead to even greater population declines across Africa, above the significant losses that have already occurred. The trend is most worrying in Central Africa, in particular in the 5 World Heritage properties of the DRC, where in 2011, 9 out of 10 elephant carcasses found were reported as having been killed illegally. In Eastern Africa, poaching pressure is increasing rapidly as well, with many reports of illegal killings documented from the Selous Game Reserve World Heritage property (United Republic of Tanzania). In West Africa, populations were already small and fragmented, and populations in the World Heritage property of Niokolo Koba National Park (Senegal) and Comoé National Park (Côte d’Ivoire) are now reduced to near extinction.

The illegal killing of rhinoceroses for their horn has also increased dramatically in Africa in recent years. This onslaught led to the probable extirpation of the last population of Northern White Rhinoceros in Garamba National Park – no other Northern White Rhinos survive in the wild. It is feared that the rare Asian rhinoceros species may come under similar pressure. The growing pressure is shown in Kaziranga National Park (India), where in 2012, 21 Indian rhino were killed, reversing abruptly the decreasing trend in poaching observed since 2007. In Manas National Park (India), 4 of the recently translocated rhino have been killed, endangering the re-establishment of the species at this site.

To address this situation, a number of decisions were taken at the CITES COP16. A series of on-the-ground actions were approved, focusing on the 30 countries most involved in or

affected by the illegal killing of elephants and the illegal trade in ivory. Parties were also requested to prosecute members of organized crime groups implicated in rhinoceros-related crimes, applying legislation with penalties that could act as effective deterrent and to consider stricter domestic measures to regulate the re-export of rhino horn products. Parties were further asked to develop and implement demand-reduction strategies to reduce consumption of rhino horn products. The World Heritage Centre is also discussing with the CITES Secretariat how to increase cooperation in awareness raising activities as well as monitoring and law enforcement training for site managers. A joint information leaflet, using infographics to demonstrate the importance of World Heritage properties for rhino conservation, was recently published in English, French, Vietnamese, Chinese, Assamese, Hindi, Kiswahili and Bahasa Indonesia (see <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/992>).

ESTABLISHMENT OF EFFECTIVE LEGAL FRAMEWORKS FOR WORLD HERITAGE

For the past several years, a number of countries have been reviewing their legal framework for heritage protection. Some have sought the advice of World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies on how to incorporate World Heritage issues within their national legal frameworks. In some of these review processes, efforts have been made to ensure that provisions are included for the proper protection and conservation of World Heritage properties and for the adequate implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. In some cases, like Hungary and South Africa, specific World Heritage laws have been adopted. Georgia is also planning the elaboration of a World Heritage-focused law, while the Russian Federation is examining the options of improving and harmonising their legal framework for the protection of cultural heritage properties. Notwithstanding, some state of conservation reports indicate that problems derived from unclear legal frameworks, and from the overlapping of authorities and mandates for World Heritage properties, continue to exist, which hinder the efficacy of legal protection and management systems.

Efforts made by States Parties in the improvement and harmonisation of their legal frameworks are commendable, especially as they must take into account their own legal system and traditions. According to its specific framework, each State Party will need to decide whether to work primarily on the improvement of existing legislation, administrative systems, and management frameworks, or whether it is appropriate to adopt a specific law for World Heritage, to ensure the protection of World Heritage properties. In either case, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies consider it important that attention be paid to ensuring a clear distribution of competencies, roles, and responsibilities at the national, regional, local, and site levels.

IUCN notes that its expert World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) and the Commission on Environmental Law (CEL) provide a strong network of expertise and advice on World Heritage and protected area law. A joint specialist group of these two IUCN Commissions exists and could be requested to engage in providing guidance and support regarding appropriate national legal recognition of World Heritage.

FIRES (DISASTER RISK REDUCTION)

Over the past year several World Heritage properties have been affected by wildfires, particularly in Southern Europe and Africa, including Garajonay National Park (Spain), an extremely rare example of the humid sub-tropical forest that covered most of Europe before the arrival of human beings, and Mount Kenya (Kenya), an ancient extinct volcano which constitutes the second highest peak in Africa. Fire also impacted the rare and endangered endemic species at Pitons, Cirques and Remparts of Reunion Island (France). The impact of fires has also been raised as a matter of concern for other World Heritage properties such as

Teide National Park (Spain), Mount Athos (Greece), Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin), Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) and Old Town of Lijang (China).

The impact and response have been different for each of the affected World Heritage properties. It should be noted, however, that one of the most heavily affected properties, Garajonay National Park (Spain), provided an example of fast emergency response and adequate post-disaster measures. The rapid and effective response was crucial in preventing further damage to the property and measures currently in place contribute to the long-term recovery of the affected area. In Mount Kenya, the Kenya Wildlife and Forest Services mobilized important logistical means to extinguish the fires, including the use of several helicopters to further reduce impacts (see Decision **37 COM 7B.2**).

Overall disaster risk reduction strategies are important tools for all World Heritage properties and should be systematically integrated into management systems, as stated also in Action 5.1 of the Strategy for Reducing Disaster Risks at World Heritage properties, adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) (available online at <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2007/whc07-31com-72e.pdf>).

The Advisory Bodies have specifically recommended the preparation of five Disaster Risk Management Plans as part of the reactive monitoring process for the 37th session of the Committee. Particularly in regard to fire hazards, it is important for properties to adopt adequate prevention, mitigation and preparedness measures before fires happen. It is also necessary to ensure adequate emergency response processes are in place to deal with fire emergencies when they occur, and that when post-fire monitoring, recovery and rehabilitation is undertaken, measures take into account the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The resource manual, *Managing Disaster Risks for World Heritage* (available online at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/disaster-risk-reduction>) has been developed by the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre to assist States Parties in the process of preparing Disaster Risk Management plans.

THREATS FROM EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES

In 2003, the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM), regrouping the world's largest mining and metals companies launched their commitment not to explore or mine in World Heritage properties. This landmark private sector "No-go" commitment has been referred to as best practice by the World Heritage Committee in its own decisions concerning mining issues in World Heritage sites. A similar commitment was made by Shell in the same year, though further participation from the oil and gas sector is not yet forthcoming. The "No-go" commitment has also been adopted as a policy within a growing number of financial institutions in relation to project financing. The World Heritage Committee has consistently reiterated in its decisions on properties under threat from extractive activities that it considers these as incompatible with World Heritage status. The first ever deletion of a property from the World Heritage List resulted from a decision by the State Party of Oman to remove the protection status of a large part of the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary to allow for oil exploration.

An independent review of the implementation of the long established "No-go" principle was undertaken with the participation of the extractive industries, banks, government representatives, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre. The results of this review were noted in Decision **36 COM 7C**, at the 36th session of the Committee (Saint-Petersburg, 2012). The review found that notwithstanding the decade long commitment, there is evidence that threats to these sites from extractives activities is growing, particularly in Africa. In order to manage the risk posed from those members of the extractive industry that do not observe a "No-go" policy, a series of actions from different stakeholders, including States Parties to the Convention, are required.

Further supporting the “no-go” commitment, participants to the “Living with World Heritage in Africa” conference convened by the Africa World Heritage Fund (26-29 September 2012, Gauteng, South Africa) independently recommended that “*States Parties respect the ‘no go’ ICMM principle by not granting licenses to non [ICMM] members at World Heritage Properties*” (26-29 September 2012, Gauteng, South Africa). This document is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/news/documents/news-949-1.pdf>

Despite this long standing policy, threats from the extractives sector continue. At its 36th session, the World Heritage Committee in several decisions called on specific petroleum companies involved in oil exploration activities inside or adjacent to World Heritage properties to subscribe the no-go commitment (case of Total, SOCO and Tullow Oil), but so far these companies have not yet done so. Another company, British Petroleum (BP) approached the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to discuss their environmental policy in particular in relation to protected areas including World Heritage sites. BP also proposed to facilitate the participation of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN at a global Oil and Gas Industry Association for Environmental and Social Issues meeting to be able to engage in a discussion around the “No-go” commitment.

Although the World Heritage Centre also notes certain positive developments whereby States Parties, through their judiciary or executive branches, are reaffirming a “No-go” policy for extractives in World Heritage properties, there are also many cases to the contrary. For example, extractive activities are currently foreseen in the immediate vicinity of several World Heritage properties: Lake Malawi National Park (Malawi), Lake Turkana National Park (Kenya), Banc d’Arguin (Mauritania), Doñana National Park (Spain), Gros Morne National Park (Canada). In these cases, these activities could possibly impact the values of the property, especially in lake or marine environments (Lake Malawi, Lake Turkana, Banc d’Arguin) or when the proposed techniques could contaminate ground water layers shared with the site (Gros Morne). In addition associated facilities such as pipelines or shipping routes could also impact the values. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies therefore reiterate the importance to carefully study all potential direct and indirect impacts through a thorough Environmental and Heritage Impact Assessments (EIA/HIA).

The results and recommendations of the independent review and of the “Living with World Heritage in Africa” conference in South Africa suggest that in light of the increasing concerns related to the impact of extractive industries on World Heritage properties, the “No-go” principle should be rapidly and consistently adopted amongst all stakeholders in order to safeguard these exceptional and unique places for future generations.

The attention of the World Heritage Committee is also drawn to a new global study on the overlap between mining, oil and gas and natural World Heritage properties currently being jointly undertaken by IUCN, UNEP-WCMC, ICMM and WWF. The results of this study are intended to provide baseline data on the extent of overlap between extractives industries and natural World Heritage properties and will provide a valuable evidence base on this matter.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Factors identified through the analysis of a sample of 50 cultural heritage state of conservation reports, show that development and infrastructure projects stand as one of the most common problem affecting World Heritage properties.

The World Heritage Committee has increased its requests for States Parties to carry out Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA), and Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) for development and infrastructure projects, noting the procedures already foreseen in Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. As HIA is a relatively new concept within the heritage sector, there is a significant need for capacity building to be able to adequately

respond to these requests. In this respect, ICOMOS has prepared guidance on the preparation of HIA, and ICCROM, in partnership with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Institute for Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region (WHITR-AP), carried out a first course on HIA for World Heritage properties in Lijiang, China in October 2012. However, further efforts and a more proactive approach, linking capacity building activities in HIA to the requests of the Committee, are required. There is also a need to develop effective procedures and allocate resources to allow the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to report back to the States Parties when an HIA has been submitted.

In Decision **35 COM 12E**, the Committee requested the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to “*develop guidance to clarify the need for Environmental Impact Assessments/Heritage Impact Assessments of potential developments’ impact on Outstanding Universal Value, the range of proposed activities with a likely impact on Outstanding Universal Value to be reported on and the documentation required by the World Heritage Centre (under Paragraph 172).*”

In response to this request, IUCN will launch at the 37th session of the Committee a brief Advice Note on Environmental Assessment and natural World Heritage, which will be available on its website (<http://www.iucn.org/worldheritage>) and provides initial advice related to natural heritage.

The Advice Note provides guidance on integrating natural World Heritage within environmental assessments and decision-making processes for land-use planning. It also sets out World Heritage Impact Assessment Principles based on those of the International Association for Impact Assessment (IAIA). These principles are intended to complement, but not replace, existing environmental assessment and land-use planning guidelines.

IUCN recalls that all proposals for activities which may affect a natural or mixed World Heritage property, including proposals located outside its boundaries, should be subject to an appropriate and rigorous appraisal process, such as an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), prior to considering whether to grant consents and licenses. These appraisal processes should respect the highest international best-practice standards, including, but not limited to:

- a) Specifically assessing the likely effects of the proposal(s) on the site’s Outstanding Universal Value, including direct, indirect and cumulative effects;
- b) Identifying and evaluating alternatives, to determine least damaging options;
- c) Being publicly disclosed and subject to thorough public consultation; and
- d) Proposing an environmental management plan detailing operating, monitoring and restoration conditions.

Such assessments should include a dedicated section or chapter presenting the assessment’s conclusion on the proposal(s) potential impacts on Outstanding Universal Value. For multiple or large-scale proposals, a Strategic Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (SESIA) should be undertaken in order to assess their potential cumulative impacts, as these types of proposals cannot be adequately assessed through individual ESIA’s.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that while separate guidance is now available on impact assessment for both cultural and natural properties, more detailed joint guidelines are needed to provide a comprehensive overview of World Heritage Impact Assessment Principles and how the results of these assessments can be successfully integrated into decision-making processes for land-use planning.

In regard to management issues, the analysis of the state of conservation reports shows that 85% of properties are in need of a management plan or require clarification in their management system. The Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre have been making considerable efforts to clarify the requirements for effective management systems,

particularly through the development of World Heritage Resource Manuals on managing natural and cultural heritage. These Manuals are the key resource documents to provide consolidated guidance to States Parties, and the Managing Natural World Heritage manual, prepared in 2011 and published in June 2011 has recently been printed in English and French with support from the European Union and Government of the Netherlands. The draft manual on Managing Cultural World Heritage is under development under the leadership of ICCROM, and will be available later in 2013. Having developed this coordinated advice, it will be important that this is provided consistently through the Periodic reporting cycles, and through the capacity building efforts of all actors in the *Convention*. The establishment of effective management plans and systems for all World Heritage properties is an important priority for proactive support to World Heritage properties, and this should be considered as a priority action by States Parties following up on Periodic Reporting, with the support of the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre.

SPACE TECHNOLOGY

Following Decision **34 COM 7C**, the World Heritage Centre has been further exploring the use of remote sensing technology to assess the potential threats to World Heritage properties and to enhance management practices.

The work being carried out at the Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan), a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, is an example of how this technology is now being used. Located in an isolated area, Jam imposes challenges in management, since it does not allow regular monitoring in order to determine its state of conservation. Furthermore, the entire extension of the historic site of Jam had not yet been determined since it included archaeological remains of a nearby settlement and a cemetery at some distance. The maps available in the past did not show clear boundaries, and therefore did not meet requirements for proper management and monitoring.

In 2012, the World Heritage Centre produced a detailed topographical map of Jam, without undertaking a field survey. This work was carried out using newly available GeoEye Satellite Stereo Image Technology, which has the capacity for mapping three-dimensional ground features at a very high spatial resolution with great accuracy.

Previously, remote sensing technologies usually captured large surface areas at relatively low or medium resolutions. In recent years, however, technology has progressed and it is possible to obtain images at higher resolutions (less than one meter) and reduced field of view, which allows mapping even down to the scale of a single monument or site.

This technology is of particular interest for sites located in remote places, such as Jam. It should be noted that the data obtained by the satellite to produce the topographical maps was also used to carry out a hydraulic study, which provided information on the most appropriate ways to protect the Minaret from river erosion and flooding. The case of Jam illustrates how the application of the most recent remote sensing technology can be used to improve documentation, conservation and management of World Heritage properties, particularly those in remote locations.

In response to Decision **34 COM 7C**, an International Centre on Space Technologies for Cultural and Natural Heritage (HIST), as a Category 2 Centre under the auspices of UNESCO, was formally established in July 2011 in Beijing, China by UNESCO and the Chinese Academy of Sciences. In October 2012, HIST organized the First International Workshop on Space Technologies for World Heritage in Beijing. Some forty site managers from Asia and the Pacific region participated in this meeting. The theme of the Workshop was '*From Space to Place: Application of Space Technologies in Management and Conservation of World Heritage*'. Further information on this activity is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/886/>.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC.13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Expresses its utmost concern about the many conflicts which are affecting World Heritage properties and in particular that the recent cases where parties engaged in the conflict are intentionally destroying heritage sites or targeting the people in charge of their protection;
3. Takes note of the efforts of the World Heritage Centre and partners to try to minimize the impacts on the properties by raising the awareness of the parties engaged in the conflict and mobilizing financial support for their conservation and calls upon the United Nations Security Council to ensure that the protection of World Heritage properties as well as other heritage properties is included in the mandate of United Nations peace keeping operations, wherever relevant;
4. Also expresses its utmost concern about the impacts on World Heritage properties due to the rising poaching pressure on elephants and rhinoceros linked to a growing illicit trade to Asia, fuelled by soaring prices for rhino horn and ivory and the increasing involvement organized crime getting involved in this lucrative business;
5. Welcomes the measures taken by the 16th Conference of the Parties of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) to help address this poaching crisis and requests the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to strengthen its cooperation with the CITES Secretariat to assist States Parties to implement these measures;
6. Also requests the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to develop for the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2014 an analysis of the effectiveness of national legal recognition of World Heritage properties, and recommends further advice to States Parties on this issue, and also calls upon States Parties to the Convention to support this analysis;
7. Also welcomes the relevant conclusions of the “Living with World Heritage in Africa” Conference held in Gauteng, South Africa (26-29 September 2012) which build on the recommendations of the independent review of the “No-go” principle concerning mining exploration/exploitation in World Heritage properties, noted in Decision **36 COM 7C**;
8. Notes with concern the growing impact of the extractive industries on World Heritage properties, and urges all States Parties to the Convention to respect the “No-go” principle, and leading industry stakeholders, by not permitting extractives activities within World Heritage properties, and by making every effort to ensure that extractives companies located in their territory cause no damage to World Heritage properties, in line with Article 6 of the Convention;
9. Further requests the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to continue a dialogue with the extractives industry on extending the commitment made by Shell and the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) to not explore or develop oil, gas and mineral resources within World Heritage properties to other companies and parts of the industry, and also to ensure that existing and future operations in areas

surrounding World Heritage properties are compatible with the protection of their Outstanding Universal Value and do not threaten their integrity;

10. *Further welcomes that guidance on impact assessments is now available from the Advisory Bodies for both natural and cultural properties, and also notes that more detailed joint guidelines are needed to provide a comprehensive overview of how the results of these assessments can be successfully integrated into decision-making processes for land-use planning, and also encourages States Parties to support the preparation of compiled guidelines for both natural and cultural properties;*
11. *Requests furthermore the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to develop, where possible, appropriate capacity building activities to be linked to the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) requests made by the World Heritage Committee;*
12. *Welcomes furthermore the publication of the Managing Natural Heritage Resource Manual in printed versions; thanks the State Party of the Netherlands, and the European Union for their support for this and further encourages other States Parties to the Convention to support translation and dissemination of this resource manual in a range of regional languages;*
13. *Requests moreover States Parties, with the support of the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre, to prioritize the establishment of effective and up-to-date management plans and management systems for all World Heritage properties;*
14. *Further notes how the use of the recent remote sensing technology can assist States Parties in the management and monitoring of the state of conservation of their properties and further encourages them to apply it whenever possible;*
15. *Finally requests the World Heritage Centre to make the state of conservation reports received from States Parties public at the time of their distribution to the Advisory Bodies.*

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1987

Criteria
(ix) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/407/documents/>

International Assistance
Total amount granted: USD 84 700
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/407/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
Total amount granted: USD 60,000, UNESCO FIT Netherlands. USD 193,275 and USD 118,725, respectively in 2008 and 2009, in the frame of the Central Africa World Heritage Forest Initiative (CAWHFI) in the south-west of Cameroon

Previous monitoring missions
March 1998: UNESCO monitoring mission; June 2006, December 2009 and February-March 2012: joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring missions.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Lack of entire approval and implementation of management plan;
- Mining exploitation project close to the property;
- Industrial agriculture in the buffer zone;
- Threats exerted by commercial hunting and deforestation around the Park.

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

Current conservation issues

On 29 January 2013, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. This report identifies a number of measures designed to strengthen the institutional and operational framework for management of the property. These measures include the strengthening of technical and logistical capacities, the establishment of a framework agreement with the management body of the property, environmental awareness and the development of micro-projects for local communities. It also specifies the responses provided by the State Party to Decision **36 COM 7B.1**. The report also lists a number of activities

planned for 2013. The State Party reports that a five-year emergency safeguarding plan for protected areas in Cameroon was developed in 2012 and approved by the President of the Republic. The plan provides for the annual recruitment of 500 eco-guards, their training, and the upgrading of equipment. The Dja Faunal Reserve is one of the seven priority areas of the emergency plan. The property is one of the ten pilot sites of the Africa Nature Programme of the World Heritage Centre co-funded by the African World Heritage Fund, IUCN, the MAVA Foundation and the Kingdom of Belgium. The programme's overall objective is to improve the management effectiveness of these properties through the implementation of the tool entitled "Enhancing our Heritage".

Furthermore, the State Party has sought and obtained from the Franz Weber Foundation funding of USD 263,700 to contribute to the implementation of Decision **36 COM 7B.1** of the World Heritage Committee and a project for the sustainable conservation of the property, over a five-year period (2013-2017). This project aims to: (1) mitigate threats due to the impacts of mining and agricultural projects around the property, (2) strengthen the technical and operational capacities of the management body of the property, (3) encourage the involvement of local communities in the management of the property and the improvement of their living conditions.

a) *Mining activity within and around the property*

The report recalls that the GEOVIC Mining Corp, which has a cobalt mining exploitation project on a site located 30 km from the property, submitted a second social and environmental management plan to the Ministry of Environment, Protection of Nature and Sustainable Development (MINEPDED). However, this document, which does not clearly describe the potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and their mitigation measures is still awaiting approval, although no exploitation activity has begun, and the company pursues its exploration activities. Moreover, in the framework of the sustainable conservation project of the Dja Faunal Reserve funded by the Franz Weber Foundation, the terms of reference of a new Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) will be elaborated by the end of May 2013, and validated in a national workshop on 3 June 2013. This work will lead to the creation of a new ESIA to be funded by GEOVIC, and which will meet the highest international standards.

Regarding the mining permit that straddled the property, parliamentarians met in special session in early 2013 and recommended the suspension of all mining permits within protected areas in Cameroon. In the case of this property, this action was followed by the decision of the Ministry of Industry, Mines and Technological Development of Cameroon, taken on 13 March 2013, to reduce by 20% the Venture Capital firm's holdings of mining exploration permits, to limit the encroachment observed on the property, as requested by the Committee.

The report also states that a new mining company (AUCAM) obtained an exploration permit on the western edge of the property. It mentions a resurgence of artisanal gold mining south of the Dja Biosphere Reserve, but without giving details of its impact on the property itself.

b) *Construction of the Mekin Dam*

The report notes that the work on the future Mekin Dam (in the Mekas loop, 100 km west of the property) will continue, and that this work has contributed to the opening of bypass roads that could be used by poachers. The Government expects delivery of the dam in 2014. The report does not mention any revision of the impact assessment in relation to the property, nor any measures to mitigate the impacts of this vast infrastructure on its Outstanding Universal Value. Nor does it provide information on the State Party's intentions to prepare a comprehensive development plan for the Dja Valley.

However, the State Party emphasizes that since 2012, the EDC / Hydro Mekin Company is involved in a multiparty discussion between stakeholders within the territory of the Biosphere Reserve. A draft memorandum of understanding has been formulated and is awaiting

signature by the stakeholders. Despite this positive sign of improved dialogue between those concerned, which should be pursued, the progress of work -- without assessment of impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, or an adequate environmental management plan -- remains a major concern.

c) Industrial agricultural exploitation and forest exploitation in the periphery of the property

Contacts were initiated between the managing authority of the property, the Sud Hevea Cameroon Company and the other local economic stakeholders to provide for joint actions to mitigate the effects of the implantation of these private operators. This led to the elaboration of a "Memorandum of Understanding" which is currently submitted for reflection to the key players in view of its forthcoming signature, and to a letter of commitment from the Sud Hevea Company, addressed to the management authority. Although this progress with the Sud Hevea Company should be welcomed, it remains that the report provides no information on concrete measures that have been taken.

Moreover, the report adds that the start of the planting project has, in conjunction with that of the Mekin Dam, enabled the opening of several routes used by poachers. The report does not give information about the state of the forest exploitation in the Biosphere Reserve, in the immediate vicinity of the property, and on the measures of sustainable management of the forest resources taken by the companies that have been attributed units of forestry development (UFD) in the Reserve.

d) Poaching for bushmeat markets

The report indicates that the service in charge of managing the property continues to face various difficulties linked primarily to the lack of operational resources to tackle poaching. The development plan of the property must be evaluated and revised in 2013. Meanwhile, an action plan has been drawn up for 2013, although the report does not specify the content or resources mobilized for its implementation.

The report states that, apart from its own resources, the management authority of the property works together with the forestry and hunting control posts depending on the same ministry. These services are sometimes supported by other national services of which the gendarmerie, or the police or defense forces, during specific actions. Transborder cooperation for anti-poaching is also being implemented in the TRIDOM space (including the protected areas of Dja in Cameroon, Odzala in Congo and Minkébé in Gabon). The management authority of the property also provides support to the 18 vigilance and monitoring committees established in local communities living around. With the support of the Great Apes Project, two community wildlife management committees have been created and a simple wildlife management plan has been approved for the Malen V village, as well as community zoning of some hunting areas.

The report indicates a considerable patrolling effort (foot and motorized patrols, fixed and mobile barriers), seizure of weapons, ammunition and large quantities of game (more than 3 tons of meat and a dozen ivory tusks seized in 2012). It does not, however, rule on the effectiveness of actions taken with respect to the stagnation or decline in poaching. Because of important energy and industrial projects it is feared that poaching problems will continue to increase, and it would be useful for the management authority to monitor the effectiveness of the anti-poaching combat in the boundaries of the property. This should be achieved with the development of transborder cooperation and the joint adoption of the MIST ecological monitoring system by the three countries in the TRIDOM space.

The report mentions numerous awareness-raising and environmental education activities that have been conducted by the management authority of the Reserve and various partners: festivals, radio programmes, presentations and debates in schools, etc.. However, although there have been many activities in this domain, the report provides no information as to their effectiveness in terms of changes in attitudes and practices with regard to the property.

The report also mentions that incentives for alternative activities to hunting have been implemented, such as training in traditional farming and agroforestry. RAPAC through the ECOFAC V project also finances the revival of production chains in the Mekas loop, west of the property (honey, cocoa, fishing, etc..).

Moreover, in the framework of the sustainable conservation of the property supported by the Franz Weber Foundation, an education and awareness-raising campaign for the populations in the fight against poaching will be conducted in 2013. This activity will inform populations about the negative impacts of poaching on the environment and the risk of criminal sanctions.

e) *Strengthening of human and logistical resources of the management body of the property*

The report states that 24 new officers were assigned to the property in 2012 for an updated total of 72 staff (including 16 managers and supervisors). These agents are divided into four branches, two of which are located on the outskirts of the Biosphere Reserve. The report also mentions the increase in the operating and investment budgets by the State Party in 2012. This effort should be pursued to improve the management effectiveness of the property.

The sustainable conservation of the property foresees in 2013 the development of a comprehensive personnel restructuring plan to enhance effectiveness of teams in the field, and the provision of motorized and aquatic transportation equipment to eco-guards to improve supervision and control land and water areas of the property.

f) *Effective monitoring system of the biodiversity of the property*

The State Party points out in its report that what little ecological research is currently ongoing in the Biosphere Reserve is that of the Great Apes Project. The ecological monitoring activities are not operational. However, the MIST ecological monitoring system was adopted in the framework of the TRIDOM partnership. A cooperation agreement is also being signed with FAE in respect to ecological monitoring activities. Therefore it is hoped that the establishment of an effective environmental monitoring can be realized in 2013, although the data acquisition is dependent on the establishment of a well-thought-out protocol for data collection and the operational capabilities of the management service.

g) *Delineation of the property*

A map provided in the State Party's report, specifies the size of the Faunal Wildlife Reserve itself, with a discontinuous priority area of intervention and a peripheral zone that surrounds the entire property. This map is defined on the basis of the forest development units adjoining the site. However, the report does not provide the detailed description of the boundaries of these different areas, and only partially indicates the regulations in force. The projected activities of the property management service in 2013 include the revision of the boundaries, their materialization and maintenance. The terms of reference are being developed for this activity and will be submitted to the RAPAC for funding under the ECOFAC V Programme.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN appreciate the efforts of the State Party, particularly as concerns staffing and increased operating and investment budgets for the property. They also highlight the commitment and work of the management authority of the property in the fight against anti-poaching in a difficult operating environment. The property management authority has begun a consultation process with economic operators working in the Biosphere Reserve, which, in 2013, should result in a Memorandum of Understanding between stakeholders in the efficient environmental management of the Reserve and the property itself. The revision of the management plan is also under study. These actions should provide a favorable institutional framework for the management of the property.

As concerns mining activity developed within and around the property, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the State Party's decision to reduce by 20% the size of the exploitation zone of the Venture Capital Company in order to halt the encroachment observed in Dja Faunal Reserve. Nevertheless, they remain concerned that the exploitation planned by the Venture Capital Company could engender negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and recommend that the Committee request the State Party to undertake an assessment of these impacts in an ESIA to determine the challenges to maintaining the property's Outstanding Universal Value. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the GEOVIC activities are limited on the ground and that the new impact study submitted in 2012 is still under consideration by the MINEDED and has not been revised in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee.

They recall, however, that many exploration permits are still valid in the periphery of the property, and that they are a threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They also point out that the construction of the Mekin Dam is progressing and that it is essential that studies of its impact on the Outstanding Universal Value be carried out and submitted to the World Heritage Centre, and that steps be taken to evaluate and mitigate them. They welcome the commitment of Sud Hevea to contribute to reducing the impacts of industrial plantations, in a Memorandum of Understanding with the management authority of the property, and they recommend that the Committee request the State Party to provide detailed information on the concrete measures that have been taken. They believe that it is more urgent than ever to set up an ecological monitoring-evaluation system of the property and clearly define responsibilities in its implementation and in the containment of impacts, and mitigation or restoration of the environment in the event of unavoidable impacts. They hope that the funding from the Franz Weber Foundation will effectively lead to the establishment of a monitoring-evaluation system in 2013 and the implementation of activities to reduce the threats from the impacts of development projects around the property, strengthen the technical and operational capacity of the management body of the property, and encourage the involvement of local communities in the management of the property and the improvement of their living conditions.

Despite these advances, they consider that the property remains exposed to persistent threats. They also consider that the State Party should urgently submit the environmental impact study of the Mekin Dam and the impact study of the the Venture Capital Company's mining exploitation on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, as well as the overall development plan of the Dja Valley, for review by IUCN.

Finally, they recommend that the Committee maintain the possibility of an inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 38th session in 2014, if significant progress is not made before the end of 2013.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.1

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.1**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction that the State Party has undertaken an emergency safeguarding plan for the protected areas of Cameroon, and that this is evidenced by the assignment of agents and supplementary budgets for the property, and calls on the State Party to continue and strengthen this support;*

4. Welcomes the initiative of the State Party to revise the development plan for the property and to set up a framework for multi-stakeholder dialogue throughout the property and its periphery, as well as the funds obtained by the State Party from the Franz Weber Foundation to contribute to the sustainable conservation of the property over a five-year period; and also welcomes that this year the State Party has already undertaken a series of activities to mitigate the threats due to the impacts of development projects around the property, to strengthen the technical and operational capacities of the property's management body, and to promote the involvement of local communities in the management of the property and the improvement of their living conditions;
5. Further welcomes the decision of the State Party to reduce by 20% the size of the Venture Capital Company's exploitation zone in order to halt encroachment observed by the Committee on the property, but considers that its proximity to the property could engender negative impacts on its Outstanding Universal Value and requests the State Party to undertake an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) of the operation and submit it to the World Heritage Centre in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
6. Notes that the State Party is considering a moratorium on mining exploration and exploitation in protected areas and also calls on the State Party to validate this commitment by a text of appropriate laws;
7. Also notes that, although no exploitation activity has begun exploration activities continue at the GEOVIC mining site, and reiterates its request to the State Party to suspend the GEOVIC mining operations until a new ESIA meeting international standards is conducted on the basis of the terms of reference that will be developed with the support of the Franz Weber Foundation and submitted to the World Heritage Centre;
8. Expresses its concern about the potential impacts of the Mekin Dam, the consequences of which could affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and in particular its integrity;
9. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, explicit measures taken to prevent, reduce and offset the negative effects of the industrial plantation project of Sud Hevea on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, following the Memorandum of Understanding;
10. Further notes that the means of action of the management authority of the property are too weak in regard to the issues at stake, particularly in terms of equipment and logistics, and that an efficient environmental monitoring system for the property is slow to materialize;
11. Considers that, in 2014, if significant progress is not made on the remaining recommendations set out in Decision **36 COM 7B.1**, as well as on the new above-mentioned requests, the property will meet the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger contained in Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines;
12. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, especially on progress made in mitigating threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2012

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/1380/documents>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: 250,000 Euros from 2008 to 2013 through the Central African World Heritage Forest Initiative funded by the European Commission

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/eng/list/1380>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 25 April 2013, the World Heritage Centre was informed by organisations working in the region that the worsening security situation in the Central African Republic as a result of the political turmoil was affecting the Dzanga-Ndoki National Park, one of the three protected areas that make up the property. According to the information received an unknown number of heavily armed men have installed themselves in Nola at 105 km from Bayanga, where the park headquarters are situated, from where they are conducting missions to surrounding villages and sites, including looting, and pillaging. The park headquarters have been raided three times resulting in the destruction and theft of most of essential materials and equipment, including vehicles and communication materials. The manager of the site together with the international staff working for the World Wildlife Fund and international researchers working at the property had to evacuate to neighbouring Cameroun as a result of the security risks. Park guards were reportedly disarmed but have stayed on-site and continue to try to guard key locations in the park. It appears that elephant poaching has started and that elephant meat is available on local markets and villages.

In a reaction to this alarming situation, the Director-General of UNESCO on 2 May 2013 wrote a letter to the Prime Minister of the Central African Republic, expressing her concern on the situation and requesting his personal intervention to take all necessary measures to secure the region, ensure the protection of the property and the security of the communities.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the Sangha Trinational World Heritage property was only inscribed at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) and recall that problems related to insecurity resulted in the disappearance of most of the wildlife in the other World Heritage property in the Central African Republic, Manovo-Gounda St. Floris National Park, currently inscribed on the List of

World Heritage in Danger. They recall that the property comprises one of the last intact forest elephant populations in the region, which so far was almost not impacted by the wave of elephant poaching which is affecting Central Africa. They therefore recommend that the World Heritage Committee express its utmost concern on the current situation and urges the Government to take all necessary action to restore security and ensure the protection of the property. They also call upon the State Parties of Cameroon and Congo to take all necessary measures to ensure security of the property in their respective territories and prevent a further increase in elephant poaching or other illegal activities.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.2

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 8B.8** adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Expresses its utmost concern about the recent attacks on the part of the property situated in the Central African Republic, which lead to in the destruction and theft of most of essential materials and equipment, including vehicles and communication materials and the evacuation of the manager of the site together with the international staff and international researchers working at the property and about the reported increase in elephant poaching in and around the property;*
4. *Urges the State Party of the Central African Republic to take all necessary action to restore security in the area and ensure the protection of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Parties of Cameroun and Congo to increase surveillance activities to avoid insecurity and poaching also affecting areas of the property located within their respective territories;*
6. *Launches an appeal to the State Parties of the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) to consider the sub-regional dimension regarding the consequences of crimes against wildlife to which the property is confronted, in order to ensure a sustainable and efficient fight against poaching in Central Africa;*
7. *Also requests the States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a detailed joint report on the state of conservation of the property, in particular on the impacts of the current security problems on the property, and the response undertaken, for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

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

4

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1984

Criteria

(vii)(ix)(x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/289/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 107,744

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/289/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal fresh wood cutting;
- b) Woodland management;
- c) Fires;
- d) Expansion of enclaved villages.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/289/>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

a) *Oil exploration in Lake Malawi*

In August 2012, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received information about oil exploration activities in Lake Malawi which may threaten the ecological integrity of the property and its unique endemic fish fauna. The State Party, in an email to the World Heritage Centre, subsequently provided clarification on the boundaries of the property and reassurances that the proposed oil exploration will take place outside the property in the northern part of the lake. Although further details were not provided by the State Party, media reports in November 2012 suggest that a contract for oil exploration was awarded in 2011 to British company Surestream Petroleum, and that the company has subsequently been undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) prior to full-scale exploration drilling. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that, while the oil exploration might be outside the inscribed property, oil drilling anywhere in the lake might affect the OUV of the property due to the risk of an oil spill and other pollution which could impact of the entire lake ecosystem, including the property.

b) *Inadequate size of the property*

IUCN notes that the property is a small serial site (94 km²), with 17 components clustered around the Cape Maclear Peninsula in the southern part of the lake. Less than 10% of its area covers aquatic habitats, which are the basis of its inscription on the World Heritage List, representing just 0.02% of the lake's total area. The property is consequently small and geographically limited to protect the full range of unique endemic fish species, many of which are confined to individual islands or quite small areas of habitat throughout the lake. Furthermore, the small size of each component of the serial site makes them vulnerable to

threats from outside the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the three States Parties which share Lake Malawi (Malawi, Mozambique and Tanzania) should be encouraged to explore the opportunities to extend the property so as to protect a more fully representative area of the lake's habitats, endemic species and associated evolutionary processes. They note that the State Party of Mozambique has made commendable recent efforts to protect its part of the lake by creating a major new reserve with designated zones to allow for total protection.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that, whilst the area where oil exploration activities have been approved lies outside the World Heritage property, the risks associated with oil drilling anywhere in the lake could affect the entire lake ecosystem and represent a significant threat to the unique assemblage of endemic fish species, other biodiversity and associated evolutionary processes, which are the basis for the property's inscription on the World Heritage List.

Considering the ecological and geographical limits of the present property, the growing pressures on the lake's resources, and the potential threat of oil drilling in the lake, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that the States Parties of Malawi, Mozambique and Tanzania should be encouraged to explore the potential for a transnational extension of the property. An extended property should include a larger and more representative area of the lake, including parts of the rocky lake-shore and islands that host unique endemic fish fauna and support associated evolutionary processes not yet represented, across the length and breadth of the lake.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the property has never been visited by a reactive monitoring mission since its inscription on the World Heritage List in 1984. With the oil exploration and integrity concerns, they consider it is appropriate to request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.5

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Expresses its concern about oil exploration activities in Lake Malawi, and considers that oil drilling poses a potentially severe risk to the integrity of the entire lake ecosystem, including the aquatic zone and shoreline of the property and reiterates that mining, oil and gas exploration and exploitation are incompatible with World Heritage status;*
3. *Urges the State Party of Malawi to ensure that no oil exploration or exploitation is carried out in Lake Malawi until a full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) has been carried out;*
4. *Requests the State Party to provide full details of the proposed oil exploration activities, including a map of the concession area and details of the activities, operations and environmental safeguards envisaged as well as copies of the ESIA mentioned above, for review by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
5. *Commends the State Party of Mozambique for recently declaring its portion of the lake as a reserve, with designated zones providing total protection of species in some areas;*

6. *Encourages the States Parties of Malawi, Mozambique and Tanzania to initiate a technical study/studies to ascertain the most significant localities throughout the lake for endemic fish species, other biodiversity and evolutionary processes, with a view to protecting these localities and possibly incorporating them into an extended trans-national World Heritage property;*
7. *Also requests the State Party of Malawi to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to review the state of conservation of the property, in particular the potential impacts of oil exploration on the Outstanding Universal Value of Lake Malawi, other potential threats and concerns related to the integrity of the property;*
8. *Further requests the State Party of Malawi to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including the requested information on the oil exploration activities, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

ARAB STATES

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1996

Criteria
(ix) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/506/documents>

International Assistance
Total amount granted: USD 35,000
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/506/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
2013: World Heritage Centre mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

1.
Illustrative material
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/506>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 28 February 2013, the World Heritage Centre wrote a letter to the State Party to request more information about a number of ongoing developments that were brought to its attention, including offshore hydrocarbon exploration, the extension of the Taziast gold mine, an exploration permit for gold and related substances in the Tanoudert area, the possible expansion of the iron ore production site near Cap Blanc, various activities related to the construction of the Nouakchott – Nouadhibou road, the establishment of a new city north of Chami, and a number of developments in the municipality of Nouamghar within the property. On 28 March 2013, the State Party submitted a detailed report in response to this letter.

a) *Offshore hydrocarbon exploration*

The State Party notes that the only currently active hydrocarbon exploitation site is the site of Chinguetti, which has been exploited since 2006 and is located 80 km offshore. It reports that its national production of hydrocarbons has decreased tenfold between 2007 and 2011, reducing the risk of environmental impacts. It also notes that any proposal for the development of a hydrocarbon exploitation project is subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) which has to be approved by both Ministries responsible for the environment and for energy. The State Party further notes that the biggest threat lies in the transportation of hydrocarbons, of which between 400 to 500 million tonnes are shipped

through Mauritanian waters each year. It recognizes that an accidental oil spill would have major and possibly irreversible consequences for certain marine and coastal ecosystems, as well as for the Mauritanian economy which relies significantly on the income generated by fisheries. The State Party reports that, in an effort to address these concerns, the park management has recently (March 2013) started a process to classify part of the Mauritanian Exclusive Economic Zone as a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA), which is supported by the World Heritage Centre, through its Marine programme.

b) Mining exploration and exploitation

The State Party reports that according to the 2013 National Environmental Profile of Mauritania (Profil Environnemental du Pays – PEP), all mining operations in Mauritania disturb the natural environment and use products that are often very toxic and damaging to the balance of ecosystems if used without sufficient control. The PEP also states that the annual (brackish) water consumption of the Taziast gold mine is estimated at 5.11 million cubic metres. The State Party states that an extension of this mine would result in an eight to tenfold increase in its activities, which could result in a water consumption of 36.5 million m³/annum by 2014. It notes that a study of the hydrographic network and its connections to the property is currently being prepared to mitigate the impacts of the infiltration of up to 100,000 m³/day of sea water in addition to the current situation. The EIA for phase 3 of the extension of the Taziast mine is on-going, and the public consultation process has recently been completed, including representatives of the park. The State Party considers that the drainage of sea water towards the extension of the Taziast mine contributes to reducing the pressure on the Bénichab water table, which is separated from the sea by only 7 km.

c) Intensification of fishing activities

The State Party reports that the ever increasing fishing activities outside the property are resulting in the overexploitation of a majority of fish stocks. The increase is demonstrated by the increase in the number of canoes from 2000 in the early 1990s to 7000 in 2012, and the increase in catch sizes from 15,000 tonnes in 1994 to more than 180,000 tonnes in 2010. More than 40% of the artisanal fishing fleet in the Mauritanian Exclusive Economic Zone operate in the immediate proximity of the property, and artisanal fishing camps are increasingly contiguous with the North and South boundaries of the property. To address this situation, a national plan for the management and development of artisanal and coastal fisheries (PADPAC) has been adopted, in order to match fishing capacities and catch potential. The State Party also notes several measures to prevent illegal fishing, including an expected increase in surveillance activities through the procurement of two new speedboats in 2013 and 2014, and the construction of a new control post at Cap Saint Anne in the extreme North of the Park.

d) Indirect impacts from the Nouakchott – Nouadhibou road, including the establishment of a new city north of Chami, and various developments in the municipality of Nouamghar

The State Party states that the impacts from the Nouakchott – Nouadhibou road have already been assessed upon its construction, and that they are being considered in the short term and long term management policies of the property. It notes that the EIA and subsequent studies have considered the opportunities for agglomeration offered by this road. The ongoing construction of a new city (la Moughataâ de Chami), which in future will house the administrative headquarters of the Park, is given as an example. The State Party indicates that among the positive impacts of this city will be the creation of development opportunities for the Imraguen people, in compensation for their current isolation in enclaves in the Park. It notes that for the same reasons, a road is currently being constructed to connect the village of Mamghar to the Nouakchott – Nouadhibou road. However, the State Party recognizes that the construction of this additional road has not been subject to an EIA.

Following public outcry the road works have been stopped, in order to put in place all the necessary measures to reduce its environmental impacts, including the completion of an EIA.

The State Party emphasizes that the 2010 – 2014 Management Plan for the property foresees the construction of infrastructure to open up isolated communities.

Concerning other developments in the municipality of Nouamghar, including a wind farm, a low voltage electricity network, two desalination plants, a water reservoir, a drinking water distribution network, and two ice factories, the State Party notes that the park authorities have foreseen the reinforcement of their marine monitoring system in the Southern perimeter of the property, in light of expected impacts from these developments, particularly in terms of an intensification of fisheries. It also notes the implementation of environmental communication and education programmes in Chami, Cap Blanc and Mamghar, which are open to the public.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the information provided by the State Party, and recommend that the World Heritage Committee commend the State Party for its swift response. They note with appreciation that the State Party has taken a number of measures to address some of the issues raised by the World Heritage Centre in its letter. However, concern remains about the pressure of fishing activities, the mining as well as the reported intensification of exploration for hydrocarbons throughout the Exclusive Economic Zone of Mauritania. They note that the additional 100 000 m³/day of water to be transported to the Taziast mine would reportedly be sourced far enough outside the property to avoid impacts, it would however end up its course in a hydrographic network that is intimately linked to that of the property, increasing the risk of cyanide poisoning. They also note that the State Party did not provide further information on the reported exploration permit for gold and related substances that was granted for the Tanoudert area, outside but immediately adjacent to the property. They are of the view that if prospecting activities commence, this would further increase pressure on the hydrography of the property, either directly through consumption of fossil water, or indirectly through the contamination of the water table with (possibly polluted) salt water. They further note that the State Party did not provide any information on the projected increase in the iron ore production capacity of the Société Nationale Industrielle et Minière (SNIM) by 2018, which would require the expansion of their production site near Cap Blanc. While the Satellite Reserve of Cap Blanc is not part of the property, the possible consequences of such an expansion (increased turbidity, changes in the physical and chemical composition of the marine environment, risk of red tides due to increased iron content) would clearly have a high impact on its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), as it is noted in the Statement of OUV with regards to criterion (ix) that the ecological processes at PNBA are “the result of the permanent upwelling of the Cap Blanc”. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note that it is not clear whether the various developments in the municipality of Nouamghar have been subject to EIAs, and they consider that the intensification of surveillance, while welcome, on its own is unlikely to mitigate all impacts from these developments. They note the importance for the State Party to improve living conditions of communities living in the park but conclude it is critically important to develop a strategic plan that clearly illustrates the socio-economic needs within the park and identifies the required infrastructure to meet those needs without negatively impacting the OUV of the property.

In light of the various developments and threats noted above, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee request the State Party to invite an IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property, which should assess the potential impacts from the mining, fisheries and oil exploration on the OUV of the property and the measures taken to mitigate them, and make recommendations for the continued protection of the OUV of the property.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.8

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **33 COM 7B.11**, adopted at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009),
3. Commends the State Party for its rapid response to the letter from the World Heritage Centre, requesting further information on a range of concerning developments within the property and in its vicinity;
4. Notes with serious concern the reported increases in mining and hydrocarbon exploration and exploitation in close proximity to the property, reiterates that mining and oil and gas exploration and exploitation are incompatible with World Heritage status, and requests the State Party to take all necessary measures to ensure that any such activities in the vicinity of the property do not impact negatively on its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV);
5. Welcomes the information provided by the State Party that work on the road that would connect the village of Mamghar with the Nouakchott – Nouadhibou road has been halted, pending the implementation of a number of ministerial conditions, and also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre copies of the Environmental Impact Assessments for this road and the other developments in the municipality of Nouamghar, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
6. Further requests the State Party to notify the World Heritage Committee of any development that might negatively impact the property before any decisions are taken that are difficult to reverse, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
7. Also notes with concern the reported increases in fishing activities and the resulting reductions in fish stocks, and encourages the State Party to continue providing adequate financial and material resources to the park authorities in order to prevent illegal fishing within and in the immediate surroundings of the property;
8. Requests furthermore the State Party to invite an IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property, in order to assess the potential impacts from mining, fisheries and oil exploration on the OUV of the property and the measures taken to mitigate them and provide recommendations for the continued protection of its OUV;
9. Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including a report on progress with the implementation of the above requests, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

9. Socotra Archipelago (Yemen) (N 1263)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2008

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/1263/documents>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

December 2012: IUCN mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Legal frameworks, governance and management systems;
- b) Ground transport infrastructure: roading;
- c) Livestock grazing: sheep, goat and cattle;
- d) Invasive species;
- e) Fishing and collection of marine resources;
- f) Solid waste: primarily in and around main settlements.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1263>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

In November 2012, IUCN conducted a mission in follow up to the property's inscription on the World Heritage List in 2008 (Decision **32 COM 8B.5**), and assessed the progress achieved by the State Party in the implementation of the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee. The mission report is available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM>. The mission reported on the key issues as follows:

a) *Governance and Management*

The mission noted that an overall governance framework of the property, including a set of five Cabinet decrees setting the strategic goals and actions adopted by the government of Yemen for Socotra, was in place. However, little evidence was found of a systematic management planning framework geared towards long term protection and sustainability. Socotra seems to have been subject to a period of stagnancy which started soon after the inscription.

No concrete progress has been made towards establishment of an independent authority for Socotra mandated to oversee the Archipelago's management and protection. The current capacity of the Environment Protection Authority is below the minimum level of human and financial resources as well as law enforcement powers needed to ensure the effective management of the property. The property management plan has not been reviewed or developed in response to its inscription on the World Heritage List. The buffer zones of the property also lack adequate regulations and management systems needed to achieve functionality as a shock absorber to threats approaching the property.

b) *Road Construction*

The mission identified the road construction issue as a main threat to the conservation status of Socotra. Specifically, roads lead to the complete destruction of the lands over which they run, and can significantly alter additional lands from which road building material is sourced. Poorly constructed roads also lead to the risk of erosion and landslides, as already observed by the mission within the property. Roads also facilitate the propagation of introduced

species and ease of access for illegal activities. The mission noted that most of the 450km of roads constructed in the Archipelago were constructed with minimal environmental or social safeguards and precautions. However, it reported that road construction had ceased since late 2010 due to political instability and economic constraints. However, there is no guarantee that the construction works will not be reactivated in the future. The mission further reported that there seemed to be a high level of awareness and commitment among the Government to mitigate the negative impacts of roads and to adopt a new set of guidelines and procedures for road construction and other infrastructure development fully responsive to Socotra's World Heritage status.

c) *Livestock Grazing*

Many biodiversity and conservation experts identify the issue of grazing as the key factor negatively impacting the conservation of the property. The mission noted excessive grazing levels evident throughout the main island of Socotra. Currently, there is no capacity to assess the actual level of grazing impact on the biodiversity and rangeland productivity of the Archipelago. The mission noted a lack of systematic approach towards addressing the grazing impacts. They also concluded that little could be done to address the grazing challenges at the current stage of economic and social circumstances. This is due to the socio-economic sensitivity of the activity for local people and the fact that the islands have gone through consecutive years of severe drought and low productivity. The mission concluded that the grazing issue represented an ongoing and possibly expanding challenge facing the property in the main island of Socotra specifically, and possibly the island of Abdul Kori.

d) *Invasive Species*

The mission did not document any concrete actions taken by relevant authorities to deal with alien species import or native species export. This includes the inability to control the numerous access points on the island. The Environmental Protection Authority currently has limited capacity on the island to enforce such controls, especially after 2008, which marked an amplification of the problem. It is noted that the status is even more challenging for the outer islands of the Archipelago where almost no information is available and very little control is exerted.

e) *Tourism Development*

The mission concluded that tourism did not represent for the time being a major issue for the conservation of the Archipelago. Nevertheless, it is recognized as a potential future threat, especially considering the lack of tourism strategy for the property, the limited capacities of relevant authorities to manage tourism, the low levels of management infrastructure and facilities, and lack of control systems and monitoring protocols.

Visitor numbers were increasing between 2008 and 2010 but declined upon the political crisis in Yemen. Visitor numbers could easily pick up again after the foreseen period of stability, hence a clear strategic approach is required for future management and development.

f) *Marine Resource Exploitation*

Fishing and other forms of collection of aquatic resources were identified by the IUCN mission, local communities and scientific experts as a continuing threat and issue for the conservation of the property. The effect is amplified by the increase of security problems in the Indian Ocean and the limited law enforcement capacities of the Archipelago authorities to respond. Further, the issue related to dead coral collection and export to neighbouring countries does not seem to have been resolved considering economic perspective and impact on coastal zones.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the strong governance framework developed for Socotra upon its inscription. The 2008 Cabinet Decrees represent a firm commitment from the Government of Yemen to safeguard Socotra and adopt a strategy for its protection and sustainable development. It seems however, that this commitment has been greatly challenged by development pressure in 2009 and 2010. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that, if the construction of new or unfinished roads within the core biodiversity areas is resumed, it would pose a serious potential threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in line with paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note the continuation of several key issues with high impacts on the long term conservation and sustainability of the property's natural values and associated cultural attributes. These include the absence of a management system for the property supported by adequate levels of human and financial resources, the continuing impacts from past road construction, current livestock grazing, alien species introduction, solid waste accumulation, and marine resources exploitation, in addition to the potential impacts of unsustainable tourism and visitation.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note the limited capacities of the national and local authorities to adopt a management framework associated with clear programmes for law enforcement, monitoring, documentation and awareness-raising. This represents a key impediment to the long term protection and sustainability of the property's biodiversity and natural resources. They note that a positive outcome of the mission is a partnership between IUCN and the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage to provide additional capacity building to the property.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.9

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 8B.5**, adopted at its 32th session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Welcomes the State Party's formal pledge to conservation of the property through reconfirming commitment to the full implementation of the 2008 Cabinet Decrees addressing the various challenges facing the property;*
4. *Notes the challenging period the State Party is facing which hindered its ability to activate and follow up on the agreed strategies and actions for the conservation of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to immediately devise and adopt an action plan for the full activation and implementation the 2008 Cabinet Decrees;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to commence the establishment of an independent management authority mandated for the management and long term sustainable development of the property;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to ensure that the road network in the property is not expanded and that the road master plan is revised in line with the property's zoning plan, with a particular focus on mitigating impacts from existing roads;*

8. Urges the State Party to implement the other recommendations of the 2012 IUCN mission, including:
 - a) Put in place an effective biodiversity monitoring system with the objective to assess the current impacts of other threats, such as cattle grazing and invasive species, and devise threat specific strategies to ensure their minimal long term impacts,
 - b) Adopt a strategy on strengthening the marine enforcement capacity supported by a clear policy framework,
 - c) Undertake a comprehensive tourism carrying capacity assessment and establish a monitoring system to ensure tourism sustainability and its minimal impact on the natural heritage and associated cultural values of the Archipelago,
 - d) Develop and implement a tourism development and marketing strategy for the Archipelago in collaboration with local and international private sectors;
9. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2015**, a report on the progress made with the improvement of the management of the property and in addressing key conservation challenges and opportunities, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.

ASIA-PACIFIC

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2003

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/1083/documents/>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
April 2006 UNESCO/IUCN joint reactive monitoring mission; April 2013 IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Dams;
- b) Boundary modifications;
- c) Mining;
- d) Signage;
- e) Management planning.

Illustrative material
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1083>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 17 January 2013, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012). The State Party report provides information on hydropower dam construction and mining in the vicinity of the property, and the overall management of the property. An IUCN reactive monitoring mission visited the property from 15 to 25 April 2013 to assess these same issues. The mission report is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM/>.

a) *Hydropower development*

The State Party notes that 13 large hydropower dams are proposed along the major rivers which give the property its name. The status of planning is detailed in a table, which had been submitted to the World Heritage Centre in almost identical form with a letter dated 27 November 2012. According to this table, overall hydropower planning in the three watersheds dates back to at least the year of inscription.

A series of planned hydropower dams along the Nujiang River has been the focus of considerable controversy for several years. After the highest level of government had temporarily suspended the project pending further study, planning has since resumed with four dams under discussion in Northwest Yunnan. While the individual Environmental Impact

Assessment (EIA) has been concluded for the proposed Liuku site, the EIAs for the other dams are either pending or awaiting finalization and none has been approved. According to the State Party no dam construction on the Nujiang River is taking place, which the mission was able to confirm.

The situation is, however, less clear as regards the six planned dam projects on the Lancang River in Northwest Yunnan. In particular, the mission noted and documented major construction activities at the two dam sites visited, Lidi and Wulongnong. Areas of apparent inconsistency with the State Party report were evident when representatives of the governmental Hydro Lancang Company stated to the mission that preparatory construction on the Lidi dam site started as early as 2009. Final approval for construction was reportedly granted in February 2013, i.e. just after submission of the State Party report. In the case of the proposed Wulongnong site, major construction has very obviously been taking place for some time. This is described as "preparatory construction" in the State Party report. The EIA status for this dam proposal was reported by the State Party as not formulated in November 2012. The corresponding section is left blank in the updated table provided in the report dated January 2013. Company representatives explained that approval for preparatory construction was granted by provincial authorities, while final approval for construction from the central government remains pending.

The excerpts of the EIAs refer to a large number of dams along the Jinsha River and describe the basin as the largest energy base of China, leaving no doubts about the scale of the planned hydropower development being contemplated. According to the State Party report, no EIA has been formally approved for any of the 3 hydropower projects on the Jinsha River near the property. Nevertheless, preparatory construction is reported to have started at the Liyuan dam site east of the Haba Snow Mountain component. The situation appears to be consistent with the Wulongnong site, i.e. provincial level approval appears to have enabled preparatory construction despite pending EIA completion and subsequent approval. None of the proposed dam sites on the Jinsha River could be visited by the mission due to time constraints.

The key position of the State Party in its report and during the reactive monitoring mission is that none of the components of the serial property or buffer zones are directly affected by the proposed dam construction. The location of dams, reservoirs, road access and future transmission corridors is reported to be physically located outside of the property and its buffer zones. The lack of connection between the property and the hydropower plans is a function of the boundary design of the property, which covers almost exclusively high altitude terrain of the Heng Duan Mountains. The only river to flow through the property's core zone is the Lancang, crossing one of the 15 components, whereas the Nujiang River crosses its buffer zone, and the Jinsha River runs along part of the boundary of the property's buffer zone.

In the view of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, this position of the State Party is formally accurate. Based on a review of the written information provided by the State Party and from selected site visits there are no indications that construction of dams and/or associated infrastructure is planned or occurring within any components or buffer zones of the property. They note, however, that physical location and altitudinal distance alone are insufficient criteria to assess ecological impacts, given the complex and well-documented ecological linkages in the landscape. Examples of the complexity that need to be considered include the linkages between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and habitats and the impacts of physical barriers and disturbance on wildlife corridors along rivers and consequently on landscape connectivity. Such matters need to be considered as part of the assessment of impacts on Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) in a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), and the individual EIAs of such schemes.

Two further aspects deserve to be highlighted. Firstly, the scenic beauty of the deep river gorges recognized under criterion (vii) could be significantly impacted, through changes

outside the property boundaries. Second, the ongoing preparatory construction occurring at three dam sites prior to EIA approval is of significant concern given that the World Heritage Committee had explicitly urged the State Party to avoid such situations (Decision **36 COM 7B.9**).

b) *Mining*

In its report, the State Party reaffirms its unambiguous commitment to refrain from granting any further permits for mining operations within the property and its buffer zones. The State Party does not state whether its reaffirmed commitment includes exploration licenses. Other statements referring to legal mining require further clarification, including a statement that "a certain area outside the property will be delineated as no-mining zone where mining rights will not be approved". The methods underpinning such delineation are not specified and there is likewise a need to clarify that this commitment extends to all mining rights, including exploration licenses. The relationship of the planned delineation with existing buffer zones also requires clarification.

Statements regarding mining rights that have existed in the adjacent areas and buffer zones before inscription indicate the existence of such rights but fail to specify their scale and/or location. According to the State Party report, international standards regarding the environment and human health are to be applied; however specific information on this aspect is required. It is important to remember the highly particular history of the property in terms of mining, where prospecting and mining licenses predating the establishment of protected areas and the World Heritage inscription had not been noted in the evaluation and inscription processes and were excluded from the property through the approval of a minor boundary modification in 2010.

The mission visited the tailings disposal site of a former mine, and a large copper mining operation in the excised area located between the Hongshan and the Haba Snow Mountain components of the property and met with private and governmental company representatives. Two other mining projects nearby could not be visited due to snow conditions. The State Party confirmed a total of four current mining and prospecting projects between the two above components. On location, a map was provided by the property's management authorities suggesting that some 20 prospecting licenses jointly cover most of the land between the Hong Shan and the Haba Snow Mountain components. While the State Party and company representatives insisted that prospecting is unlikely to take place across the entire area licensed for exploration, the scale and location of possible operations raise serious questions in terms of possible future impacts on the connectivity between the two components. IUCN notes that environmental monitoring of prospecting and mining, as described to the mission, appears to focus on technical aspects of air and water pollution, whereas impacts on wildlife do not appear to be monitored at present.

Another concern expressed by the non-governmental observers is illegal mining. Governmental representatives and consulted scientists acknowledged the past occurrence of illegal mining but suggested that it has been brought under better control over the last years. At the same time, it was acknowledged that small-scale mining operations may locally continue within the property in violation of clear guidance from the central government. Independent reports on alleged illegal gold mining near Mount Kawagebo, where the Baimang-Meili component of the property borders the Tibet Autonomous Region, were not able to be reviewed by the mission. While the State Party reported that it was not aware of any current mining there, further clarification on this is necessary.

c) *Overall management and management effectiveness*

The Three Parallel Rivers is a large serial property inevitably posing significant management challenges. Over the decade since inscription, the State Party has made substantial investments in improving management. According to documentation and briefings provided to the mission, the management structure is reasonably well established and is being progressively refined. Room for improvement is acknowledged by the State Party and

appears ever more important given the increasing development pressures around the property.

Designing and implementing a comprehensive and rigorous Management Effectiveness Assessment (MEA) was beyond the scope of the reactive monitoring mission. It was, however, feasible to obtain and document informed impressions. There was widespread agreement on the usefulness of an in-depth MEA. Entry points and options for cooperation between the State Party and IUCN were openly discussed during the mission drawing on existing IUCN guidance and the experience gained through the Enhancing our Heritage initiative (EoH). As detailed in the mission report, a full MEA would amount to a medium size project and would require corresponding funding. The beneficiaries of a possible MEA include governmental officials at all levels and the civil society.

Specific areas which would benefit from a comprehensive MEA include (i) lines of decision-making and leadership given the institutional complexity and overlap; (ii) effectiveness of conservation measures for the attributes of the OUV, (iii) site design, including connectivity and the feasibility of including additional areas of high conservation value in the vicinity of the property, (iv) tourism and recreation in light of ambitious development plans; and (v) linkages with and management implications of major development schemes in the broader region. More specific topics, which have received little previous attention, include the development of practical approaches to wildlife monitoring and management responses to reportedly increasing human-wildlife conflicts, in particular crop damage.

In that regard, the mission noted reports that wildlife populations appear to have been depleted in parts of the property, and considers this, and the causes requires further consideration.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN draw the Committee's attention to the vast scale of the planned hydropower development, which will no doubt lead to significant ecological and other changes in and beyond Northwest Yunnan, where the property is located. The 13 dams planned in the vicinity of the property are part of China's West-East Electricity Transfer Project. Many more than the reported 13 dams are planned along the mainstreams and tributaries of all three rivers, in particular in neighbouring Tibet Autonomous Region and Sichuan Province. In addition, there are hydropower plans in downstream countries along the Nujiang and the Lancang Rivers and elsewhere along the Jinsha River. The possible indirect and cumulative impacts of this scale of development on the OUV of the property require careful evaluation.

In the view of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, and in line with the findings of the World Commission on Dams, a project of this scale requires a profound assessment and understanding of benefits versus impacts, costs and risks and this is well beyond the scope of assessment possible through reactive monitoring within the framework of the *World Heritage Convention*. IUCN was provided with excerpts from some of the EIA, and noted that these make no reference to assessment standards or methodologies. The conclusions provided on a number of topics appear somewhat general, simplistic and an adequate evidence base for some conclusions is not apparent. In the absence of reliable wildlife data, the reference and basis for the various statements on wildlife populations seem unclear at best. Some conclusions are drawn based on vague and unsubstantiated causal links, or simply not justified at all. There is also no indication that World Heritage status has received any specific consideration. References to mitigation in the EIA reviewed are not sufficiently specific or justified. IUCN considers that the quality and depth of the EIAs as presented to the mission appear fundamentally incompatible with the scale of the individual projects and significant doubts remain on whether the available information base allows for responsible decision-making at this stage.

At present, EIAs for 10 out of the 13 listed dam projects are either not concluded or not approved. Furthermore, the State Party reports that relevant state departments continue to be engaged in in-depth research. The mission observed with concern that preparatory construction appears to start in many cases prior to EIA approval. It appears that major investments are being made in the absence of a concluded EIA, indicating high confidence in positive EIA outcomes, even before these have started. Moreover, the approval and construction of transmission infrastructure appears disconnected from the actual dams and however no plans for the exact location of the transmission lines could be obtained during the mission. There appears to be no overall consideration of the impacts of the multiple dams (cumulative impacts), let alone in combination with other development projects in the region, including but not limited to mass tourism.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to commit to a much more in-depth and strategic understanding of the consequences, costs and risks of the "West-East Electricity Transfer Project" through a SEA, including a specific focus on the OUV of the property, as well as wider environmental and social impacts prior to making final decisions. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are willing to assist the State Party with the identification of any technical expertise required to support the preparation of such a SEA.

In terms of mining, it is recommended that the Committee request that the State Party extend its commitment to the property, and ideally, to the buffer zones to explicitly include exploration licenses. They also recommend that the Committee request the State Party to ensure monitoring and full consideration of connectivity concerns in possible future prospecting and mining near the property, and to provide a map depicting all exploration licenses between the Hongshan and the Haba Snow Mountain components, as well as a map illustrating any existing mining and/or exploration licenses near the property predating its inscription, to ensure that none overlap with the property.

As regards management effectiveness, the elaboration of an in-depth MEA was beyond the scope of the mission, but is a recommended action following the EoH methodology. Despite noteworthy investments and progress, the State Party acknowledges the usefulness of further analysis as a basis for increased management effectiveness in the future. The mission report provides specific guidance in this regard, and including a range of key issues aside from the impacts of infrastructure that require further consideration.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note with concern the apparent decline in wildlife populations noted by the mission, and they recommend that the Committee request the State Party to develop and implement a systematic wildlife monitoring programme, to inform about the status and trends of populations of key species, as well as poaching activities. Such a monitoring programme should provide a firm basis for the identification and implementation of measures to allow for the recovery of wildlife populations in the property.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.12

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.9** adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Notes with concern that the depth and quality of the Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) appear to be incompatible with the scale and complexity of the planned hydropower development that may affect the property;*

4. Also notes with concern that preparatory construction has advanced in the absence of approved EIAs in several locations, and reiterates its request to the State Party not to proceed with project implementation prior to appropriate EIAs being completed;
5. Requests the State Party to conduct a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the West-East Electricity Transfer Project, including a thorough assessment of its direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, and encourages the State Party to seek the assistance of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for the identification of technical expertise to support the preparation of such a SEA;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit maps of all licenses related to mining in the region surrounding the property, and including the area between the Hongshan and Haba Snow Mountain components of the property, to ensure that none overlap with the property;
7. Further requests the State Party to ensure and monitor ecological and landscape connectivity in the area between the Hongshan and Haba Snow Mountain components of the property, including areas included in prospecting licenses;
8. Urges the State Party to ensure no mining activities, including prospecting and illegal mining, takes place within the property or in adjacent areas if this would impact the OUV of the property;
9. Requests furthermore the State Party to undertake by **1 December 2014** a Management Effectiveness Assessment of the property, possibly using the “Enhancing Our Heritage” methodology, and considering the recommendations noted in the April 2013 IUCN reactive monitoring mission report;
10. Also urges the State Party to develop and implement a systematic wildlife monitoring programme, to inform about the current status and trends of the populations of key species, as well as poaching activities, and to serve as a basis for the formulation and implementation of measures that would facilitate the recovery of wildlife populations;
11. Requests moreover the State Party to implement the other recommendations of the April 2013 IUCN reactive monitoring mission report;
12. 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, including progress achieved in the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1999

Criteria
(viii) (ix) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions

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

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 41,400

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/955/assistance>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2004: IUCN mission; 2008: UNESCO/IUCN Joint Reactive Monitoring Mission; 2011: UNESCO/IUCN Joint Reactive Monitoring Mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

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

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

Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation of the property as requested by Decision **35 COM 7B.15** adopted at the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee (UNESCO, 2011).

In the absence of a report from the State Party and a scarcity of information from other sources about the conservation status of the property, it is unclear if any activities have been undertaken to implement the decision of the World Heritage Committee and the recommendations of the 2008 and 2011 reactive monitoring missions.

a) *Infrastructure development*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011) had expressed its grave concern that road construction within the property had not ceased as repeatedly requested by the Committee. They also recall that road development in the property is driven by a provincial plan to provide an integrated transport programme for the development of new local government areas in Papua. They further recall that following an interdepartmental meeting on 1 April 2011, the Directorate of Highways of the Ministry of Public Works had instructed its regional office in Papua to cease road development in the Lake Habema region until the Ministry of Forestry issued a permit.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note with concern recent media reports dated 16 April 2013, indicating that the Trans-Papua Highway plan is to be revived. They note that within that plan, the proposed Jayapura – Wamena – Mulia road is most likely to negatively impact on the property, especially if it would adopt the route via the globally unique and fragile equatorial alpine and sub-alpine ecosystems of the property, which have already been damaged by road construction of the Lake Habema – Nduga – Kenyem road. They note that the latter road remains a serious and immediate concern. They consider that whilst these impacts have been relatively localised, the damage being done to unique and fragile peat bogs will take hundreds of years to rehabilitate, and if road construction is completed as proposed, large areas of the property will be segmented and opened to other threatening processes including human settlement, illegal logging and poaching, introduction of alien

species and uncontrolled tourist access. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that unless the broader implications of the proposed road development strategy are specifically addressed, the resulting fragmentation of the largely intact wilderness of the property is likely to result in the irreversible loss of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of significant parts of the property.

They recall that the Committee, at its 35th session, urged the State Party to commission a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the integrated transport programme for Papua province as it relates to the property, in order to identify the least environmentally damaging transport options, including alternatives to road building. On 16 April 2013, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party requesting more information about the revival of the Trans-Papua Highway plan, and the measures taken by the State Party to ensure the protection of the property's OUV. At the time of writing of this report, no reply had yet been received from the State Party.

b) *Forest dieback*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the State Party, in its 2011 report to the Committee, acknowledged that the road construction facilitates the spread of *Phytophthora fungus* which causes dieback in temperate *Nothofagus* forest in the vicinity of the Lake Habema road. They also recall that at the time, the State Party stated that investigation and action to address forest dieback was expected to be conducted in 2011-2012. In the absence of a report from the State Party, it is not clear if the expected investigation has taken place, and which, if any, actions are being implemented to address this issue.

c) *Management issues*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the 2010 International Workshop on Effective Management of Lorentz National Park World Heritage site identified a number of management issues, including a lack of implementation of the management policy, local government decentralization, unclear boundaries between regencies, limited communication between stakeholders, lack of World Heritage regulations, limited management capacity, and insufficient detail in the management plan regarding zonation, community traditional rights and use of local/traditional knowledge. They note that although the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan has been adopted, on-ground action has been delayed while a management plan and zonation plan are prepared. These plans were scheduled for completion in 2011 but their current status is unknown. They also recall that the Committee, at its 35th session, considered that the management planning process should be based on the protection of the property's OUV. They recall that the 2011 reactive monitoring mission to the property observed that effective management intervention has been seriously hampered by conflicting objectives for the site between government agencies, different levels of government and customary owners, which generate tensions between national, provincial, regency and local governments so as to constitute an escalating threat to sound management of the property. This renders the Lorentz National Park Bureau virtually powerless to oppose development pressures and customary owners of the park entering into arrangements with provincial and regency governments and their contractors who undertake works in the park contrary to national legislation.

Whilst IUCN has received reports that both management planning and management capacity are improving, concern remains that they are currently inadequate to meet the challenges of such a large and complex area. Key strategies proposed in the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan for participatory planning, protection, biodiversity conservation, cultural heritage conservation and sustainable use appear not to have been implemented. The main reasons for this have previously been identified to be inadequate staff training and inadequate resourcing of on-ground management programmes, combined with overlapping or conflicting jurisdictional issues at all levels of government. In the long term this situation could lead to an increasing threat to the integrity of the property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the property's inscription on the World Heritage List is in part justified by the fact that it is the only protected area in the world which incorporates a continuous, intact transect from snow cap to tropical marine environment. They therefore consider that if the Jayapura – Wamena – Mulia road is constructed through the property, and if construction of the Lake Habema – Nduga – Kenyem road continues, they would represent a clear potential danger to its Outstanding Universal Value in line with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and be a clear basis for the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee regret that the State Party did not provide a report on the state of conservation of the property, without which it is extremely difficult to assess progress achieved by the State Party in the implementation of requests made by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **35 COM 7B.15**. They recommend that the Committee request the State Party to provide a comprehensive report on the current state of conservation of the property, including a detailed report on progress achieved with the implementation of Decision **35 COM 7B.15**, and the 2008 and 2011 mission recommendations, particularly: the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the integrated transport programme for Papua Province as it relates to the property; investigation and treatment of forest dieback, and development of management guidelines to contain the spread of dieback disease; development and implementation of a strategy to engage customary owners in park management decision-making processes; any budget reviews that may have been undertaken to redirect resources to address the major threats to the property's OUV; the current status and, if available, copies of the draft Management Plan and zonation plan; and progress in building the capacity of park staff to manage complex ecological, technical and sociological issues. They also recommend that the Committee consider the need for a further reactive monitoring mission to the property on the basis of an examination of the State Party's report at its 38th session in 2014.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to fully implement the recommendations of the 2010 International Workshop on Effective Management of Lorentz National Park World Heritage Site. Noting concern about the jurisdictional conflicts between national, provincial and local governments and customary owners, they recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to convene a high level national meeting, in cooperation with IUCN and UNESCO, to review in a comprehensive manner the management and governance arrangements between these levels of government and customary owners, in order to facilitate and streamline the coordinated and cooperative management of the property.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.13

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.15**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit its report on the state of conservation of the property, as requested by the Committee at its 35th session;*
4. *Notes with serious concern the reports indicating that the Trans-Papua Highway plan may be revived without a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the integrated transport plan for Papua as it relates to the property having been undertaken, and considers that the continuation of construction of the Lake Habema – Nduga – Kenyem*

road and the proposed Jayapura – Wamena – Mulia road, if built through the property, would represent a clear potential danger to its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) in line with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines, and be a clear basis for the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger,

5. Requests the State Party to provide detailed information about the revival of the Trans-Papua Highway plan, and the measures taken to ensure the protection of the property's OUV;
6. Reiterates its request to the State Party to fully implement the 2008 and 2011 mission recommendations, and to prioritize the following:
 - a) Cease all road construction in the property and rehabilitate recently constructed roads and mitigate their impacts,
 - b) Investigate and address forest dieback, and develop management guidelines for all relevant stakeholders undertaking activities within the property to contain the spread of the dieback disease,
 - c) Develop and implement a strategy to engage customary owners in park management decision-making processes,
 - d) Review the budgeting for the property in order to ensure that resources are directed to address the major threats to its OUV,
 - e) Review the draft Management Plan and zonation plan using protection of OUV as the primary basis for zone allocation,
 - f) Build the capacity of park staff to manage complex ecological, technical and sociological issues;
7. Urges the State Party to convene a high level national meeting, in cooperation with IUCN and UNESCO, to review in a comprehensive manner the management and governance arrangements between national, provincial and local governments and customary owners, in order to facilitate and streamline the coordinated and cooperative management of the property, and to fully implement the recommendations of the 2010 International Workshop on Effective Management of Lorentz National Park World Heritage Site;
8. Calls upon the international community to support the State Party in resolving the severe constraints to the effective operation of the park management including funding, limited monitoring and surveillance equipment, and limited staff capacity and technical expertise;
9. 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, including progress achieved in implementing the recommendations of the 2008 and 2011 missions, as well as the results of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the integrated transport programme for Papua Province, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994; extended in 2000

Criteria

(vii) (viii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

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

International Assistance

Total amount granted (up to 2008): USD 113,395 for management planning support, equipment and training
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/672/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

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

Previous monitoring missions

January 2003 and December 2006: UNESCO/IUCN mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/672>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation problems

On 28 March 2013 the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, providing an overview of progress made in addressing a number of ongoing projects within and adjacent to the property as well as the State Party's response to Decision **35 COM 7B.20**, adopted at the 35 th session of the World Heritage Committee (UNESCO, 2011).

a) *Urban and industrial development*

The State Party reports that several projects within the buffer zone of the property have been completed including Lan Be – Cot 8 sea ringroad, Lan Be – Bai Tho Mountain sea ringroad, Cai Lan Port expansion project and Cam Pha Cement Plant construction. The report from the State Party notes that Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) were approved and their recommendations implemented for each of these projects and that water quality indicators (including for heavy metals, coliform, total suspended solids, pH, oil, turbidity and oxygen demand) remain within the limit of Viet Nam's standards for coastal waters. However, the EIAs or detailed specific information on the impacts of these developments on the property's OUV, as requested by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **33 COM 7B.20**, were not provided.

The State Party also notes that measures continue to be taken to address pollution from commercial and domestic waste and wastewater, but recalls that these are difficult to implement due to the legislative framework of the property and surrounding area. The World

Heritage Centre and IUCN note that an integrated planning approach is needed to address the continuing pressures on the property from water pollution emanating from nearby urban and industrial development. They recall the World Heritage Committee's request in Decision **33 COM 7B.20** that no development having a significant direct or indirect impact on the OUV of the property take place.

b) Tourism management

The State Party reports that there are usually 450 tourist vessels on the property at any one time, 150 of which are equipped with overnight accommodation facilities. It also reports that tourist activities are mainly concentrated in the core area of the property. Investment continues in the maintenance and upgrading of tourism facilities including strengthening the system of signs and information boards in regards to the values of the property. The State Party also reports that the Ha Long Management Department has been instructed to develop the Ha Long Bay Tourist Management Plan for 2013 – 2015, and that the Ha Long Bay Management Department has developed a plan for sustainable use of the Cua Van Cultural Centre (CVCC) from 2013 – 2015, listed as Annexes to the State Party report, but not included in the version received by the World Heritage Centre. As such it remains unclear whether the plan for CVCC includes an assessment of a possible relocation to a less sensitive location in the buffer zone of the property, as recommended by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009).

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN acknowledge the State Party's continued efforts to minimize tourism pressure on the property while continuing to develop tourism opportunities. However, reports received by IUCN indicate that unregulated tourism boats operating in the bay, increasing influx of visitors and an absence of operating regulations contribute to undesirable impacts from tourism in the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain concerned that this has led to a market saturated with irresponsible tour operators unconcerned with environmental issues. Reports received by IUCN indicate that the provincial government has established a tourism inspection force with the involvement of inspectors and police in the tourism, environment, transport and construction departments. However, these reports also indicate that this decision has yet to receive support from tourism enterprises and residents of fishing villages.

c) Absence of an integrated planning approach;

In relation to the Committee's request to further reinforce the Ha Long Bay Management Board (HLBMD), the State Party reports continued efforts to strengthen management and capacity. It outlines a number of efforts to address Management Planning of the property including a Heritage Management Plan 2011 – 2015, the Quang Ninh Province Aquaculture Master Plan 2015, the Ha Long Bay Tourist Management Plan 2013 – 2015, the Ha Long Bay Management Plan 2011 – 2015, and the Ha Long Bay Preservation and Promotion Planning 2020. The State Party notes its intention to request international assistance to carry out a Management Effectiveness Evaluation in line with the "Enhancing our Heritage" toolkit, as recommended by the Committee at its 33rd and 35th sessions.

d) Other conservation issues – population growth

The State Party report details current levels of population within the property as 2400 people in over 600 households in 3 key fishing villages but does not specifically address population growth and efforts to address this issue in areas surrounding the property or within its boundaries. The State Party reports on actions to limit impacts from the existing population including collection of domestic waste, construction of a participatory recirculation system, with support from the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), and efforts to encourage career change for resident fishermen.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that a number of development projects outside the boundaries of the core zone of the property, but within the buffer zone, have been completed. They also note that monitoring of water quality has shown that standards have remained well within legally accepted levels within the property. Based on this information, they conclude that these projects do not appear to have affected the property's OUV, as recently defined in the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (Decision **36 COM 8E**, Saint-Petersburg, 2012). However, they regret that the State Party did not submit Environmental Impact Assessments for these developments as requested by the Committee at its 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 35th (UNESCO, 2011) sessions.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee welcome the various management plans recently developed and currently under development to address these issues, however they consider that the development of individual management plans does not represent an integrated management approach, and therefore makes it extremely difficult to successfully address these multiple pressures in the long term. In that regard, they recommend that the Committee welcome the State Party's intention to request international assistance to conduct a Management Effectiveness Evaluation in line with the "Enhancing our Heritage" toolkit. They expect that the Enhancing our Heritage methodology, if properly carried out, will be a good opportunity to engage the various planning stakeholders in a medium-term effort to devise more integrated planning approaches.

Based on the recently adopted retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for this property, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that the principal features of the property are not significantly threatened at this time. However, the aesthetic values linked to limestone islands dispersed in the sea risks being undermined by: i) excessive and uncontrolled tourism activities and ii) by water pollution from nutrient loading and solid waste emanating from coastal activities, and iii) water pollution by solid and organic wastes emanating from the floating villages and aquaculture activities within the property. They note that these threats, along with continued pressure from population growth and tourism represent an on-going risk to the property and require constant vigilance.

Therefore, they recommend the Committee to encourage the State Party to invite a IUCN reactive monitoring mission to assist the State Party with the design of an action plan for the implementation of an integrated management of the property. The Enhancing Our Heritage Tool kit methodology should provide the framework for the design of the action plan. The mission could ensure that the action plan is the result of a comprehensive stakeholder consultation round with all relevant government agencies and concludes with concrete recommendations, including time schedule, for the establishment of an integrated management of the property by 2015.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.16

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.20** adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Notes that the State Party is yet to submit the plan for the sustainable use of the Cua Van Cultural Centre, and requests the State Party to submit this and other recently developed management related plans to the World Heritage Centre and urges the State

Party to expedite any measures included in the plan to ensure sustainable use of the Centre and to limit tourism impacts on the property;

4. *Welcomes the efforts made by the State Party to develop a number of management plans to address the multiple development, population and tourism pressures affecting the property, but also notes that these do not represent an integrated management approach of the property and its buffer zone, without which it will be extremely difficult to address these pressures over the long-term;*
5. *Welcomes the State Party's intention to request international assistance to undertake a Management Effectiveness Evaluation for the property, in line with the 'Enhancing our Heritage' tool kit;*
6. *Regrets that the State Party did not provide Environmental Impact Assessments on the impacts of the landfill and other major developments recently completed within the buffer zone of the property, but further notes that water quality within the property is reported to be well within national standards;*
7. *Also urges the State Party to ensure that visitor regulations are effectively enforced to limit impacts from tourists in key areas in order to reduce visitor pressure on the property's Outstanding Universal Value whilst enhancing visitor's quality experience;*
8. *Requests the State Party to invite a reactive monitoring mission to the property to be conducted by IUCN before the 38th session of the Committee in 2014, in order to assist the State Party with the design of an action plan for the implementation of an integrated management of the property and its buffer zone and assess progress in the implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee at its 33rd (Seville, 2009) and 35th (UNESCO, 2011) sessions;*
9. *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, including a report on the outcome of the Management Effectiveness Evaluation for the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

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

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

Criteria
(vii) (viii) (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/225/documents/>

International Assistance
Total amount granted: USD 15,000
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/225/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
Total amount granted: financial support from the Participation Programme of UNESCO for development of a strategy for sustainable tourism (2010)

Previous monitoring missions
2002, 2004: Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring missions; 2011: World Heritage Centre reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Developments in the Bansko ski zone;
b) Lack of effective management mechanisms;
c) Boundary issues;
d) Illegal logging.

Illustrative material
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/225>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2013, a comprehensive report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party.

a) *Developments in the buffer zone*

The State Party provides details on five minor construction and reconstruction projects mainly in connection with existing skiing infrastructure which were considered and approved inside the buffer zone of the World Heritage property in 2012 following an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and an Appropriate Assessment (AA) to verify their compatibility with the conservation objectives of Pirin National Park. These developments have been approved as their impacts on the National Park are considered insignificant by the State Party.

The State Party further reports about a proposal by the Bansko Municipality to amend the regime of the Tourism Zone of the current management plan of the National Park, included in the buffer zone of the property to allow further development of Bansko skiing zones, within the area that was excluded from the property and became part of its buffer zone in 2010. This proposed amendment is currently under consideration by the State Party, in line with the relevant legislation.

Additional information was provided by the State Party in a letter dated 23 April 2013, further to an inquiry of the World Heritage Centre concerning the approval of the proposal of Bansko Municipality. The State Party confirmed that on 19 February 2013 the proposal has been considered by the High Ecological Expert Council (HEEC) under the Ministry of Environment and Water, which proposed that the Minister of Environment and Water submit the project for amendment of the management plan, for adoption by the Council of Ministers, after considering the comments of HEEC. The State Party also clarified that at this stage of the process, the proposal does not carry any specific investment proposals and therefore no environmental impact assessments are required. The State party also confirmed that if the proposed amendment is accepted, "this will only allow to further draw up a plan under the Spatial Planning Act, with specific parameters and location of concrete objects, which will be assessed for their impact". At the time of writing this report, the project had not been submitted to the Council of Ministers.

b) *Plans for the establishment of new skiing zones inside the property*

The State Party recalls that no new proposals for the construction of skiing zones inside the property were approved in 2012, and that all issues of importance to the National Park will be considered in the course of the development of a new management plan for Pirin National Park. The State Party stresses that it is aware that the World Heritage status of the property does not allow for ski developments inside its boundary and would lead to its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, but did not provide a clear commitment that no further ski development will be permitted within the property as was requested by the Committee in Decision **36 COM 7B.18** (Saint-Petersburg, 2012).

c) *Regional planning for sustainable development, including nature tourism*

The State Party confirms that the lack of a Master Development Plan for Bansko Municipality has triggered an excessive expansion in the number of beds in this part of the property's buffer zone, and reports that preparation of a Master Development Plan for this municipality, including a SEA taking into account the National Park, has already started. The State Party notes that the 2010 Strategy for Sustainable Nature Tourism will be taken into account in upcoming development processes for municipal Master Plans and the National Park management plan and that an action plan for its implementation with specific activities, timetable and financial framework has been developed.

d) *Demarcation of the property*

The State Party informs that a GPS-based demarcation of the boundaries of the property will be conducted as part of the project "Sustainable Management of Pirin National Park", but provides no expected completion date. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that a timely completion of GPS-based demarcation of the property will be a key prerequisite to ensure that further encroachment of skiing facilities onto the territory of Pirin National Park and the property is prevented.

e) *Impact monitoring and minimization of ski and other activities in the buffer zone*

The State Party announces plans to assess the need and possible approach for monitoring of impacts of skiing and other activities in the buffer zone on the surrounding property, without committing at this stage to initiate such a monitoring programme. The State Party further stresses the existing legal means of controlling the environmental impact of existing buildings and related facilities within the National Park.

f) *Renewal of the management plan of Pirin National Park and tourism implementation plans*

The State Party provides an update on the planned management plan renewal process, which is expected to be approved in 2014. The same is true for tourism implementation plans for Bansko and Dobrinishte buffer zones. The existing management plan of the property will stay in force until then, based on new legislation on the matter.

As mentioned above in this report a proposed amendment to the existing management plan is currently under consideration by the State Party.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that a proposed amendment of the management plan of Pirin National Park, which would permit further skiing developments inside the Bansko buffer zone, is currently under consideration by the State Party. They also take note of the information provided by the State Party that Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIA) and Appropriate Assessments (AA) are to be undertaken with regard to the spatial and technical developments plans which will be developed, if the proposed amendment is approved. They recommend to the Committee to request the State Party to ensure that the proposed amendment does not contradict the 2010 Strategy for Sustainable Nature Tourism and that an appropriate monitoring mechanism for ski and other activities in the buffer zones is put in place, as requested by the Committee, before approval of the proposed amendment of the management plan and any further developments in the buffer zone. They also consider that the ESIA and AA, which would be undertaken with regard to the spatial and technical developments plans mentioned above, should rigorously evaluate the potential impacts on the OUV and in particular the integrity of the property.

They also recommend that the Committee reiterate its request to the State Party to clearly confirm that no further areas within the property, outside the already excluded areas, will be permitted for ski or other similarly high-impact developments. They further recommend that the Committee reiterate its request that the State Party urgently demarcate, communicate and maintain the boundaries of the property and ensure that they are being respected.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.17

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.18** adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Notes that a proposed amendment to the management plan of Pirin National Park which would allow further skiing developments within the buffer zone of the property, is currently under consideration by the State Party;*
4. *Requests the State Party to ensure that the proposed amendment is in line with the 2010 Strategy for Sustainable Nature Tourism and that an appropriate monitoring mechanism is put in place, as requested by the Committee and the 2011 Reactive monitoring mission, before approval of the proposed amendment;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the development of the buffer zone, including consultations with stakeholders, and urges the State Party to ensure that these proposals will not negatively impact the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and in particular the integrity of the property;*
6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to confirm that no further ski development inside the property will be permitted and recalls its position that if any additional development of ski facilities, ski runs, or associated infrastructure within the property are undertaken, the conditions for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger will be fulfilled;*

7. *Urges the State Party to expedite the implementation of the outstanding recommendations of the 2011 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property which have not been fully implemented to date;*
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.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1987

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/419/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/419/>
And <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 4 February 2013 the World Heritage Centre contacted the State Party in reference to information received on plans for directional drilling and hydraulic fracturing by the Shoal Point Energy company in community enclaves surrounded by the World Heritage property. The World Heritage Centre indicated concerns that these exploratory activities could threaten the Outstanding Universal Value, and in particular the integrity, of the property and requested more information.

A response from the State Party on 25 February confirmed that Shoal Point Energy had plans to drill and hydraulically fracture (frack) three onshore-to-offshore test wells in 2013. Exploration activities would begin in the spring of 2013 in one of the enclaves at Sally's Cove, located less than 500 meters from the Gros Morne National Park boundary, and could be extended to other enclaves including St Paul's as well as other locations in the vicinity of the property. The response further noted that a Strategic Environmental Assessment process for the western Newfoundland offshore area adjacent to the Gros Morne National Park would

be undertaken, led by the joint federal-provincial Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board (C-NLOPB). The response indicated that Parks Canada had been invited to participate as a stakeholder to provide input in this process.

The State Party subsequently sent updated information to the World Heritage Centre (received on 8 April), in which they indicated that Shoal Point Energy and Black Spruce Exploration Corp had submitted a project description and draft scoping document for exploratory drilling for the period 2013-2019, and that C-NLOPB had invited relevant federal and provincial agencies to comment on these documents and to indicate whether they had the specialist or expert knowledge necessary to participate in the environmental assessment process. The State Party noted that Parks Canada had confirmed its expertise and desire to participate in the environmental assessment process.

The State Party's communication noted that in addition to the C-NLOPB process, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador would also conduct an environmental assessment and would invite Parks Canada to participate. The State Party also noted the likelihood that the C-NLOPB and provincial environmental assessment processes would be conducted jointly. The second communication reiterated Parks Canada's commitment to participate in all environmental assessment processes.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that plans to drill and hydraulically fracture (frack) three onshore-to-offshore test wells in the immediate vicinity of the property could impact the Outstanding Universal Value and in particular the integrity of the property as a result of pollution, industrial infrastructure and shocks to geological formations.

They recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to complete the Environmental Impact Assessment process to review these impacts and to submit its result for review to the World Heritage Centre before taking a final decision. In particular, it is recommended that the State Party proceed with assessments on the possible impacts of drilling and hydraulic fracturing activities, such as offshore leakage reaching the property, pollutants affecting pristine lakes on the property, and the risk of rock fall from high cliffs caused by shocks during hydraulic fracturing, including areas of the property with high visitation.

They further recommend that a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission be sent to the property to assess potential risks to the Outstanding Universal Value from activities in enclaves surrounded by the property and other areas bordering the property.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.18

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Notes with serious concern the plans to drill and hydraulically fracture (frack) three onshore-to-offshore test wells in the immediate vicinity of the property which could impact the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and in particular the integrity of the property as a result of pollution, industrial infrastructure and shocks to geological formations;*
3. *Urges the State Party to complete the Environmental Impact Assessment process to review the potential impacts on the OUV of the property and to submit a copy of the EIA to the World Heritage Centre, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, prior to making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse;*

4. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess these risks;
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, including the conclusions of the environmental assessment process, for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th Session in 2014.

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

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

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 15,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/754/assistance>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1998: World Heritage Centre monitoring mission; 2001: UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission; 2005: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission; 2011: UNESCO/IUCN Mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of adequate management system;
- b) Uncertain legal protection;
- c) Pollution;
- d) Illegal timber harvesting;
- e) Gas and oil pipeline project across the World Heritage property (issue resolved);
- f) Illegal construction on the Lake shore;
- g) Illegal sale of land;
- h) Tourism development
- i) Lack of mechanism to control waste water discharge.

Illustrative material

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

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 recent developments in relation to issues raised by the Committee.

a) *Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill*

The State Party provides an update of recent developments around the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill (BPPM) and notes that it issued a permission for the discharge of polluting substances into the environment until 16 August 2013, in order to give time for the

Commission established by the Government to prepare scenarios for the future of the plant, including its possible closure. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that this permit seems to be in contradiction to the State Party's commitment made at the Committee's 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) and confirmed to the 2011 high level mission to develop and implement a closed-loop water treatment system by December 2012.

However, on 27 February 2013, the Russian Deputy Prime Minister Arkady Dvorkovich announced plans of the Government of the Russian Federation to gradually shut down BPPM. The Deputy Prime Minister did not specify the timeframe for stopping operations but stated that gradual closure would be possible over a period of a few years. In a meeting on 19 March 2013 at UNESCO, the Ambassador of the Russian Federation to UNESCO and the Vice Governor of the Irkutsk province confirmed that the decision to close the plant had been taken at the highest level and that the World Heritage Centre would be informed in due course of the details of the decision, including the proposed timeline. At the time of preparation of this report, further details were not yet received. Recent media reports indicate that the facility was still operating and discharging wastewater into the lake in March 2013.

b) *Long-term strategy for economic development of Baikalsk based on alternative sources*

The State Party reports that in August 2012 the Federal Target Programme (FTP) "Protection of Lake Baikal and Social and Economic Development of the Baikal Natural Territory for 2012-2020" was approved by the Federal Government. The programme comprises actions to decrease water pollution and solid waste accumulations, including measures to deal with the industrial legacy of solid waste at BPPM, establishment of tourism carrying capacities and regulation of visitation, species conservation, fisheries management and general environmental monitoring, with an overall budget of almost \$ 1.9 billion for the period 2012-2020. Its geographic focus is the entire Baikal Natural Area, not only Lake Baikal and its immediate catchment itself. In the above mentioned meeting the Vice Governor of Irkutsk stressed that following the decision to close BPPM, the programme should bring about the necessary actions to engage the Baikal region in a path of sustainable development.

c) *Development of the Kholodninskoye ore deposit*

The State Party states that mineral exploration in the Central Ecological Zone of the Baikal Nature Area remains prohibited by law, but does not make an unequivocal commitment to not permit any mineral exploration or exploitation works in the future. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received reports that license No. 3965\UDE 13040 TE to mine ore at the Kholodninskoye deposit remains in effect until 10 March 2025.

d) *Special Economic Zones with development of marinas and mountain skiing facilities*

The State Party confirms the establishment of the "Baikal Harbour" Special Economic Zone (SEZ) in the Republic of Buryatia (3,613 ha) and of an additional SEZ "Gate of Baikal" in Irkutsk Region (2,358 ha), both at least partly inside the World Heritage property. The SEZ are focused on tourism development, including mountain skiing and yachting. The report notes that basic infrastructure is being developed already in "Baikal Harbour" SEZ. The development of infrastructure in these zones complies with the Russian Federation's legislation on the protection of Lake Baikal, and the State Party notes that they will include obligatory environmental impact assessments. However, no Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) reports for the developments inside these SEZs have been submitted to the World Heritage Centre, despite the State Party's statement at the Committee's 36th session that an EIA for the "Baikal Harbour" SEZ was being conducted in February/March 2012 and would be submitted to the World Heritage Centre as soon as it was finalized.

e) *Conservation status and management of protected areas that make up the property*

The State Party states that Federal Law No. 365-FZ of 30 November 2011, does not affect the protection status of the protected areas of which the World Heritage property is composed. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that Federal Law No. 365-FZ affects the protection status of Strict Nature Reserves that have Biosphere Polygons,

which includes Barguzinskiy Strict Nature Reserve (BSNR), one of the protected areas included in the property. The State Party indeed refers to changes in the federal law which permit the development of tourism infrastructure inside the Biosphere Polygon but does not specify the exact nature or the extent of tourism infrastructure. The State Party states that these changes would not affect the level of protection of the BSNR. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note, that as the Biosphere Polygon is located entirely within the boundaries of the property, it is necessary to provide details on the proposed developments and assess their potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in line with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

IUCN received reports that on 8 February 2013, the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation registered new Regulations on Baikalo-Lenskiy Strict Natural Reserve (BLSNR), which were developed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and allow for a number of activities that are a potential threat to the property's Outstanding Universal Value, including "firewood and commercial timberharvesting (as part of sanitary cutting)" and the establishment of up to 15 new roads including those to be used by motorized transport (e.g. snow mobiles).

The State Party report provides useful information on the threats and management of the protected areas included in the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the currently highly fragmented management system of the property and reiterate the need for an integrated management plan and land-use planning for the property as requested by decision **36 COM 7B.22**.

f) *Other conservation issues – pollution of the Selenga River and planned dam projects on one of its tributaries*

The State Party reports that pollution of the Selenga river and other tributaries of Lake Baikal remains a problem. Reduced fish and gammarid stocks are observed in the Selenga and specific causes are currently under investigation. The FTP, as well as additional plans of the republic of Buryatia, includes a number of measures to reduce water pollution in the Selenga river. The State Party also mentions a transboundary UNDP/GEF project on "Integrated Natural Resource Management in the Baikal Basin Transboundary Ecosystem", which involves the State Party of Mongolia and from which a reduction of pollution pressure on the property is expected. The State Party further notes the threat from air pollution and acid rain to the biota of the property, particularly to fir and cedar forests. Scientists have highlighted atmospheric transport of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) from the southeast to the property as a potential source.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received reports about plans of the Government of Mongolia to construct at least one dam on the Orkhon river, a main tributary of the Selenga river, and to pump water from there into the Gobi desert. Although these plans appear to be at an early stage only, it has been estimated that discharge of the Selenga river into Lake Baikal could be reduced by up to a third as a result. The Selenga river system itself contributes approximately half of the water input into Lake Baikal.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the decision of the Government of the Russian Federation to shut down the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill (BPPM) but consider that the Committee should request the State Party to submit a clear timeframe and a closure plan including the measures foreseen to address the industrial legacy of the plant. They note that currently BPPM continues to operate without such a system and therefore consider that the closure should happen as soon as possible. They recall the Committee's position that the continued operation of BPPM without adequate measures in place to address the considerable negative environmental impact represents a clear ascertained danger to the property's Outstanding Universal Value in line with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines* (Decision **36 COM 7B.22**).

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that any plan of the Government of Mongolia to construct a dam on a main tributary of the Selenga River, which provides half of the water supply to Lake Baikal could affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and recommend that the Committee request the two State Parties – the Russian Federation and Mongolia - to provide detailed information on the planned developments as well as on the environmental impact assessments which are foreseen to quantify these potential impacts.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the confirmation that mineral exploration remains prohibited in the Central Ecological Zone of the Baikal Nature Area but note that the license for the mining of ore at the Kholodninskoye deposit remains in effect until March 2025, and recall the Committee's established position that mining is incompatible with World Heritage status.

They note the numerous other conservation challenges including on-going and planned developments in the "Baikal Harbour" and "Gate of Baikal" Special Economic Zones; changes to federal legislation that permit development of tourism infrastructure in Barguzinskiy Strict Nature Reserve Biosphere Polygon; reported changes in the regulations in Baikalo-Lenskiy Strict Nature Reserve; pollution of the Selenga river and air pollution. They also recall the recommendation of the 2011 monitoring mission to develop an integrated management plan and land use plan for the property that fully considers all proposed projects, including those inside the Special Economic Zones "Baikal Harbour" and "Gate of Baikal", in order to ensure that they are implemented in a way that is compatible with the Outstanding Universal Value and conditions of integrity of the property. They also recall that the potential impact of these developments on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property should be assessed before a decision is taken to proceed, in line with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.22

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.22**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Welcomes the State Party's decision to close down the Baikalsk Paper and Pulp Mill (BPPM), and urges the State Party to close it **as soon as possible** and submit a clear timeframe and a closure plan including the measures foreseen to address the industrial legacy of the plant;*
4. *Reiterates its position that the continued operation of BPPM without adequate measures in place to address the considerable negative environmental impacts would represent a clear ascertained danger to the property's Outstanding Universal Value in line with paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines;*
5. *Notes with concern the potential impacts on the property from the planned construction of a dam on the Orkhon river in Mongolia and requests the State Parties of the Russian Federation and Mongolia to provide more information on the status of these plans as well as on the environmental impact assessments which are foreseen to quantify these potential impacts, in line with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*

6. Welcomes the confirmation that mineral exploration remains prohibited in the Central Ecological Zone of the Baikal Nature Area but notes with concern that the license for the mining of ore at the Kholodninskoye deposit remains in effect until March 2025;
7. Reiterates that mining is incompatible with World Heritage status, and urges the State Party to cancel the mining license;
8. Expresses its concern on a number of important existing and potential threats to the property in particular on-going and planned developments in the “Baikal Harbour” and “Gate of Baikal” Special Economic Zones, changes to federal legislation that permit development of tourism infrastructure in Barguzinskiy Strict Nature Reserve Biosphere Polygon; reported changes in the regulations in Baikalo-Lenskiy Strict Nature Reserve; pollution of the Selenga river and air pollution;
9. Reiterates its request to the State Party to develop, under the umbrella of the Special Law for Baikal, an integrated management plan and land-use plan for the property that fully considers all proposed projects, including those inside the Special Economic Zones “Baikal Harbour” and “Gate of Baikal”, to ensure that they are implemented in a way that is compatible with the Outstanding Universal Value and conditions of integrity of the property;
10. Also urges the State Party to assess the potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property of the above mentioned projects through an Environmental Impact assessment and submit the results to the World Heritage Centre before a decision is taken to proceed, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
11. 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.

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1998

Criteria
(x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/768/documents/>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
2001: UNESCO/UNDP mission; 2007, 2012: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Impacts of a road project across the property
- b) Gas pipeline construction plans

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/768>
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, providing information on the current status of the gas pipeline project and on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2012 reactive monitoring mission.

a) *Gas pipeline project*

The State Party report states that no decision has been made on the construction of the Altai gas pipeline project through the Ukok Quiet Zone Nature Park, that the construction project has not been developed and that therefore the environmental impact of the pipeline project has not been assessed and maps showing possible and preferable routes are not available. The State Party also states that the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of the Russian Federation is obliged to take measures in order not to allow construction of the gas pipeline through the territory of the property.

However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received information that the Republic of Altai on 2 August 2012 passed a decree 212 N 202 "On amendments to some Decrees of the Government of the Republic of Altai" which allows the "construction and exploitation of linear objects as well as structures that are an integral part of the process, subject to conservation measures to reduce the negative impact on natural systems and their components" in the Ukok Quiet Zone Nature Park. They were also informed that when the decree was published for public consultation on the website of the Republic of Altai prior to its approval, an accompanying explanatory note stated that the decree was developed by the Ministry of Forestry of the Republic of Altai based on the outcomes of a meeting on project development of the Altai gas pipeline, which took place on 13 June 2012, one month after the monitoring mission. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that this amendment significantly weakens the protection status of this component of World Heritage property as it would make the development of the pipeline legally possible. They recall that in accordance with Paragraph 180 b) i) of the *Operational Guidelines* the modification of legal protection status of an area included in a property is considered as a potential danger to its Outstanding Universal Value and a reason for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. On 10 September 2012, 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. So far no reply to the question has been received from the State Party.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also received information, including photographic material, that preparatory survey work on the pipeline route has been continuing inside the property, including in the most restricted protection zone of the Ukok Quiet Zone Nature Park. On 9 April 2013, the World Heritage Centre has sent a letter requesting the State Party to verify this information and provide further details. At the time of drafting this report no response had been received yet from the State Party.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that such activities, if confirmed, would be in contradiction to the request of the World Heritage Committee to the State Party to make an unequivocal decision to abandon the construction of the Altai gas pipeline through the property and to ensure that no further preparatory works are undertaken within the property. Furthermore the State Party did not respond to the Committee's request (Decision **36 COM 7B.25**) to ensure that the pipeline developer Gazprom considers alternative routes, and to

ensure that Environmental Impact Assessments are submitted to the World Heritage Centre for any infrastructure development in or around the property that could affect its Outstanding Universal Value.

b) *Hydro power cascade on Multa River*

On 18 July 2012, the World Heritage Centre requested that the Russian authorities submit to the World Heritage Centre relevant information on the project of a hydro-electric power plant on the Multa River and its potential impact on the World Heritage property in accordance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. In a letter of 26 October 2012, as well as in the state of conservation report, the State Party informs that a project for small scale hydropower development on the Multa River, downstream from the property, has been under discussion for two years, and could potentially constitute a threat to the property. The report notes that no construction has been carried out to date and that the project is at the pre-production stage. The State Party also notes that survey work has been scheduled from June 2012 to August 2013 and that expert examination can only be made after the survey work has been completed.

c) *Progress made in the implementation of other recommendations of the 2012 mission*

The State Party restates previously reported progress with the implementation of the other recommendations of the 2012 mission, including the implementation of the 2009-2015 development and management strategy and the preparation of management plans; the establishment of the non-profit partnership "Council of Lake Teletskoe", continued patrolling efforts, purchase of new equipment and capacity building. Progress is also reported in relation to trans-boundary cooperation with China, Kazakhstan and Mongolia, to enhance the ecological connectivity across the Altai-Sayan Ecoregion; managing visitor pressures, including research into recreational impacts and ecological change of Lake Teletskoe; comprehensive monitoring including of airborne pollution, climate change impacts, animal populations and on-going monitoring of rare and endangered species; and research into climate change revealing glacial reduction and changes in hydrological regimes and the initiation of a strategy for adaptation to climate change.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that while the State Party affirms that no decision has been made on construction of the Altai gas pipeline project through the Ukok Quiet Zone and that the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment would not allow the construction of a gas pipeline through the World Heritage property, preparatory survey work on the pipeline route is reported to continue and a new decree by the Republic of Altai allowing the construction of linear objects seems to create the legal conditions to permit the construction of the pipeline across part of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that in accordance with Paragraph 180 b) i) of the *Operational Guidelines* the modification of legal protection status of an area included in a property is considered as a potential danger to its OUV and a reason for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. They therefore recommend that the World Heritage Committee urge the State Party to ensure that Government of the Altai Republic restores the legal protection status of the Ukok Quiet Zone in line with the protection requirements of the Convention. They further note that this again highlights the weak protection status of regional parks in the Russian Federation and recall the recommendation of the World Heritage Committee to establish a comprehensive national legal framework for the protection and management of natural World Heritage properties in order to ensure the fulfilment of the State Party's obligations under the *Convention*.

They further recommend that the World Heritage Committee reiterates its request to make an unequivocal decision to abandon the construction of the Altai gas pipeline through the property and to ensure that no further preparatory works are undertaken within the property, in line with its previous decisions. They recall the Committee's position (Decisions **32 COM**

7B.22, 35 COM 7B.26 and 36 COM 7B.25) that a decision to proceed with the gas pipeline project through the property would represent an ascertained danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in line with paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and would lead to the property meeting the conditions for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

They recommend furthermore that in line with Paragraph 172, the Committee reiterates the need for an environmental impact assessment to assess the potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value before any proposed hydropower development on the Multa and other rivers that might affect the property is decided.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.25

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.25**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Takes note that no official decision has been made on the Altai gas pipeline project and that the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment would not allow the construction of a gas pipeline through the World Heritage property;*
4. *Expresses its utmost concern about a new decree 212 N 202 dated 2 August 2012 of the Republic of Altai which allows the “construction and exploitation of linear objects as well as structures that are an integral part of the process”, which weakens the legal provisions protecting the property and recalls that in accordance with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines the modification of legal protection status of an area included in a property is considered as a potential danger to its Outstanding Universal Value and a reason for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
5. *Notes with concern reports that preparatory survey works on the pipeline route are continuing within the World Heritage property;*
6. *Reiterates its position that any decision to go forward with the gas pipeline through the property would represent an ascertained danger to its Outstanding Universal Value in line with Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines, and represent a clear case for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
7. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to make an unequivocal decision to abandon the construction of the Altai gas pipeline through the property and urges the State Party to ensure that no further preparatory works be undertaken within the property, and that the Government of the Altai Republic restores the legal protection status of the Ukok Quiet Zone in line with the protection requirements of the Convention;*
8. *Requests the State Party to ensure that Environmental Impact Assessments be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for any infrastructure development in or around the property, including the gas pipeline and hydropower projects, which could affect its Outstanding Universal Value, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*

9. Also requests the State Party to continue its efforts to implement the recommendations of the 2012 reactive monitoring mission;
10. Also reiterates its position that all legal issues concerning natural properties in the Russian Federation, which are composed of federal and regional protected areas, be addressed through a comprehensive national legal framework for the protection and management of natural World Heritage properties in order to ensure the fulfilment of the State Party's obligations under the Convention, and further reiterates its request that the State Party convene a workshop to assist in developing such a framework, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN;
11. 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, **with a view to considering, in the case of the confirmation of ascertained or potential danger to Outstanding Universal Value, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2007, extension 2011

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/1133/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 integrated Management Plan;
- b) Lack of transnational research and monitoring plans;
- c) Need for capacity building.

Illustrative material
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1133/>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN received information from the Council of Europe concerning an expert mission that visited the Poloniny National Park in Slovakia in October 2012 as part of the renewal process of its European Diploma of Protected Areas. Parts of the

park are included in the Slovak component of the property. The reports highlight a number of threats and conservation challenges that the park is confronted to, as described below. In September 2012 the World Heritage Centre and IUCN also received a letter from a Slovak environmental NGO outlining various threats to the Slovak component of the property which was transmitted to the State Party in October 2012.

In response to the letters of the World Heritage Centre of 15 February and 19 March 2013 requesting information on the threats and the measures taken to address them, the State party replied on 28 March 2013 stating that relevant information on the overall situation around the property will be provided to the World Heritage Centre in the State Party's Periodic Report. The State Party also mentioned in the letter that they might ask for assistance of the World Heritage Centre in order to assess the state of conservation of the property and concluded that the Ministry was "*looking for the most appropriate measures for solving problems of the World Heritage property*".

The following conservation issues affecting the property have been identified on the basis of the received information, which relates only to components of the property located in Slovakia, and particularly within Poloniny National Park:

a) *Lack of integrated management*

IUCN notes that although an Integrated Management Plan for the property had been prepared at the time of its nomination, its implementation is not clear nor is its relationship with other forest management plans of several forest reserves that form the Slovak component of the property, which do not take into account the World Heritage status of those component sites and do not provide for sufficient level of protection of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the management challenges pointed out by the Group of Specialists of the European Diploma, who concluded that the management of the park could not be considered exemplary, as required by the regulation of the European diploma. The Group of Specialists recommended that the State Party be requested to immediately start the process of elaboration of an integrated management plan for the Diploma holding area, which would address all land uses and different activities sectors (tourism, hunting) in order to meet its obligations under the Regulations of the European Diploma for Protected Areas. The State Party has been requested to submit the draft management plan by November 2014, place this process under the coordination of a Pilot Committee, ask the Council of Europe for assistance, associate all other relevant international organizations including UNESCO and IUCN, ask also for financial external support if needed, and benefit from external technical expertise. In the event of failure to meet these provisions, the Group of Specialists recommended that the European Diploma be withdrawn immediately.

b) *Unsustainable logging*

According to the information included in the report received from the Council of Europe, the forest management plans of the forest reserves which form the Slovakian part of the World Heritage property provide for logging in those areas. The expert mission concluded that 93% of the Park is under serious pressure from unsustainable logging, as well as hunting and poaching.

c) *Infrastructure development*

The report received from the Council of Europe also mentions several infrastructure projects (e.g. an antenna, roads and mass tourism infrastructures) that are planned in the immediate surroundings of the World Heritage areas.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the report of the Council of Europe, which shows that the Slovak part of the World Heritage property is affected by serious threats that might

impact its Outstanding Universal Value, in particular its integrity, and are exacerbated by a lack of adequate management. It is therefore recommended that the State Party of Slovakia be requested to take a series of immediate measures to stop activities that negatively impact the property directly and indirectly, to improve the management of the Slovak part of the property, and enhance its transnational cooperation with Germany and Ukraine for a more effective management of this trilateral property as a whole.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.26

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 8B.13**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Expresses its concern about the level of threats which might be affecting the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property and about the lack of adequate management response to address those pressures;*
4. *Requests the State Party of Slovakia to ensure that a comprehensive vision for development around the Slovak component of the property and practical guidance for achieving an effective protection of its Outstanding Universal Value and in particular its integrity be included in the management plan requested by the Council of Europe, in order to ensure that both the requirements of the Convention and those of the Council of Europe can be met in one single management plan;*
5. *Also requests the State Party of Slovakia to strengthen cooperation between different Ministries and Agencies relevant for the management of the property and to ensure that the World Heritage status of the property is recognized in their strategies and plans;*
6. *Urges the State Party of Slovakia to halt unsustainable logging activities within component sites of the World Heritage property;*
7. *Recalls that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) should be conducted and submitted to the World Heritage Centre for all development projects within the property and its surroundings that could affect its Outstanding Universal Value, in line with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, and further requests the State Party of Slovakia to immediately halt all infrastructure development that could affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property until such EIAs are conducted ;*
8. *Encourages the State Parties of Germany, Slovakia and Ukraine to enhance their transnational cooperation and to implement the recommendations adopted in its Decision **35 COM 8B.13**, in particular the establishment of an integrated management system for the trilateral property to ensure the protection of the functional linkages between the component parts, as well as research and monitoring plans in order to monitor the property as a whole, and the development of capacity building to share best practices;*
9. *Requests furthermore 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.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986

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/369/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

February 2013: IUCN advisory mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Development of a golf resort

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/369/gallery/>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/627>

Current conservation issues

In its Decision **36 COM 7C** the World Heritage Committee had requested the State Party to halt the proposed development of a hotel and golf resort in the vicinity of the property until its potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) had been assessed. Prior to the Committee's Decision, the World Heritage Centre, by letter dated 31 May 2012, had suggested to the State Party to invite an advisory mission in light of the scale of the proposed development. From 20 to 22 February 2013, an IUCN advisory mission visited the property, at the invitation of the State Party, to assess the overall state of conservation of the property and to provide technical advice on its conservation and heritage-led development.

a) *Overall state of conservation*

The IUCN advisory mission found that the OUV of the property in terms of criterion (viii) has been maintained. It noted that the new visitor centre, which replaces a structure that was present at the property at the time of its inscription, and which had been the subject of previous reports to the Committee at its 27th (UNESCO, 2003), 29th (Durban, 2005) and 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) sessions, is well integrated in the surrounding landscape. It, however, also noted that no buffer zone has yet been defined despite the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission of February 2003 that had suggested establishing a clearly defined buffer zone to provide for the best protection of the values and integrity of the property, given that it is also inscribed under criterion (vii) for its outstanding natural beauty. The IUCN advisory mission also recalled that the 2003 mission had pointed out that the landscape setting is crucial for the conservation of the natural beauty, and had therefore recommended to carefully review all zoning arrangements

in order to preserve the landscape values of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) surrounding the property. It had also recommended that no developments, which could potentially threaten these values, should be allowed.

b) *Development projects*

The IUCN advisory mission reviewed the state of conservation of the property. It considered that the planned hotel and golf resort development, the so-called Runkerry Development, does not comply with the principles of heritage-led development given its scale and location in the property's immediate surroundings and its potential negative impact on the OUV and integrity of the property. The development project is located at 550 m outside the boundary of the 70 ha World Heritage property and stretches over an area of 148 ha, which lies within a nationally protected Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) that includes a high plateau, and an exposed sheep-grazed and rural landscape.

The advisory mission noted that, to date, specific assessment of impacts on OUV of the development has not been undertaken. Based on a review of information available, the mission considered that the proposed golf resort development would create an irreversible change of landscape character and would impact on important views within the setting of the property. The mission noted that the impact on the landscape includes incorporation of a dune landscape and rural landscape into a highly manicured environment. Moreover, the 18-hole golf course and the various buildings associated to the resort, including 75 lodges, a nearly ten metre high golf academy, and a 120 bedroom hotel with large amounts of glazing, would impact on important views in the landscape setting.

The IUCN advisory mission recommended that given the significant impact on the landscape setting and important views, which sustain the property's OUV, this development should not be permitted in its proposed scale and location.

c) *Planning policies related to protection and heritage-led development*

IUCN recalled that national UK planning policies include provisions for the protection of World Heritage properties, in particular Planning Policy Statement No 6 (PPS6) of the Department of the Environment of Northern Ireland (DoENI), which clearly states that *"development which would adversely affect [World Heritage properties] or the integrity of their setting will not be permitted unless there are exceptional circumstances"*. It also noted draft Policy COU12 pertaining to the proposed Distinctive Landscape Setting of the property where the proposed development is located, which provides that *"no development within the Distinctive Landscape Setting outside of settlement development limits will be approved except [...] exceptionally modest scale facilities, without landscape detriment, which are necessary to meet the direct needs of visitors to the [property]"*.

Regarding the specific case of the proposed Runkerry golf resort development, IUCN considered that it does not appear to qualify as an "exceptionally modest scale facility" and that the development would appear to fall short of demonstrating a case for "exceptional circumstances" that would permit the development under PPS6.

IUCN noted that the written judgment of the Judicial Review of the approval of the development application refers to the February 2012 submission to the Secretary of State recommending approval of the proposal, which stated that the proposed development "would have a significant landscape and visual impact on the setting of the property", but that this was regarded as being outweighed by economic and tourism considerations. IUCN further noted that the written judgment of the Judicial Review contains significant concerns of the approach that the responsible UK authorities have taken in relation to the assessment of impacts on OUV. The judgment notes the position of the responsible UK authorities in relation to consultation with and *"the role of UNESCO to be surprising in a number of respects"*, for instance that the State Party *"considers that notification of a decision after it is made accords with paragraph 172 of the [Operational] Guidelines"*, as *"[...] the object of the exercise is to engage with the [World Heritage Committee] [...] before the decision is made."*

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the request of the Committee in Decision **36 COM 7C**, and consider that the planning process of the Runkerry golf resort development has not allowed adequate consideration of impacts on the OUV of the property. They recall that the development project is located at 550 m outside the boundary of the property within a nationally protected AONB.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN further note that no buffer zone has yet been defined to provide for the protection of the values and integrity of the property, in particular its outstanding natural beauty, by preserving the landscape values of the AONB surrounding the property.

Given the scale and location of the proposed golf resort development project, it is recommended that it should not be permitted at its proposed scale and location in order to avoid adverse impact on the landscape setting and important views of the property, which are part of the property's OUV. The Committee may therefore wish to reiterate its request to the State Party to halt the development until its impacts have been assessed in detail.

Noting the concerns raised by both the mission and the UK court regarding the current approach to consulting the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN further recommend that the Committee strongly encourage the State Party to consider reinforcing its legal provisions and planning framework to allow the national authorities to ensure their responsibilities for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* at the national level, by establishing a consistent and clear priority for the protection of the OUV of UK World Heritage properties.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.28

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7C**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not keep the Committee fully informed about the Runkerry golf resort development prior to any decisions being taken that are difficult to reverse, in line with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to halt the proposed golf resort development project until its potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property has been thoroughly assessed;*
5. *Invites the State Party to consult the World Heritage Centre and IUCN on potential modifications and alternatives to the golf resort development project to avoid adverse impacts on the OUV of the property;*
6. *Strongly encourages the State Party to consider strengthening its legal provisions and planning framework to allow the national authorities to ensure their responsibilities for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention at the national level regarding planned developments that could potentially impact on its World Heritage properties, and by ensuring that potential impacts on the OUV of any World Heritage property located on its territory be adequately assessed as part of the required Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for such developments, or through a specific Heritage Impact*

Assessment (HIA), and to also ensure that developments that adversely impact OUV are not permitted;

7. *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 requests, as well as a copy of the EIA of the proposed Runkerry golf resort development, including a thorough assessment of its impacts on the OUV of the property.*

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

29. Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1035)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2001

Criteria
(ix) (x)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1035/documents/>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
Total amount granted: USD100,000 - World Heritage Biodiversity Programme for Brazil; USD 30,000 - Rapid Response Facility support for firefighting

Previous monitoring missions
March 2013: IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Insufficient legal framework and protection in place

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1035/>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 11 February 2013, a brief report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party of Brazil, providing information on the process to re-establish the protection status of Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park (CdVNP), as well as the planning for the remainder of the process. The State Party invited a UNESCO World Heritage Centre/IUCN technical advisory mission to the property but the Committee requested an IUCN reactive monitoring mission, which took place from 4 to 9 March 2013. The mission report is available on-line at the following address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM>.

a) *Loss of the protection status of 72% of Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park*

The State Party indicates that despite having lost national park status since 2003, no new dangers threatening the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) are currently noted in the area concerned. It considers that given increased human presence in the area, a strict return to the original National Park boundaries at the time of inscription is no longer an option, and that therefore, an alternative approach was proposed intended not only to create conservation units in most of the area that lost legal protection in CdVNP, excluding areas that no longer have integrity, but also to establish new protected areas of different management categories outside the property, which eventually would constitute a mosaic of conservation units which it considers would form the basis for adding new areas to the

property, through a re-nomination. Among this array of conservation units are Federal, State, and private areas.

The State Party reports that the process of establishing new protected areas within and outside the property is in an advanced state and there is a good basis for its finalization with the local communities. The report highlights the establishment of protected areas by the State of Goiás and the interest of private land owners in establishing private reserves. Given the complexity of the participatory process, the State Party estimates that the final proposal for the mosaic of protected area is expected to be referred to the Ministry of the Environment by December 2013, after which the Ministry would have to consider it and carry out the necessary steps for eventual approval, should it so decide.

The mission noted that in the area of the property that is not under legal protection, human activities (especially extensive cattle ranching) have increased during the last decade. However, it confirms the State Party's statement that most of the property is in a good general conservation status. Also, the mission identified extensive areas outside the property that have a similar good state of conservation with the potential to contribute to the conservation of its OUV, but only if functional biological connectivity is ensured. This in part is a result of both some of the different existing conservation regimes for the wider region and the very difficult terrain therein.

The mission confirmed that re-establishment of the protected status of the entire property is not feasible due to the established human presence in those areas. In addition to increased human intervention in the area, there is an unclear land tenure situation and continued resistance among a small group of landowners/cattle ranchers against establishment of protected areas of a management regime that implies exclusion of agricultural practice (IUCN category I or II). Therefore, the mission concluded that the State Party's approach of restoring legal protection to the largest extent possible within the existing property, and through establishing an array of different protected areas within and outside the property to restore its integrity to be a valid strategy, provided that it can be delivered. Nevertheless, it noted that the management regimes currently planned for new conservation units at Federal level are not all sufficient to guarantee the protection of the OUV of the property, because they do not necessarily guarantee conservation of biodiversity and the ecosystem functions integrity. Additional management regulations would be required to ensure that future conservation regimes regulate threats from human activity (allowed on private property within these categories) to features of OUV.

b) *Status of features that sustain OUV*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that in its previous report, the State Party had identified the main threats to the property to be wildfires, hunting, illegal deforestation and selective illegal extraction of timber. The State Party does not provide updated information on the status of these threats.

The mission noted that agricultural activities are carried out within the property, including associated infrastructure like housing, fencing and paths. In those parts of the property no longer afforded the protection of national park status, evidence of the use of lands for cattle ranching is fairly widespread, and the activity is reported to be increasing. As cattle ranching is an activity that relies on the expansion of open areas to the detriment of scrub forest, there has also been a tendency to set more "brush cleaning" fires in the property. Though still at an overall low intensity level, the growing presence of cattle in the property is a clear concern that needs to be addressed before commercial and political interests become too vested in this activity. The mission noted that fire continues to be the main threat to the property and most of the conservation effort of the environmental authorities is dedicated to fire control within the much reduced CdVNP. Although there is an active collaboration between park staff and fire fighters, fires keep occurring even within the national park. Outside CdVNP, fire frequency and intensity is higher, especially along the major roads and areas occupied by extensive cattle ranching.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain highly concerned over the absence of any effective management regime over 72% of the Chapada dos Veadeiros component of the property. This situation has lasted 10 years, and over this time, cattle ranching in the property has become more widespread. The State Party has indicated over the past two years that it would re-establish an adequate protection regime, yet to date, 170,455 hectares within the property do not benefit from protection at a level to meet appropriate standards. Though the features contributing to inscription under criteria (ix) and (x) remain generally in good condition, the absence of a protection regime puts the property's integrity into clear doubt. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recognize the State Party's renewed efforts to establish a new configuration of different protected areas within the general vicinity of the property with the objective of ensuring that those features contributing to criteria (ix) and (x) are effectively protected. They note that these changes, as communicated to the reactive monitoring mission, will definitely consist of a major boundary modification which will require a new nomination, in line with Paragraph 165 of the *Operational Guidelines*. Until such a major boundary modification can be considered by the World Heritage Committee, the property, as it is currently recognized, remains in a situation of potential danger in line with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that if adequate protection is not restored, or in case of an emerging significant threat while adequate protection is not in place, the property would need to be considered for immediate inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee could have decided that it was appropriate to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger since 2003, given the persistent issue that has been identified. To date, given the clear action of the State Party to address those issues now they have been identified, and considering that the extent of threats to the property's values is currently still at a low level, the position has been adopted that a decision to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger could be delayed. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN highlight that this situation cannot be allowed to persist with the property, given the continued lack of protection for the property and the threats located within its boundaries as currently recognized under the *Convention*. Based on the findings of the mission, they are of the view that a means to resolve the protection of the property should be defined before the Committee's 39th session in 2015, including the possible revision of the boundaries of the property through a major boundary modification that will ensure a property that meets all requirements of OUV. In the event that no resolution has been reached at that point, the property should be considered for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also recognize that outside that portion of the property no longer afforded national park status, there are several areas with conservation values that are similar to those of the unprotected portion of the property. They conclude that establishing functional biological connections with these areas would widen the area of interconnected Cerrado biome in good conservation status and could support the conservation of those features that are currently recognized under the *Convention*, if included in an eventual nomination for a boundary modification.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN underline the fact that management regimes currently proposed for new conservation units at Federal level, which would presumably comprise the new boundaries for the property, currently provide insufficient protection to those features contributing to its OUV. They recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to ensure that adequate management regimes are in place for these areas before a modification of boundaries is proposed.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.29

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.30**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Reiterates its concern that the majority of the Chapada dos Veadeiros component of this serial property continues to no longer benefit from National Park status, and that its integrity is no longer guaranteed;
4. Recognizes the positive actions undertaken by the State Party to develop new conservation units to restore some of the legal protection that has been lost, and notes that the process of putting in place effective protection and management, based on due public consultation, is taking more time than previously anticipated;
5. Considers that the possible boundary changes currently being considered by the State Party would represent a major boundary modification, and will require a re-nomination, as per Paragraph 165 of the Operational Guidelines;
6. Reminds the State Party that until such a re-nomination is presented for consideration by the World Heritage Committee, the property as it is currently recognized under the World Heritage Convention is no longer afforded the full benefit of an adequate legal protective status, and therefore is regarded as being in potential danger in line with Paragraph 180 (b)(i) of the Operational Guidelines;
7. Also considers that if significant progress to address the lack of protection of parts of the property has not been achieved by the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee, or in case of the emergence of a significant threat to the property before that time, the property will be considered for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger;
8. Requests the State Party to finalize the establishment of new conservation units within and outside the property before the end of 2013, taking into consideration the following criteria:
 - a) the need to ensure optimal public consultation with all affected land owners, and promote and support the establishment of private natural heritage reserves,
 - b) the application of management regimes that ensure the best possible protection of biodiversity and ecological processes, and ensure full collaboration in management between Federal and State agencies, as well as private owners. In case the proposed management regimes do not guarantee integral protection of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), additional regulations need to be put in place,
 - c) consider extending the property to include the areas within and outside the property with the best status of conservation, prioritizing the area of Rio das Pedras (within the property), São Bartolomeu, the area of Rio dos Couros (south of the property) and the area of Rios Macaco and Macaquinho (within and outside the property);
9. Also requests the State Party to fully implement all the other recommendations of the 2013 IUCN reactive monitoring mission;

10. Also requests the State Party to submit, by **1 February 2015**, in line with Paragraph 165 of the Operational Guidelines, a major boundary modification for consideration by the World Heritage Committee, that will include additional lands of conservation value not currently included in the property, and result in a property that meets all requirements of OUV, including effective protection and management;
11. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including a report on the state of advancement of the re-nomination, 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)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2005

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/1138/documents/>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount granted: USD350, 000 for management planning, installation of mooring buoys for diving boats, working with local communities, capacity building, public use planning and improved stakeholder understanding of legal protection measures.

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Continued and growing presence of cattle;
b) Delayed implementation of the Management Plan for the Special Zone of Marine Protection;
c) Planned construction of a naval base;
d) Absence of clear regulations relating to the property;
e) Commercial and sport fishing;
f) Insufficient management capacity at the property.

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1138/>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 26 February 2013 which details progress toward implementation of Decision **36 COM 7B.33**. The State Party notes that the retrospective statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) is included in section II of the Periodic Report, however this was not received by the World Heritage Centre.

a) *Management planning, fisheries management and governance*

The State Party acknowledges that a Management Plan for the Special Zone of Marine Protection (SZMP) remains to be completed, despite the World Heritage Committee's repeated requests, as early as 2005, for its finalization (**28 COM 8B.13**). It indicates that the Commission for the Sustainable Management for Fishing Practices in the SZMP continues to meet with the purpose of assuring the implementation of the World Heritage Committee recommendations. The State Party notes that the delay in the completion of the management plan is due to the lack of information, including on fishing activities, adding that progress is being made toward obtaining this information via the collection of funds for consultations (together with MarViva and Conservation International) and through scientific expeditions. It has expressed support for carrying out an independent Management Effectiveness Evaluation of the property but no progress has been made to undertake the work.

The State Party reports that conservation actions toward artisanal fishing are being implemented; the number of artisanal fishing vessels has been reduced from 47 to 21. It reports that sport fishing permit numbers are stable and that violations of illegal fishing activities have decreased, likely due to the presence of Sea-Air Service that patrols the area. The World Heritage Centre notes a March 2013 press report on the State Party's decommissioning of illegal fishing gear encountered in the property.

b) *Coastal development*

The State Party reports only very modest and localized development along the coast, and largely consisting of small hostels for visitors of modest means, with no large tourism or residential development plans underway. It notes that the main port from which visitation to the island originates is 90 km away, and can only accommodate small craft. It also notes that eventual development intended for tourism would have to comply with the Ecotourism Master Plan and developments of any type in the property have to comply with additional environmental legislation in that regard.

Though current tourism development pressures appear to be low, previous reports on the potential for much larger developments to occur on the coast immediately facing the property prompted the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to recommend carrying out a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in this regard. The Committee had requested the State Party to develop a coastal zone development and conservation policy to help guide any eventual proposals (Decision **33 COM 7B.38**). No progress is noted in this regard.

c) *Continued presence of livestock*

The State Party reports that removal of livestock (mostly cattle) from the property has been more difficult than expected. It further notes that the submission of an International Assistance request will be discussed with the executive Council of Coiba National Park, and that arrangements are being made internally for the removal of the livestock starting in March 2013. The work is done according to the Action Plan recently developed by Panama's natural environmental Authority, in collaboration with the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute and Conservation International. The State Party mentions that livestock may be allowed to remain on the island as a source of meat for the occupants of the naval station.

d) *Naval station on Coiba Island*

The State Party informs that an air-sea station in the old Coiba Penitentiary Area is already under construction. It reports that consultations were held for the evaluation of the environmental impact studies and an Environmental Impact Assessment is now being prepared for the expansion of the dock and the restoration of the abandoned penal colony infrastructure. However, copies of the environmental impact assessments were not provided to the World Heritage Centre.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the improvements toward reduction of fishing activities but consider that the on-going absence of a clear management framework and management plan for the SZMP component of the property is a matter of increasing alarm. The World Heritage Committee first requested a management plan in 2005 at inscription, repeating its request consistently over the past 8 years. Without such a plan, it is impossible to establish whether or not the property's integrity is assured. They consider that the lack of information should not prevent the State Party from preparing at least a preliminary management plan for the SZMP in which a comprehensive view of the property's key conservation needs is presented, and preliminary management responses identified. They are also concerned over the absence of a coastal zone development and conservation policy that ensures the cumulative and combined impact of coastal development on the OUV of the property is effectively addressed.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain concerned that little progress has been made since the issue of livestock presence in the property was first raised by the Committee in 2009 (Decision **33 COM 7B.38**). They note that the technical capacity and know-how for addressing this issue is readily accessible in the region, where livestock removal has been successfully completed in several other World Heritage properties. They also note that allowing for the continued presence of livestock on the island as a source of food for naval personnel stationed there is not compatible with the property's protection requirements.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have not obtained a copy of the environmental impact assessments for work being carried out on the establishment of a naval base on the property and remain concerned over the potential impacts of this development on the property's OUV. They reiterate their recommendations presented to the Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011):

- The base must not become a source of introduction of new species (e.g. biosecurity measures should be put in place);
- Personnel should be well informed against trafficking of wildlife;
- Personnel must not engage in agricultural production;
- Boundaries must be very clearly marked, ideally with a fence, and as small as possible, with restrictions on movement of people beyond those boundaries;
- Shore facilities must be built and managed in such a way as to not destroy sea bottoms, and contribute to erosion;
- The airport must not be permitted to contribute to development pressures, such as tourism and hotels.

They reiterate that the resolution of many of these issues has been pending since the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List in 2005. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee request the State Party to invite a joint reactive monitoring mission to the property in 2013-2014.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.31

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.33**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),

3. *Requests the State Party to urgently finalize a draft Management Plan for the Special Zone of Marine Protection, adopt it and initiate its implementation, and to start with the independent Management Effectiveness Evaluation in order to inform the effective management for both Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to develop and implement a coastal zone development and conservation policy in order to ensure that cumulative and combined coastal zone development impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value are effectively addressed, and encourages the State Party to develop this policy on the basis of a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the coastal zone's development potential;*
5. *Expresses its concern about the potential impacts of the naval base on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and also requests the State Party to take the necessary measures to minimize these impacts, in particular:*
 - a) *Put in place biosecurity measures to avoid that the naval base become a source of introduction of alien species,*
 - b) *Educate personnel to ensure they do not engage in trafficking of wildlife,*
 - c) *Ensure that personnel does not engage in agricultural production,*
 - d) *clearly mark boundaries, ideally with a fence, and as small as possible, with restrictions on movement of people beyond those boundaries,*
 - e) *Ensure that shore facilities are built and managed in such a way as to not destroy sea bottoms and contribute to erosion,*
 - f) *Not permit the airport to contribute to development pressures, such as tourism and hotels;*
6. *Urges the State Party to finalize the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to invite a World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission to consider the state of conservation of the property as a whole, including in regards to impacts from the development of a naval base, and to advise on the development of a management plan and on coastal policy development issues;*
8. *Requests furthermore 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 on the progress made on the issues mentioned above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2004

Criteria
(vii) (viii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

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

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 19,950

See <http://whc.unesco.org/en/intassistance/1528/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

20-24 March 2010. Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Development pressures associated with tourism and housing
- b) Absence of strict development control process

Illustrative material

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

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

Current conservation issues

On 19 February 2013 a report on the state of conservation of Pitons Management Area was submitted by the State Party. The World Heritage Centre requested additional clarification on 28 February 2013 and 25 April 2013 regarding the reported weakening of the moratorium on development within the property. In response, the State Party submitted letters on March 18 2013 and 3 May 2013. The findings and recommendations of a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission, which visited the property from 20 to 24 March 2010, continue to serve as important background information. The mission report is available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/34COM/>. The State Party also wrote to the World Heritage Centre and the Director General of IUCN on 11 March 2013 to correct some inaccurate statements that were made in the State Party report regarding support and advice provided to the property via IUCN's Caribbean initiative, which has supported the State Party in commissioning the Limits of Acceptable Change study discussed below.

Development pressures associated with tourism and housing

In its state of conservation report, the State Party reaffirms its full commitment to the World Heritage property and reports on a number of activities. These include convening an unspecified ad hoc team of experts, reconstituting the Pitons Management Area Advisory Council (PMAAC) and the upgrading of the position and subsequent appointment of a Protected Area Manager responsible for the Pitons Management Area as of 1 November 2012. The State Party furthermore mentions the participation of the Pitons Management Area Office in a socio-economic monitoring research project. There is also reference to an initiative dedicated to the eradication of invasive alien species and the intention to possibly appoint two technical field experts.

The State Party notes that applications for residential and touristic development within the property continue to be submitted, with 95 applications currently pending, and that it has responded to this demand through an Executive Order of Cabinet Memo No. 58 dated 28 January 2013. In the State Party report, this Executive Order is said to have approved several policy directions with immediate effect, including a moratorium on all new developments in certain zones and restrictions to develop "*leisure and residential projects in selected locations subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)*" in another zone. In yet another zone, development is to adhere to guidance suggested in a 2007 consultant report and another study which remains to be elaborated.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the affirmation of the State Party's commitment to the property. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the 2013 Executive Order No. 58, as described in the State Party's report, clearly does not constitute a satisfactory management response and would enable further development within some zones within the property. To seek to clarify the matter, further exchanges of letters between the World Heritage Centre and the State Party took place, with the final letter received by the World Heritage Centre on 3 May 2013. It states that the Executive Order of Cabinet Memo No. 58 reaffirmed the moratorium on all developments within the property, and further states that all previous approvals had lapsed and that none had been renewed. It also explains that all future development applications would have to adhere to the Hyder Report, and any new conditions established by the upcoming Limits to Acceptable Change study. In this letter, the State Party explains that Executive Orders are confidential, and for this reason, a copy could not be forwarded to the World Heritage Centre. Whilst this information appears to be largely reassuring that no developments that had previously been submitted will be permitted, it remains unclear if there remains a possibility that some developments could be permitted within the property if resubmitted, and without further scrutiny of these issues by the World Heritage Committee.

In the State Party's letter to the World Heritage Centre, dated 4 April 2013, it indicated that the Limited of Acceptable Change study has been awarded to a consultancy firm and has now begun. Progress with this study is to be welcomed. IUCN has also been able to provide some advice to the State Party regarding the Terms of Reference.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the World Heritage Committee repeatedly expressed strong concern about developments within the property and has annually requested state of conservation reports since 2007. Attempts by the State Party to address the development pressure go back to at least 2004. According to the IUCN evaluation in that year the Cabinet agreed to direct the Ministry of Physical Development, Environment and Housing and the Development Control Authority not to approve any major development within the PMA until a comprehensive Limits of Acceptable Change study is completed, and approved by the Cabinet of Ministers. Nevertheless, developments have since occurred which motivated the World Heritage Committee to express its concern about proposed hotel development that may compromise the superlative natural beauty of the property (Decision **31 COM 7B.42**). Along similar lines, the World Heritage Committee expressed its concern about continuing development within the property in the following year, which, if not urgently addressed, is likely to lead to significant loss of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property (Decision **32 COM 7B.40**). One year later, the World Heritage Committee communicated serious concern (Decision **33 COM 7B.39**) that the State Party had not complied with all its requests, triggering a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property.

The findings of the reactive monitoring mission included a recommendation to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. While not following this recommendation due to a commitment made by the State Party to implement a complete moratorium, the World Heritage Committee again expressed concern about the approval of major development applications despite a requested moratorium and reiterated its request to urgently place a moratorium on development until such a time as new effective regulations are in place to determine if and where such developments could be permitted (Decision **34 COM 7B.37**). Due to a lack of tangible progress, the World Heritage Committee subsequently reiterated its clear position that development within the property should be strictly circumscribed in order to avoid any deterioration of its OUV (Decision **35 COM 7B.35**). The most recent World Heritage Committee decision (Decision **36 COM 7B.34**) expressed grave concern that additional developments within the property were granted in 2011. Consequently, the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to issue a stop work order and to cancel the five development permits granted in 2011, and to not approve any additional developments until the Limits to Acceptable Change study, along with

development regulations and guidelines, are completed and legally integrated into the development review process. The State Party was also asked to focus on progress in halting existing development permits within the property and World Heritage Committee.

Conclusion

The State Party has reaffirmed its commitment, and has provided information on activities and future intentions, including the commissioning of the Limits of Acceptable Change study. The State Party report provided a description of Executive Order No. 58 which raised concerns over the nature of the development moratorium in the property, and further information has been provided in an exchange of letters with the World Heritage Centre. In the absence of a copy of the actual Executive Order 58, and given both the contradictory information presented in the report of the State Party and subsequent letters regarding its impact, and also the opportunity to consider if this provides a full protection of the property from the possibility of developments proceeding that could impact OUV, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that further information on the protection of the property will be required by the World Heritage Committee.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the Pitons Management Area is one of the smallest natural World Heritage properties. The property faces a combination of development pressure associated with tourism and housing coinciding with the absence of a structured and enforced development control system, aggravated by limited financial and technical management capacity. The clear documentation of the pattern of ongoing development goes back as early as the nomination dossier, which refers to inappropriate land development as the single most important threat to the integrity of resources. The type of impact resulting from development is critical, as the visual landscape beauty is a fundamental element of the basis for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that there is a longstanding history of inconsistent development control efforts in the property which has impacted its integrity. A previous moratorium was not successful in stopping development application approvals. Though the renewed imposition of a moratorium as clarified in the State Party's letter of 3 May 2013 is welcome, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that it is essential that the moratorium remain fully in place and effective, across the whole extent of the property, until clear development control regulations are finalized to the satisfaction of the World Heritage Committee, and applied through the necessary legislative instruments, and based on the results of the Limits of Acceptable Change study. Should development once again be allowed to take place before this time, the integrity of the property would clearly be compromised, and lead to the need to consider the inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.32

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.34**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Also recalling the State Party's intervention at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010), in which it committed to a strict moratorium on further development within the property,*

4. *Further recalling the repeatedly stated concerns by the World Heritage Committee that the property's Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) may already have been significantly, and potentially irreversibly, compromised by past developments within the property,*
5. *Takes note of the activities reported in the State Party's report on the state of conservation of the property, including commissioning the Limits of Acceptable Change study, welcomes the efforts by the State Party to improve the protection and management of the property;*
6. *Notes the clear statement from the State Party that, through Cabinet Order No. 58, as approved on 28 January 2013, a full moratorium on all development in the property will be observed, and that "all previous development approvals have lapsed, and none have been renewed";*
7. *Considers essential that the moratorium on all development remains fully in place and effective, across the whole extent of the property, until clear development control regulations are finalized to the satisfaction of the World Heritage Committee, and applied through the necessary legislative instruments, and based on the results of the Limits of Acceptable Change study;*
8. *Also considers that, should development once again be allowed to take place before this time, the integrity of the property would clearly be compromised, leading to consideration of the inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
9. *Requests the State Party, as construction may not have commenced, to not approve any additional developments until the Limits to Acceptable Change study, along with development regulations and guidelines, are completed and legally integrated into the development review process;*
10. *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, focusing specifically on progress in establishing an effective development control system, and confirming the effective and continued implementation on development within the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

MIXED PROPERTIES

AFRICA

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2007

Criteria
(iii) (iv) (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/1147/documents/>

International Assistance
Global amount granted: USD 48,000
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1147/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Creation of structures to optimize the management and conservation of the site;
- b) Training of conservation managers;
- c) Invasive alien plants;
- d) Illegal hunting for trade;
- e) Illegal wood trade;
- f) Projects for road infrastructure.

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1147/>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sco>

Current conservation issues

The site was inscribed at the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007). At the time of inscription the World Heritage Committee had strongly recommended the State Party to ensure that high priority be given to the assignment of one or several correctly trained staff members to manage the archaeological and cultural landscape sites. At the time of inscription, the IUCN evaluation indicated that the natural values would be managed by the Gabonese National Parks Agency (ANPN).

In May 2012, the World Heritage Centre was informed of the “Alembe-Mikouyi Road Development Project” and requested the State Party to submit an impact study on the cultural heritage affected by the project. In the absence of any response, the World Heritage Centre renewed this request in a letter dated 4 April 2013.

a) *Management and conservation of the property*

In its Decision **31 COM 8B.54**, the World Heritage Committee made several requests to the State Party concerning the conservation and protection of the site. But since inscription, no

structure responsible for the equal management of both natural and cultural values for which the property was considered has been established. Moreover, no information has been provided by the State Party in respect of the presence of trained staff, specifically assigned to the conservation of archaeological sites, the fragile nature of the petroglyphs requiring the reinforcement of preventive conservation measures and restoration work as well as appropriate monitoring. Furthermore, no information has been provided concerning the approval of the proposed new law for the National Parks and the measures for its enforcement to improve the management of the property.

b) Alembe-Mikouyi Road Development Project

In May 2012, the World Heritage Centre learned of an environmental and social impact study on work for the “Alembe-Mikouyi Road Development Project” mandated by the China Road Corporation and Bridge Society, contracted by the State Party. All the cultural sites are concentrated in the northern part of the site, along the valley bordering the road in question.

This study highlights three possible impacts that could affect the integrity of the property: (i) an alteration to the landscape and the living environment; (ii) risk of pollution of surface and underground water; (iii) loss of vegetation. It makes no mention of the impact on the archaeological sites, which for the most part, are located alongside this section of the road, nor measures to mitigate the negative effects of the project to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Noting that the development work of this section and their impact as described in the study, would present a real danger to the property, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party on 27 July 2012, requesting that a revised study be submitted, with an analysis of the negative impacts of the road works foreseen on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, as well as the measures envisaged to mitigate this impact. The Centre recommended that this revised study focus more specifically on the archaeological areas of Elarmekora and Kongo Boumba. The World Heritage Centre addressed a further letter dated 4 April 2013 to the State Party, renewing its request for a revised study.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies propose that the World Heritage Committee express its concern regarding the Alembe-Mikouyi Road Development Project that could have an impact on the archaeological sites that justified inscription of the property under cultural criteria. They also recall that the revised environmental impact study and the heritage impact study be urgently submitted, so that an evaluation of the damage that the Road Development Project might engender on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property be evaluated. They recommend the suspension of the project until the evaluation of this analysis is completed.

Further, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned about the absence of a structure responsible for the equal management of both the natural and cultural values for which the property was considered. They believe that this situation does not guarantee the optimal conditions to manage all the development pressures currently being faced by the property. They also consider that, if this situation is not resolved in the short term, it will be very difficult to control future development pressures, and the Outstanding Universal Value of the property would be threatened.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.33

The World Heritage Committee,

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

2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 8B.54**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Expresses its grave concern regarding the Alembe-Mikouyi Road Development Project that could have an impact on the property, as well as the lack of information provided to the World Heritage Centre concerning the implementation of the main recommendations of Decision **31 COM 8B.54**, notably those regarding the establishment of a management authority, the approval of the law on the National Parks and the training of staff specifically assigned to the conservation of archaeological sites;
4. Urges the State Party to create this management authority and to appoint a site manager responsible for the equal conservation of both cultural and natural values of the property;
5. Reiterates its request to the State Party that high priority be accorded to the assignment of one or several well-trained persons to reinforce the preventive conservation measures and conduct restoration work at the archaeological sites;
6. Requests the State Party to transmit to the World Heritage Centre the revised environmental and social impact study and the heritage impact study on the Alembe-Mikouyi Road Development Project, for examination by the Advisory Bodies;
7. Also requests the State Party to desist from undertaking any work until such times as the requested additional information has been submitted to the World Heritage Centre;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2014** a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above-mentioned points for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

34. Cliffs of Bandiagara (Land of the Dogons), Mali (C/N 516)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1989

Criteria

(v) (vii)

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/516/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 98,640.00

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/516/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Insufficient site management means
- b) Illicit traffic of cultural property

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/516>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The state of conservation report submitted by the State Party on 6 April 2013 highlights the site management problems and constraints due to the armed conflict that has affected the northern regions of Mali as from April 2012. Amongst these constraints are the shutdown of cultural tourism which is one of the most important sources of income for local communities, the decline of cultural identities linked to the presence of armed groups and the resurgence of the phenomenon of trafficking and the illegal sale of cultural items.

To these must be added the suspension of financial resources allocated from the national budget to the Cultural Mission of Bandiagara (MCB), due to the crisis caused by the occupation of the northern regions.

In addition, the northern part of the Land of the Dogons was affected by the armed conflict, with the destruction of the Great Toguna in the city of Douenza. This area is located outside the perimeter inscribed on the World Heritage List. Fortunately the inscribed perimeter has suffered no physical damage.

a) Protection and conservation actions carried out by the MCB during the crisis

Despite the crisis and the closure of most State technical services on the site, the MCB has continued the implementation of its flagship projects, including the restoration project of the village of Banani Ammou, with a strong involvement of local communities. This project was co-funded by the World Monuments Fund and the World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with CRAterre. It has been fully implemented.

The MCB has also conducted awareness-raising activities for the protection of cultural properties. It also made an assessment of the conservation status of the items of the three local museums at the site and an assessment of risks of illegal traffic.

With the financial support of GIZ (German Development Cooperation), the MCB subsequently organized a day of reflexion with the cultural and tourism stakeholders on the socio-economic impacts and attitudes to adopt with regard to Mali's security and socio-political crisis. This day culminated in a series of recommendations aiming to minimize the impact of the crisis.

Finally, the MCB has prepared a file for the nomination of the site to the "2014 World Monuments Watch List", in order to obtain additional funding to implement conservation and management activities.

b) Threats

According to the report, the site is subject to changes due to socio-economic phenomena (exodors, schooling, infrastructure development), human activities and environmental degradation (climate change, demographic pressure). Some intangible cultural practices are mutating due to contact with other imported values (religions, cultural tourism ...).

The report notes that the social, cultural and religious traditions of the Dogons are still relatively well-preserved despite pressure from armed groups and the effects of induced changes of global development. The villages and inhabitants retain ancestral values linked to an original lifestyle. The harmonious integration of cultural elements (architectures) with the natural landscape has undergone few changes even though new infrastructures and facilities are developing on the site.

The report emphasizes that the property remains vulnerable although its values have not been greatly affected by the situation of crisis and armed conflict faced by the country. Management is still effective with the local management approach initiated by the Cultural Mission in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and other technical and financial partners.

c) Measures to be taken to contribute to the sustainable conservation of the property

The report proposes the following measures to mitigate the threats caused by the crisis in Mali:

- The implementation of a comprehensive information, awareness-raising and education campaign to protect the diversity of cultural expressions and the authenticity of intangible values (religious traditions, ritualistic events or festive cultural events). Workshops shall also be organised for capacity building of local communities and developers to take into account the heritage dimension in local development projects and programmes.
- The evaluation and implementation of the 2006–2010 management and conservation plan of the site, to adapt it to the socio-political and economic developments being experienced by the local communities.
- The implementation of rehabilitation and restoration projects for significant sites and monuments, and land settlement projects to improve the living conditions of local communities.

d) Progress in implementing the decisions of the World Heritage Committee

From 8 to 10 April 2013, in Bamako, the State Party held a training workshop on the fight against illicit trafficking of cultural property thanks to emergency funds mobilized by the Director-General of UNESCO. This workshop was attended by thirty participants from Mali and six neighbouring countries, including police officers, customs and Gendarmerie agents.

e) Actions taken by UNESCO for the protection of the property

(See the report on the state of conservation of Timbuktu (C119)).

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that despite the crisis in the northern regions of Mali and the proximity of the Land of the Dogons near areas of armed conflict, the perimeter of the Bandiagara Cliffs inscribed on the World Heritage List has suffered no physical damage, and thus its integrity, authenticity and Outstanding Universal Value remain intact.

However, the northern part of the Land of the Dogons was affected, with the destruction of the Great Toguna of the city of Douenza.

In addition, because of the crisis, problems and constraints have emerged, such as the shutdown of cultural tourism which is one of the most important sources of income for local communities, the decline of cultural identities linked to the crisis, and the resurgence of the phenomenon of trafficking and the illicit sale of cultural items

Faced with this situation, the Cultural Mission of Bandiagara was able to take action for the protection, awareness-raising and conservation of the site, despite the suspension of financial resources from the State and the closing of technical services on the site.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note with satisfaction the efforts made by the MCB, and welcome the measures it proposes to contribute to the sustainable conservation of the Cliffs of Bandiagara. They confirm the need for the Committee to support these measures and are at the disposal of the State Party to provide their expertise.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.34

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Commends the State Party for its efforts in the protection and conservation of the property in the difficult context of armed conflict in the northern regions of Mali;
3. Expresses its concern about the problems arising from the crisis and linked to the shutdown of cultural tourism which is one of the most important sources of income for local communities, the decline of cultural identities due to the crisis, and the resurgence of the phenomenon of illicit trafficking and sale of cultural property;
4. Thanks the Director-General of UNESCO for her efforts to respond to Decisions **36 COM 7B.106** and **36 COM 7B.107**, notably through the creation of a special account for the safeguarding of Malian cultural heritage and awareness-raising of the international community;
5. Thanks France, Mali and UNESCO to have organized a day of solidarity for Mali during which an international meeting of experts was held and resulted in the adoption of an Action Plan for the rehabilitation of the cultural heritage and ancient manuscripts of Mali;
6. Also thanks the UNESCO experts group on Mali consisting of the Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS, ICCROM), the International Council of Museums (ICOM), the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA), the School of African Heritage (EPA), the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) and the International Centre for Earthen Architecture (CRAterre-ENSAG) in Grenoble for having contributed to the development of the action plan in close collaboration with the Malian and French experts;
7. Appeals to States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, the African Union, the European Union, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU), other African organizations and the entire international community to contribute to the implementation of the action plan for the rehabilitation of the cultural heritage and ancient manuscripts of Mali;
8. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the Bandiagara Cliffs (Dogon Country). Property and especially on progress made in the preservation of their Outstanding Universal Value, for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1983

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/274/documents/>

International Assistance
Total amount granted: USD 166,625 USD
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/274/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
Total amount granted: USD 15,000 Extra-Budgetary Spanish FIT support for the social participation workshop requested by the World Heritage Committee (Decision **30 COM 7B.35**).

Previous monitoring missions
April, 2007: World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; January 2009: World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS reinforced monitoring mission; February 2010: World Heritage Centre technical emergency mission; May 2012: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN technical advisory mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Delays in reviewing the Master Plan and developing detailed yearly operational plans, and inadequate budgetary support for effective implementation;
- b) No evaluation of transport options, related geological studies, or the impact of bus traffic on increasing the risk of landslides;
- c) Lack of impact studies related to the carrying capacity of the Citadel and Inca Trail;
- d) Delays in the development and implementation of a public use plan;
- e) Delays in implementing urban planning and control measures for Machu Picchu Village, the main point of entry to the property, which has impacted on the visual values of the property;
- f) Lack of effective management of the property;
- g) Lack of risk management plans related to natural disasters;
- h) Inadequate governance arrangements including lack of adequate coordination of activities between different institutions and stakeholders involved in site management;
- i) Uncontrolled visitor access to the western part of the Sanctuary, related to the construction of the Carrilluchayoc Bridge.

Illustrative material
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/274> and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/587>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

A report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party on 31 January 2013. The report includes information about the actions taken in response to the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee, as well as annexes that provide additional technical information on the studies and interventions carried out to date.

a) *International Support Panel*

In 2010, the World Heritage Committee recommended that the State Party establish an International Support Panel to provide technical advice and support to the State Party, in

order to address governance concerns and sustainable finance issues, to guide effective stakeholder involvement, to seek support for the implementation of the 2009 Emergency Action Plan, and to address the backlog of unaddressed management issues (Decision **34 COM 7B.42**).

The International Support Panel was only established during the advisory mission to the property in May 2012. The 2012 Advisory mission to the property produced a detailed report on the assessment of conditions and identified recommendations and priority actions for interventions that, as with the 2009 Emergency Action Plan, are centred on these main aspects: participatory evaluation of management effectiveness, governance, planning of the western access, and risk management.

The State Party reports that several actions are being coordinated to implement the recommendations made by the 2012 Advisory mission. These include the updating of the Master Plan, the preparation of a Contingency Plan, the final approval of the new regulation of the Management Unit, improvements at the security check point in the western access of the Sanctuary, the finalization of the risk preparedness plan as well as the improvement of public information regarding risks in Machu Picchu Village and the updating and approval of tourist regulations. However, there are no indications in the report on the proposed timeframe for implementation or on budgetary provisions made to comprehensively implement them.

b) *Emergency Action Plan*

The 2009 Action Plan, recommended by the Reinforced monitoring mission of January 2009, was agreed on and recommended for implementation in Decision **33 COM 7B.42**. Since 2010, the State Party has not provided, in its state of conservation reports, an annotated report on the progress made in the implementation of the 2009 Action Plan. The 2012 Advisory mission noted that three key issues were not substantially addressed: the evaluation of management effectiveness, the planning of the western access and the touristic regulations. The priority intervention actions noted by the 2012 Advisory mission are consistent with those identified in 2009 for urgent implementation.

c) *Public use and urban planning*

The State Party reports that the formulation of both planning tools is foreseen as part of the updating of the Management Plan, with terms of reference approved in September 2012. The updating will include 5 thematic roundtables including ones on public use, visitor management and Machu Picchu Integral and load capacities. The results from these will be integrated in the updated Plan. Urban planning will be addressed jointly with the District Municipality of Machu Picchu.

The Advisory Mission noted that the 2000 Urban Plan was not implemented and that the lack of enforcement of existing regulations has allowed for chaotic developments to continue at Machu Picchu village which strongly contrasts with the natural values of the setting.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that updating the Management Plan for the property was also reported as a proposed action in 2011 and in 2012. As in past years, there are no indications on how different tools will be articulated, how the proposed evaluation of management effectiveness will be used or the actual timeframe for the completion of the different processes to fully formulate the proposed planning tools.

d) *Western access to the property*

The State Party reports that plans are being made to establish a full checkpoint to control the access of visitors, circulation of inhabitants and the creation of visitor facilities at the km 122-Hydroelectrical power plant. The State Party reports that these plans will allow for suitable premises for housing workers and offices for visitor control, with basic services and up to date communication technology. It reports that facilities should be operational within the coming months. It also reports that DRC-Cusco and SERNANP are scheduled to implement an improved controlled access system until the comprehensive strategy is developed and

enforced to guarantee controlled entry on the western side, by virtue of an electronic ticket system and where information on the potential risks of the area will be available. In addition, three roundtable discussions have been undertaken to assess the potential extension of the railway line and the construction of a station outside the boundaries of the property that would include infrastructure for visitor services.

The Advisory Mission noted that the World Heritage Committee was not notified of new concessions for the hydroelectric installations in spite of their location within the buffer zone, which will affect the area in the immediate proximity of the property. This area is the most affected by landslides and by uncontrolled traffic and irregular access, issues that have increased alarmingly in the area. The mission further noted that, although the western access had been illegally opened in 2007, to date authorities have not closed the road nor have they planned or regulated its use for tourism nor for the hydroelectric installations. Measures implemented have provided patchwork solutions and the current situation is largely chaotic, with a variety of incompatible uses, and continues to pose a potential danger for visitors to the property.

e) *Risk reduction and disaster recovery plans*

The State Party reports that training courses on operational planning for disasters and risk management sites were carried out in December 2012. An assessment of current operational capacities has also been developed and the definition of basic content for the comprehensive risk management plan has been outlined. An emergency plan for the historic sanctuary, developed in 2012 by SERNANP, is included in the report which also has provisions concerning activity protocols for park rangers according to risks identified in different sectors with the objective of ensuring visitor safety and mitigating potential impacts in case of emergencies. As in past years, the State Party reports that brochures and posters have been printed for residents and visitors which indicate safety areas. The Municipality has been asked to ensure that the early warning system that was implemented in 2011 is fully operational, which was not the case when the 2012 Advisory mission visited the property. The report also mentions that studies on geological hazards have been updated, which will serve to develop a Monitoring Plan for risk areas.

The 2012 Advisory Mission noted that the vulnerability of the Machu Picchu village has notably increased in the past 20 years, particularly with the increase of construction in areas highly exposed to natural hazards. The mission considered that, although there is information on what to do in case of emergency, most escape routes do not lead to adequately prepared areas and some are even exposed to landslides themselves, evacuation routes are complicated and not clearly marked, and most of the safety areas marked on the ground do not match those indicated in the provided maps. The mission also analysed the different documents that had been produced to date and underscored that while there are many plans to mitigate and diminish threats and to guide responses in case of disaster risk, with varied conclusions and even contradictory recommendations, in practice there is limited implementation, as was illustrated by the 2010 floods and landslides. This confirms what was underscored in 2012 by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies that to date no comprehensive disaster risk management plan has been fully developed or is currently in place.

f) *Governance, harmonization of legislative frameworks and enforcement of regulatory measures*

The State Party reports that actions were undertaken to approve the modification and operation of the Management Unit for Machu Picchu (UGM) so as to have a clear regulatory framework for harmonisation of activities and for effective decision making. It is not clear if the proposal for regulations has been approved or when the UGM will be fully operational.

g) *Inventory of land ownership and regulatory measures for land use zones*

In 2012, rural land registry was finalised and the State Party reports that there has been no increase in settlements and that subsistence agriculture continues to be the main landuse activity; the expansion of large settlements at the Huayllabamba sector has been controlled. Actions are foreseen to address pending land titles to ensure that critical areas become property of the State.

h) *Carrying capacity studies and guidelines for the Public Use Plan*

The State Party reports that further studies are needed to establish a clear and unambiguous carrying capacity. The State Party stated that the 2,500 visitor number is respected although it recognises that the number is exceeded by 10 to 15% during holidays and other special dates. It should be recalled that the 2012 Advisory mission had access to the visitation statistics and reported that the figure of 2500 is very often exceeded, counting the Inca Trail visitors and other special visits. It is expected that within the update process for the management plan, an appropriate load capacity will be established and respected.

i) *Interventions related to the maintenance and conservation at the Citadel*

Finally, the State Party also reports on maintenance and conservation activities implemented at the archaeological component of the property, in consideration of the institutional Operational Plan. A detailed report on research and conservation activities at the Citadel, including research on stone bio deterioration, structural consolidation of architectural structures, maintenance of Inca roads within the Sanctuary, and 3D topographic inventory of the archaeological monuments at the Citadel as a tool for conservation purposes, was provided.

Conclusion

Since 1999, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have expressed their concern about the conditions that pose a threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and which have remained, for the past 14 years, largely unaddressed, with many proposed activities still at the planning stages or only partially implemented.

In 2009, the World Heritage Committee acknowledged these threats and adopted the Emergency Action Plan. In 2010, the Committee further reiterated the major natural and structural threats facing the property and recommended the establishment of an International Support Panel. It considered that both of these measures would provide a strong focus for action to address the threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that these two measures have so far not had the effect of reducing the threats to the property, as only a few of the Actions within the Emergency Plan have been implemented over the past six years.

The Advisory Bodies have analysed overall progress made with the implementation of the 2009 Action Plan, adopted as a crucial measure to systematically undertake actions to the backlog of pressing conservation and management concerns. It was envisaged that the 2009 Action Plan would be implemented over a period of three years to address the overall situation at the property and its vulnerabilities that collectively were seen to pose considerable threats that could impact irreversibly on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and might also threaten the safety of visitors. Of the proposed five main issues to address (Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, management effectiveness, western access, risk management and governance) limited progress has been demonstrated and this pertains only to the development of the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and work for the establishment of the Management Unit for Machu Picchu (UGM) that, as noted beforehand, has yet to become fully operational and does not yet have the adequate regulatory framework for efficient decision-making.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further note that although the Advisory Mission of May 2012 made prioritised and budgeted recommendations, in line with the 2009 Emergency Plan, no precise action plan, with timeframes or costs, has been provided by the

State Party so it is not clear when improvement of existing conditions can be anticipated. The International Support Panel was expected to assist the State Party in addressing unresolved issues, however to date its work has been limited and no indication is provided on how effective the collaboration mechanism has been.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note that certain threats have increased since 2009. For instance, the growth of construction in areas highly exposed to natural hazards significantly increases the risk of landslides, unnatural erosion patterns and deterioration of the remarkable habitats for which the property was inscribed. Similarly, increasing visitor numbers are leading to an unsustainable situation. Other increasing negative factors are the lack of implementation of the 2000 Urban Plan, the lack of enforcement of existing regulations, and the resulting chaotic development at Machu Picchu village.

The Advisory Bodies consider that strong and decisive actions to address long-standing and persistent threats to the property, identified when the Emergency Plan was developed and the International Support Group was initiated, have yet to be implemented. The impacts of these factors have led to the deterioration of the natural environment and to the erosion of the conditions of integrity. It has also impacted on the longstanding harmonious and aesthetically stunning relationship between human culture and nature for which the property was inscribed, on the understanding of the visual ensemble that links the archaeological site with its setting, and on the land use planning that existed at pre-hispanic times. Together the underscored factors represent a clear potential danger to the integrity and Outstanding Universal Value of the property, in line with paragraphs 179 and 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

In view of the above considerations, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the World Heritage Committee request that the implementation of the identified measures is undertaken within the proposed timeframe. In the absence of compliance with this request within the proposed timeframe, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend the World Heritage Committee inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 38th session.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.35

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **33 COM 7B.42, 34 COM 7B.42, 35 COM 7B.38 and 36 COM 7B.39**, adopted at its 33rd (Seville, 2009), 34th (Brasilia, 2010), 35th (UNESCO, 2011) and 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) sessions respectively,*
3. *Expresses its deep concern that no strong and decisive action has been taken to implement the *Emergency Action Plan* drawn up in 2009 or the *Revised Action Plan* developed by the *Advisory Mission* of 2012, as a means of addressing threats to the property that have been underscored for more than ten years and which have increased since 2009;*
4. *Notes that the *International Support Panel* has not had a dynamic impact in terms of fostering action to address the acknowledged threats to the property and also notes that the *State Party* did not submit a technical and financial proposal to continue supporting the collaboration with the *International Support Panel*;*

5. *Considers that the long-standing threats to the property derived from increased public use, deficiencies in decision-making and governance mechanisms, uncontrolled development at Machu Picchu Village, among others, have not been comprehensively addressed and its effects have been further exacerbated;*
6. *Urges the State Party to confirm, by **30 July 2013**, that the International Support Panel will assist national authorities in addressing, as a matter of urgency, all the unresolved issues, and requests that said confirmation includes an explicit course of action to implement the recommendations made in 2012 with a clear indication on the financial and technical resources available;*
7. *Also requests the State Party, in line with the proposals made in the 2009 Emergency Action Plan, the recommendations of the 2012 advisory mission and previous decisions of the World Heritage Committee, to implement the following measures within the noted timeframe:*
 - a) *Harmonize legislative frameworks and enforce regulatory measures and related sanctions for violations by **1 April 2014**,*
 - b) *Develop a comprehensive strategy for the Western access to the property by **1 April 2014**,*
 - c) *Undertake the Management effectiveness assessment to assist in the review and update of the Management Plan for the property by **1 April 2014**,*
 - d) *Finalize and adopt public use, in line with the provisions of the Management Plan for the property, including the definition of carrying capacity for the Historic Sanctuary and Machu Picchu village and the measures anticipated in respect to the visitation limits by **1 April 2014**,*
 - e) *Finalize risk reduction and disaster recovery plans, including all parts of the disaster risk cycle, not only the response to emergency situations, by **1 April 2014**,*
 - f) *Finalize and approve the Urban Plan for Machu Picchu Village, containing the definition of regulatory measures, including building codes and processes for approval of new construction in the village and adjacent areas at the property and its buffer zone by **1 April 2014**;*
8. *Also considers that in the absence of the implementation of the above actions by the Committee's 38th session in 2014, the cumulative impacts of the identified and long-standing threats would irreversibly impact the property, which will result in the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger by the Committee at its 38th session in 2014;*
9. *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 and the final reports on the requested measures by **1 April 2014**, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

1985-2007

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/323/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 113,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/323/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount granted: USD 450,000 from the Government of Japan and from the Riksantikvaren (Norwegian Cultural Heritage Directorate)

Previous monitoring missions

May/June 2004 and February 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS missions; February 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre / CRAterre-ENSAG / Getty Conservation Institute monitoring mission; December 2012: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Absence of a national legislative mechanism for the protection of cultural heritage;
- b) Major deterioration of almost 50% of the earthen structural components;
- c) Lack of presentation and interpretation at the site;
- d) Lack and loss of documentation on the site;
- e) Lack of sharing of knowledge between site managers and among authorities;
- f) Need to distinguish between the site museum and the World Heritage site;
- g) No conservation or safeguarding measures have been undertaken at the site following the 2012 fire.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/323>

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

Current conservation issues

From 3 to 7 December 2012, a joint World Heritage / ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012). On 30 January 2013, the State Party submitted a State of Conservation Report. The report provides an overview of the state of conservation of the buildings within the property and progress on revising the existing management plan and the development of a disaster risk management plan and a rehabilitation strategy.

a) *Development of a Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management Plan*

The State Party reports that the work on the disaster risk management plan is ongoing, but has not yet been completed. They state that a training activity on the topic will be taking place in February 2013 and that they intend to use this training as a means of developing

and verifying aspects of the plan. The final draft of the plan should be completed in April 2013. In the interim, however, the State Party has installed fire hydrants as part of a decentralized cooperation between the city of Albi in France and the City of Abomey. The implementation of this cooperation activity is in its final phase. A video surveillance system has also been installed at the property.

The mission noted that the risk of fire is heightened by the lack of maintenance at the property, and in particular the high grass that is allowed to grow near unused buildings. While the installation of fire hydrants is a step in the right direction, there is also a need for regular maintenance and the removal, where possible, of flammable materials which augment the risk of fire.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the intention of the State Party to finalize the disaster risk management plan but are concerned that the training activity may not provide sufficient time to be able to complete the exercise. Given that there have been two fires at the property since 2009, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider the finalization and especially the implementation of this plan should be prioritised by the State Party.

b) *Development of a Reconstruction Policy for Fire Damaged Buildings*

The State Party reports that the reconstruction policy for individual buildings is considered to be part of the overall management plan for the property and will be elaborated as part of the management planning process. It also notes that a principle that no buildings will be reconstructed before their intended use is clear has been adopted, in order to avoid mistakes that have been made in the past with previous reconstructions. The State Party reports that some buildings already rehabilitated have now been assigned appropriate uses such a dance studio for royal dance and an artisanal village.

The mission noted the problems associated with the fact that many of the already rehabilitated spaces remained empty, which pose risks in the short, medium, and long term for the good maintenance and conservation of the buildings; it considered it a positive development that uses are being found for these buildings. They underscored that the policy requested by the World Heritage Committee had not yet been elaborated but that the Ministry of Culture, Literacy, Crafts, and Tourism had provided assurances the policy will be formulated. It considers that the finalization of a full reconstruction policy is crucial for the long-term conservation of the property.

c) *Updating of the Management Plan*

The State Party reports that the updating of the management plan will take place in February of 2013 and is part of the work plan developed by the Ministry of Culture, Literacy, Crafts, and Tourism for the property. The final plan is expected to incorporate both the disaster risk management plan and the reconstruction policy referred to in points a) and b) above. The report further states that the Management Council of the property meets regularly to take decisions and evaluate management issues including the programme of activities and budget.

The mission was made aware of the fact that the updating of the management plan is currently underway. It noted that the property has gone through two cycles of management plans since its inscription (1999 – 2005 and 2007 – 2012). It considered that while there have been some improvements in management, there have been no formal evaluations of the most recent plan. For this reason, the mission team worked together with the staff of the property in order to assess implementation of the plan. The result of this informal evaluation found that that while the objective related to progressive improvement of the state of conservation of the property had been partially achieved, other objectives related to better management, capacity building and increasing the knowledge of the property had seen little improvement.

The mission noted that there are a number of management issues at the property in need of improvement including the need for more and better trained staff in all aspects of management, conservation, restoration, and maintenance and for a clear administrative framework to allow the site manager and staff to be able to carry out the necessary conservation and maintenance measures. It further underscored the importance of finalising the update of the management plan and to consider in this process the need for a new overall vision for the property, one that looks at the property, not only as a museum, but as part of the socio-cultural life of the local community. Finally, the management plan should include provisions for regular evaluations in order to assess the effectiveness of management actions and to allow for change where necessary.

Another aspect noted for the mission is the loss of institutional memory that occurred with the recent change in the site manager. The lack of available information hindered the ability of the mission to understand which conservation works had been carried out since 2007 and to assess their appropriateness and effectiveness. It is essential that proper documentation of all conservation and management activities is carried out so that information is not lost when staff is changed. The mission also found that the Management Council was also not fully functional due to this loss of institutional memory. There was a further concern about the financial resources available to meet the conservation needs of the property. While there has been funding for individual projects, financial resources and sufficient staff have to be secured to ensure regular conservation and maintenance works.

d) *General State of Conservation of the Property*

The State Party notes that there are still a number of walls that remain to be reconstructed at the perimeter of the property, which would aid in securing the site. It further reports on a number of activities related to both the preventive conservation and restoration of the various buildings and tombs that make up the property, as well as promotional activities that have taken place.

The mission found that the current state of conservation in terms of stabilization of the component parts of the property had improved since 2007, with approximately 85% of the existing walls now intervened. It found, however, that there was a progressive degradation, due to lack of maintenance, at some of the already restored areas that are not used by the museum. It also expressed its concern that a proper inventory and documentation of restoration work is lacking. This makes it difficult to evaluate whether necessary attention has been given in restoration works to the authenticity and integrity of the property. It emphasized that it is fundamental that all restoration work be done with sufficient, detailed documentation to ensure that restorations do not compromise the conditions of authenticity and integrity, and that an inventory of all component parts of the property is done to have the adequate baseline data for monitoring and evaluation.

In regard to the effects from the fires of 2009 and 2012, the mission found that the damage from the 2009 fire had largely been fixed and the buildings restored. Damage from the 2012 fire, particularly at Houégbadja Palace, was still evident. However, the mission did not consider that the 2012 fire had a serious impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

e) *Other Conservation Issues*

The mission noted that while the State Party had put in place a buffer zone and regulations to govern it, there had been several cases where these regulations had not been enforced and that encroachment on the buffer zone can be seen. It recommended that the State Party take the necessary measures to enforce the regulations to control encroachment on the buffer zone. The mission further noted the need for better interpretation and presentation at the property as well as for strengthening of the relationships with the local community.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress that has been made by the State Party in the aftermath of the fires of 2009 and 2012. They also note, however, that as of the drafting of this State of Conservation report, neither the Disaster Risk Management Plan, nor the Reconstruction Policy has been completed as requested by the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee. They further note that the updating of the management plan has not yet been completed. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies urge the State Party to finalize these documents at the earliest opportunity.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies consider that the integration of the Disaster Risk Management Plan and the Reconstruction Policy into the larger Management Plan is a positive approach. They also note that the updated Management Plan should consider a new vision for the property, and define provisions for a clearer administrative and human resource framework as well as to secure the financial resources to be able to implement the various plans and policies when they come into force. They also emphasize the need for a proper inventory of all component parts of the property and for proper documentation of the restoration process. This documentation should be made available for the future management of the property.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.36

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.40**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Takes note of the information provided by the State Party concerning progress on the updating of the Management Plan and the development of a Disaster Risk Management Plan and a Reconstruction Policy;
4. Reiterates its request to the State Party to prioritise the development of a Disaster Risk Management Plan and a Reconstruction Policy and to finalize the updating of the management plan, including the development of a new overall vision for the property beyond that of its function as a museum, and to include clearer administrative, human and financial resource frameworks;
5. Urges the State Party to reinforce its efforts to ensure proper conservation and maintenance at the property, especially in regard to reducing the risk of fires and other hazards;
6. Also urges the State Party to undertake a thorough inventory of all of the buildings within the property and to ensure proper documentation before and after undertaking future restoration works;
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 recommendations for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

39. Lower Valley of the Omo (Ethiopia) (C 17)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

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/17/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

Soil erosion

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/17>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 22 September 2011, the World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party raising its concern about development projects being undertaken within the property, which could affect its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) related to the discovery in the Rift Valley of hominid fossils, some of which date back four million years and have been of fundamental importance in the study of human evolution.

According to information brought to the attention of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, one of the development projects (Kuraz Sugar Cane Development projects) would be located in or near the northern part of the property. It is understood that this could result in irreversible changes to the landscape of the property and its setting, as a result of water runoff, air pollution and the utilisation of waste materials, and thus to the prehistoric hominid fossil sites for which the property was inscribed.

No response was received from the State Party regarding this issue, and neither the official position nor relevant documents have been provided to the World Heritage Centre.

On 25 March 2013, the World Heritage Centre sent another letter to the State Party further expressing its concern over the state of conservation of the Lower Valley of the Omo World Heritage property, following further information received on the Kuraz Sugar Cane Development projects, and solicited the State Party's clarifications on this issue.

According to a September 2011 report entitled "Existing Challenges: Plantation Development versus Wildlife Conservation in the Omo-Tama-Mago Complex" prepared by the Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority (EWCA), information on government plans for the first phase of the plantations programme indicate that six sugar factories, sugar cane plantations, housing units, villages, canals and roads are to be constructed starting in early 2013. About 150,000ha of natural land will be converted to sugarcane plantations. One bridge will be built over the Omo River; and a 250km long canal will be constructed on both sides of the Omo River. 750 km of internal roads and a 132 km main road are already under construction.

The EWCA report does not give clear indications of the location of the project in relation to the boundaries of the property; therefore, detailed maps and information on the exact location of these factories and other constructions are needed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Moreover, no attempt has yet been made by the State Party to clarify the precise boundary of the property or its buffer zone.

The EWCA report, also states that officials were conducting an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in 2011 for all of the project area so as to identify the predictable problems. However, the World Heritage Centre has not received a copy of this report; and furthermore, no information has been received on whether a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) has been carried-out to consider impact on the cultural attributes of the property that convey Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned by the information that they continue to receive regarding the Kuraz Sugar Cane Development Projects and their potential impact on the OUV of the property as well as by the lack of response from the State Party regarding this issue. More detailed and official information is needed on the current development projects, especially the Kuraz Sugar Cane Development project, including a map indicating the location of the project in relation to the World Heritage property boundaries, and a proposed timeframe for its implementation.

The information obtained concerning the Kuraz Sugar Cane Development projects underscores the urgent need for a management plan, definition of boundaries and the buffer zone of the property as well as the finalization of the property's Retrospective Statement of OUV. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recognize the extreme difficulties involved in mapping the property, but consider this as a priority and urgent activity, which will also contribute to determining the location of the projects in relation to the property, as well as evaluating the potential impact of the above-mentioned sugar cane development projects on the property and its setting.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee requests a copy of the EIA carried-out by the State Party in 2011. A HIA should also be carried-out in order to evaluate effectively the impact of potential development on the OUV of the property.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.39

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **20 COM 7D.64/65**, adopted at its 20th session (Merida, 1996),
3. Expresses its concern over the Kuraz Sugar Cane Development Projects, which may have a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the Lower Valley of the Omo, if located within or near the property;
4. Regrets that the State Party has not replied to the World Heritage Centre's letters regarding its official position and clarification on the projects and their location in relation to the boundaries of the property;
5. Urges the State Party to provide details on all planned development projects, and documents on the Kuraz Sugar Cane Development Projects, including the

*Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) carried-out in 2011, to the World Heritage Centre by **1 December 2013** for review by the Advisory Bodies;*

6. *Requests the State Party to carry-out Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs), in particular for relevant roads and the sugar development projects, and submit them to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies before work commences and before any irreversible commitments are made;*
7. *Also expresses its concern over the absence of a management plan, and the lack of clarification of the boundaries and buffer zone for the property;*
8. *Invites the State Party to carry-out the above as a matter of urgency, and encourages the State Party to request international assistance for this endeavour;*
9. *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, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2001

Criteria
(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1055/documents/>

International Assistance
Total amount granted: USD 31,776
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1055/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
March 2004: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission; February 2005: World Heritage Centre advisory mission on water and sanitation assessments, May 2010: Joint 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/1055>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a State of Conservation Report in January 2013 in response to the Decision **36 COM 7B.43** of the World Heritage Committee. In addition, the State Party submitted the following documents:

- Lamu Port Feasibility Study and Master Plan
 - Lamu Port Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Study Report (version dated May 2011)
 - Lamu Port – South Sudan – Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) Corridor (Presentation)
 - Lamu District Regional Physical Development Plan 2007-2037
 - Management Plan 2013 – 2017
- a) *Lamu-Southern Sudan-Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) Corridor, and Lamu Port and Metropolis Development Project*

The Feasibility Study and Master Plan submitted by the State Party indicates massive growth foreseen for the area of Lamu District including, not only the port facilities, but also railways, highways, pipelines, an oil refinery, a new airport, a resort city, and additional massive urban development. In order to carry out this work, it will be necessary to dredge Manda Bay and introduce a significant amount of infrastructure to support such a large development. The population is expected to grow to 500,000 people in 2030 and 1.25 million by 2050 (an increase of over 1000% over 35 years). The State Party reports that the National Museums of Kenya, along with other national expert authorities, are concerned about the scale of the project and its potential impacts on the fragile heritage of the region. They further report that through the National Museums of Kenya and the local municipality, they are working to engage community based organizations, NGOs, and other stakeholders to secure interest and focused conservation and management actions for the World Heritage property.

The State Party reports that a final, comprehensive EIA report is currently in circulation for comments by the government and other stakeholders. A draft dated May 2011 was included in the submission by the State Party, and a publicly available version labelled “Final Report”, dated February 2013, is available online through the following web link: (http://www.nema.go.ke/index.php?option=com_phocadownload&view=category&id=117:eia_940-949-reports&Itemid=567).

Both versions of the report describe the Lamu Old Town as a World Heritage property and list the criteria for its inscription. The EIA then calls for a more detailed Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) (called a cultural and archaeological impact assessment in the document) to be carried out. According to the document, the HIA should focus on impacts from the large scale development, population increase, demographic change, and labour migration on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property and its setting, including impacts on tangible and intangible heritage, as well as impacts on the artisanal fishing industry, the visual qualities of the property and its setting, the sea current and coastal edge vegetation, and the loss of archaeological deposits and sites.

The State Party further reports, that the National Museums of Kenya has been approached informally by the lead experts of the EIA to determine the financial requirements for carrying out a detailed heritage impact assessment. There has not, as of yet, however, been any commitment of funds or approval of a terms of reference for an HIA nor has any potential timeframe for its development been identified.

The report does not indicate if any steps have been taken by the State Party to halt work on the port development as requested by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **36 COM 7B.43**. They do report, however, that “Save Lamu”, a local umbrella organization that brings together several local community based organizations, has petitioned the High Court of Kenya to halt the project until all impending issues are resolved. The High Court has since

directed that the case be placed urgently before the Chief Justice for the selection of a three-judge bench. However, no further information on these decisions has been provided.

b) *Management Plan*

Copies of the Management Plan were submitted by the State Party. The plan covers key areas such as conservation issues, risk management and disaster risk, and visitor management, and contains an action plan for the implementation of the proposed activities. Strategic directions of the plan deal with issues of conservation and rehabilitation of existing buildings, strengthening tourism and marketing, building better community awareness and involvement, and developing better documentation and protection of the heritage resources not only within the World Heritage property but also in the surrounding areas.

c) *Boundaries of the property and buffer zone map*

Despite requests from the World Heritage Committee in Decisions **36 COM 7B.43**, **35 COM 7B.39**, and **34 COM 7B.46**, the State Party has not submitted the requested maps showing the precise boundaries of the property and buffer zone. Clarification on this issue is crucial given the large scale developments foreseen.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies have examined the submissions provided by the State Party, and these documents confirm a development proposal for Lamu District that is on a massive scale and that will most likely impact negatively on the attributes that convey the OUV of the property, in particular its social and cultural unity and cohesion, its relationship with the surrounding landscape and setting extending to the surrounding islands, the delicate natural ecosystem, as well as its fresh water supplies of the Shela sand dunes water catchment area. There is also a strong potential to create massive urban development pressures on the property which will affect its setting.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies are of the view that it is essential that a full HIA, which focuses on potential impacts on the OUV of the property, be carried out (following ICOMOS Guidance), covering not merely the first three berths of Lamu Port but for the full scope of the project. This HIA should be carried out as soon as possible and, work on the LAPSSET and Lamu Port and Metropolis Development Project should not go ahead until this assessment has been carried out. This assessment should focus, not only on the possible impacts on the built heritage and natural environment of the World Heritage property, but also on the social, cultural, and religious impacts, which are important attributes of the OUV of the property. The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies acknowledge that the first steps have been taken towards the realization of this comprehensive HIA, through the completed EIA; and would urge the State Party to prioritize this study.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, appreciate the work carried out by the State Party in the development of the management plan and will make specific comments directly to the State Party upon finalising its comprehensive review. They would point out, however, that the single biggest management issue for the property at the present time is the development of LAPSSET and Lamu Port and Metropolis Development Project, which is not dealt with in a significant way in the plan. They would therefore recommend that in conjunction with the carrying out of the proposed HIA, a chapter dealing specifically with conservation and management issues surrounding the proposed port development be written, and integrated into the management plan. They further consider it essential that clear maps showing the boundaries of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone be urgently submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.40

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.43**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Takes note of the documentation submitted by the State Party in regard to the Lamu Port – South Sudan – Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) corridor and the new Lamu Port and Metropolis Development Project and also for the Management Plan for the property;
4. Reiterates its deep concern about the likely negative impact of the LAPSSET corridor and the new Lamu Port and Metropolis Development Project on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property;
5. Requests that the State Party urgently carry out a full Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) which focuses on potential impacts on the OUV of the property following ICOMOS Guidance, covering not merely the first three berths of the Lamu Port, but for the full scope of the project; the HIA should focus not only on the possible impacts on the built heritage and natural environment of the property, but also on the social, cultural, and religious impacts to the property and its surrounding landscape and setting;
6. Also requests the State Party to halt all work on the LAPSSET corridor and the new Lamu Port and Metropolis Development Project until the HIA has been carried out and its results discussed by the World Heritage Committee;
7. Further requests the State Party that a chapter on management issues, specifically related to the LAPSSET corridor and the new Lamu Port and Metropolis Development Project, be written and integrated into the management plan;
8. Reiterates it requests from its 34th (Brasilia, 2010), 35th (UNESCO, 2011) and 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) sessions that the State Party furnish maps clearly showing the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone;
9. Requests furthermore 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)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1999

Criteria
(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/915/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) Development plan ;
- b) Acid contamination of karts.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/915>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

In January 2011, the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to undertake a study to address concerns that had been raised by various parties about a potential threat to the World Heritage property posed by effluent from abandoned and active mines in the vicinity. The study, commissioned by the Cradle of Humankind World Heritage Site Management Authority, Department of Economic Development, Gauteng Province, South Africa, was prepared in 2011 by the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research. On 14 March 2013, ICOMOS completed an assessment of this exhaustive study. This assessment is available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/915/documents>.

Acid Mine Drainage (AMD)

Over a number of years, concerns have been raised that acidic waters rich in iron and other minerals (Acid Mine Drainage, or AMD) from abandoned mines in the vicinity of the World Heritage property, plus the input of treated mine water (and, in recent years, the overflow of untreated and partly treated mine waters at times of heavy rainfall) from the workings of an active mine about 15 km distant into the hydrology system of the property, might have a harmful effect on the caves that underpin the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. The 2011 study, "Situation assessment of the surface water and groundwater resource environments in the Cradle of Humankind World Heritage Site", attempts for the first time to give a comprehensive picture of the surface and sub-surface water regime within the property.

In relation to the impact of AMD on the property, the study concludes, *inter alia*, that nine of the 14 cave sites are considered to be at low risk for hydro-vulnerability, though one site (Bolt's Farm) has very high vulnerability. The Sterkfontein caves are judged to be highly vulnerable, but this is mitigated by long-term observed geochemical studies showing low impact on groundwater.

The study concludes that long-term monitoring needs to be maintained, and that natural treatment of AMD by neutralisation with the dolomites is not viable, therefore management of mine waters is required. Furthermore, the study recommends a gravity survey of the lower Riet Spruit valley to map karstic voids; extension of hydro-vulnerability mapping to other caves; establishment of a monitoring committee of key stakeholders; extension of treatment

of mine waters at the head of Tweelopie Spruit; and establishment of emergency limestone channels in the Tweelopie Spruit and Riet Spruit.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies suggest that the Committee congratulate the State Party for an excellent study. The work described appears to have been undertaken in accordance with best practice, and the results appear to reflect current scientific knowledge. The amount of field measurements to support the work is impressive. The study has successfully answered some of the uncertainties in knowledge about the hydrology and hydrogeology of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the recommendations in the 2011 study should be acted upon. Cooperation with other agencies, especially the Department of Water Affairs, should be strongly encouraged, and there should be consultation and agreement on the proposed resource quality objectives. Regular monitoring should be established, and a timeframe set to meet the agreed quality objectives.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that since the study was written, the Department of Water Affairs has initiated a "Feasibility study for a long-term solution to address the AMD associated with the East, Central and West Rand underground mining basins". A void assessment report was issued in draft form in March 2013, and a feasibility report proposes a system of active treatment of AMD and leachate from mine dumps for the West, Central and East Rand. If implemented in the West Rand, it should reduce the risks of AMD to the OUV of the property. They recommend that a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission be undertaken in order to assess the AMD impact to the property and propose recommendations to the State Party.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.44

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Acknowledges the submission by the State Party of a study on the "Situation assessment of the surface water and groundwater resource environments in the Cradle of Humankind World Heritage Site", undertaken in accordance with best practice and reflecting current scientific knowledge;*
3. *Urges the State Party to implement the recommendations contained in the study, with the objective of eliminating Acid Mine Drainage (AMD) and to provide details on how the necessary resources will be put in place, and which agencies and authorities will be given the necessary responsibilities;*
4. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in 2014 to evaluate the state of conservation of the property and potential threats to its Outstanding Universal Value;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, details of major planned interventions before any irreversible commitments are made;*
6. *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 progress*

made in putting in place satisfactory systems to mitigate the impacts of the AMD on the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.

ARAB STATES

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2005

Criteria
(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/1192/documents/>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
January-February 2006: World Heritage Centre mission; June 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; July 2012: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Project of land reclamation ("North Star") in the bay in front of the property, as well as the project of a fishing harbour (issue resolved);
- b) Physical and visual integrity threatened by the urban and architectural development projects around the protected area;
- c) Visual integrity threatened by a project of a causeway foreseen off the northern coast as part of the global response to the traffic congestion in this part of the country;
- d) Physical and visual integrity of the property threatened by a segment of the "N Road" project, a highway planned on the northern coast of the country whose route is expected to cross the western part of the buffer zone, at a fifty meter distance from the boundaries of the property.

Illustrative material
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1192>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 11 June 2012, the Minister of Culture of the Kingdom of Bahrain sent a letter to the Director of the World Heritage Centre informing of plans for new infrastructure development to be carried out by the Ministry of Municipalities Affairs and Urban Planning. The proposals included a project to develop a highway (called "N Road") along the northern coast of Bahrain Island. This highway's route was expected to cross through the buffer zone of the inscribed property, 50m from its boundaries, where numerous unexcavated archaeological areas and palm grove plantations are located.

At the request of the State Party, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission was carried out from 27 to 30 July 2012 in order to assess the potential impact of the "N-Road" project.

The advisory mission concluded that the proposed construction of the N-Road through the buffer zone of the property would constitute a threat to its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). However, the mission recognised the high strategic importance of the N-Road in terms of transportation and connectivity between the Capital and the Northern sectors and

that this issue had yet to be comprehensively addressed. Several recommendations were made, including the need to carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), including a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), focusing at the first stage on the portion that would directly affect the property and its buffer zone. It was recommended that upon finalisation of the EIA and HIA, a new proposal for connecting the areas and to respond to infrastructure connection needs could be developed as a joint endeavour between the involved authorities, to ensure that no impact existed to cultural or natural heritage assets. It was also requested that the results of the EIA and HIA be submitted by the Ministry of Municipalities Affairs and Urban Planning and the Ministry of Works to the Ministry of Culture in order, for the latter, to officially share them with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.

On 28 January 2013, the Ministry of Culture sent a letter to the World Heritage Centre together with the EIA and HIA carried out by the Ministry of Works. A document presenting the vision and strategic objectives towards an integrated management and conservation plan of the property was also attached. The Ministry of Culture informed the World Heritage Centre that the results of the EIA and HIA led to discussions between the concerned authorities in view of developing alternative routings for the N-Road.

On 28 March 2013, a meeting was held at the World Heritage Centre at the request of the State Party with representatives of the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Works, as well as with ICOMOS. The work carried out since the advisory mission of July 2012, in view of identifying alternative solutions, was presented. The representative of the Ministry of Works also informed of the decision taken by the highest authorities of the Government of Bahrain to cancel the initial route of the N-Road and documentation that officially confirms this decision was provided. A detailed report on the way the cancellation of the N-Road initial route will be addressed and the options which shall now be considered to achieve the project, while ensuring the integrity of the World Heritage property, was also presented. This particularly concerns the portion of the road which should now, according to the new planning options, cross the visual corridor adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2006 as an extension to the buffer zone of the property. It stated that no development above sea level should be authorized by the State Party in the visual corridor except for a bridge at a minimal distance of 3 km to the shore. The new planning options developed by the Ministry of Works concern the location of the said bridge which may need to be constructed at distance ranging from 2 to 3 km from the shore. The State Party, considering that the impact of a bridge located at a shorter distance than 3 km to the shore can be mitigated by a high quality of its design, seeks the approval of the World Heritage Committee to further develop the new planning options within the established visual corridor but considering 2 to 3 km distance to the shore.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to stress the commitment of the State Party in implementing the recommendations of the advisory mission and the significant efforts made in cancelling the initial route of the N-Road in order to preserve the integrity of the World Heritage property. They suggest that this successful cooperation between the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies be highlighted and that the State Party be commended for its commitment to the conservation and protection of the property. They are also of the view that the request of the State Party to have the possibility to explore different options for the location of the future bridge, crossing the visual corridor within a 2 to 3 km distance to the shore is acceptable, providing that the design of the future bridge is of high quality and that it ensures the minimum visual impact. Should the World Heritage Committee decide to positively respond to the State Party's request, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that no decision be taken regarding the final location of the bridge prior to a review of the details of the selected option.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.47

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decisions **32 COM 8B.54** and **33 COM 7B.53** adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) and 33rd (Seville, 2009) sessions respectively,
3. Commends the State Party for its commitment to the conservation and protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property including its conditions of integrity, and for its close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies towards the identification of alternative solutions of the route of the N-Road;
4. Invites the State Party to continue its efforts towards the protection of the property as well as its cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
5. Approves the request of the State Party to explore options for the location of the bridge foreseen to cross the visual corridor within a distance ranging from 2 to 3 km to the shore and strongly recommends that priority be given to the options which would provide the maximal distance between the bridge and the shore;
6. Requests the State Party to submit the the results of the studies carried out concerning the location and design of the proposed bridge to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies before a final decision is taken;
7. Reiterates its request to the State Party to finalize the integrated management and conservation plan for the property and submit, by **1 February 2014**, three printed and electronic copies of this plan, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
8. Also request 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.

53. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libya) (C 190)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1982

Criteria
(ii) (iii) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/190/documents>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Need to complete the Management Plan in order to co-ordinate actions in the short- and medium-term;
- b) Need to provide a detailed map at the appropriate scale showing the boundaries of the property and buffer zone;
- c) Threat to rock-hewn monumental tombs as a result of inadequate protection, leading to vandalism and the development of agricultural activities in the rural zone and urban constructions;
- d) Inappropriate earlier restoration work;
- e) Problem of discharge of sewage from the modern town into the Wadi Bel Ghadir;
- f) Inadequate on-site security and control systems;
- g) Need for a presentation and interpretation system for visitors and the local population.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/190>
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 28 March 2013. In this report, the State Party confirms that the property was not directly affected by the 2011 conflict but that indirect damage due to vandalism was noted, notably at the Jason Magnus Palace, where the mosaic of the four seasons was vandalized and two emblems depicting the seasons were stolen. Since the end of the conflict, manmade degradation of the site has increased, in particular vandalism, graffiti on monuments and erosion from uncontrolled circulation and access. The lack of control and maintenance during the conflict due to a reduction in the number of staff, which was already limited, has favoured these phenomena. Furthermore, urban encroachment has increased due to the extension of the neighbouring city of Shahat and random construction within the site remains uncontrolled, all of which threatens the integrity of the property.

a) *Capacity-building*

Since the end of the conflict, the Department of Antiquities has benefited from the support of UNESCO which has launched two emergency projects in 2012. The first one, funded by the Government of Italy, is the *Programme for the Protection and promotion of Cultural Heritage in Libya* and foresees Cyrene as the pilot site for Cyrenaica, to implement technical training courses on documentation, conservation, presentation and interpretation, awareness raising campaign to sensitize communities vis-à-vis urban encroachment and uncontrolled building construction, use of land and environmental/natural landscapes issues. This project which should start in the coming months will also enforce security at the property and provide training for guards. The second project *Emergency intervention to secure museums and sites in Libya*, funded by Libya itself, aims at addressing the damages which affected the mosaic of Jason Magnus Palace while also reinforcing the security measures. The staff of Controller Office of Cyrene also benefited from training activities in the fields of documentation and information management and has been significantly reinforced since January 2013. It is also foreseen to sign a cooperation agreement with the Department of Archaeology of the University of Bayda to jointly work on the protection of the property and to explore means for long term capacity building. The State Party announces that awareness raising actions targeting visitors will be undertaken in order to prevent vandalism.

b) *Management and Conservation Plan*

The participatory drafting of the management plan of the property has commenced, in coordination with UNESCO and with the support of the World Bank.

In terms of conservation of the property, the Department of Antiquities is planning to organize in 2013 two preliminary technical assessment missions in collaboration with UNESCO. Their objective is to evaluate the level of damage at the site and identify appropriate resources (human, technical and material) to elaborate a training programme in various fields and develop a comprehensive conservation plan, which would include a substantial component addressing the issues of inappropriate past restoration.

c) *Boundaries of the property*

The State Party's report indicates that mapping of the site by the staff of Shahat Controller Office is in progress so as "to map the extension of the site and to identify the boundaries, with the view to define a more defensible site boundary and buffer zone in light of the rampant construction occurring within the core site as it had previously been defined". This objective may need further clarification by the State Party so that the process is undertaken in accordance with the *Operational Guidelines*.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the efforts made by the State Party, since the end of the conflict, to improve the protection and conservation of the property, in close collaboration with UNESCO. This includes the progress made in the reinforcement of the Controller Office of Cyrene in terms of staff and technical means to accomplish its mission, as well as in the implementation of other recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission of January 2007. They however wish to recall the need for a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, with specific attention to the key attributes which convey its Outstanding Universal Value. Finally, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to recall that all the current or planned actions undertaken by the State Party should be conducted within the framework of a comprehensive conservation and management plan, with a clear identification of the property's boundaries and its buffer zone, to be finalized as soon as possible and submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.53

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.54**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Commends the State Party for the progress made in the reinforcement of the protection and conservation of the property as well as the implementation of other measures recommended by the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission of January 2007;*
4. *Thanks all the donors and partners which have technically and financially supported the State Party in its efforts towards the reinforcement of the protection of the property and the improvement of its state of conservation and invites them to continue to support these actions;*
5. *Requests the State Party to finalize, as soon as possible, the conservation and management plan of the property and submit it to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;*

6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, within the framework of the Retrospective Inventory, a map clearly showing the boundaries of the property as well as regulatory measures foreseen to ensure the protection of the property;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2015, a state of conservation report of the property, with a specific attention to the key attributes which carry its Outstanding Universal Value, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.*

54. Rock Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libya) (C 287)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1985

Criteria
(iii)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/287/documents>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
January 2011: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
Vandalism

Illustrative material
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/287>
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 28 March 2013. It recalls that the protection of the property's rock art sites has always been weak, even before the 2011 conflict, and that the Department of Antiquities has been alerted of an increased risk of vandalism at the site. The State Party also explains that due to the conflict, the implementation of the action plan and the recommendations made by the 2011 reactive monitoring mission has not been possible.

In the framework of the Programme for the Protection and promotion of Cultural Heritage in Libya elaborated and implemented in collaboration with UNESCO and funded by the Government of Italy, a centre should be established at Ghat or Uweinat to train the staff in charge of the protection and management of the property and to host a museum which is expected to play an important role in terms of awareness raising. A workshop on the possible creation of a heritage police and the fight against illicit trafficking of cultural property took

place from 27 to 30 April 2013 and was to address the issue of the necessary staffing to ensure the effective protection of the property. A technical mission should be carried out early May 2013 in order to further develop this initiative and assess, if security conditions permit, the state of conservation of the property. This mission is expected to serve as a basis to the International Assistance request which the State Party has been encouraged to submit for the implementation of priority measures and for the development of a conservation and management strategy for the property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to note the progress made in the implementation of measures aiming at ensuring the protection of the property, thanks to the project elaborated in collaboration with UNESCO and funded by the Government of Italy. They nevertheless wish to recommend to the World Heritage Committee to express again its concern about the lack of information on the current state of conservation of the property, as well as the urgent need to launch the conservation and recovery measures of the sites vandalised in 2009, as soon as the security conditions are favourable. Considering the substantial financial resources needed to implement long-term conservation and management actions, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also wish to recommend to the World Heritage Committee to thank the Government of Italy for its support and to call upon the international community to provide additional and sustained support to the State Party towards the implementation of the comprehensive strategy for the property, based on the recommendations of the 2011 reactive monitoring mission.

Draft Decision: **37 COM 7B.54**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.55**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Takes note of the on-going actions taken to implement the recommendations made by the 2011 reactive monitoring mission, but expresses its concern about the lack of information on the current state of conservation of the property;*
4. *Urges the State Party to launch the conservation and recovery measures of the sites vandalised in 2009, as identified in the 2011 reactive monitoring mission, as soon as the security conditions permit;*
5. *Reiterates its recommendation to the State Party to consider submitting an International Assistance request for the implementation of priority measures and for the development of a conservation and management strategy for the property;*
6. *Thanks the Government of Italy for its contribution towards the safeguarding of Libya's cultural heritage and calls upon the international community to provide additional and sustained support to the State Party for the implementation of a long-term conservation and management plan for the property;*
7. *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.*

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

Year of inscription on the List of World Heritage
2003

Criteria

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

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

Previous Committee Decisions

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

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 68,900

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1073/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2004, 2006, 2007: World Heritage Centre missions; 2011: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1073>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a state of conservation report as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011). There is therefore no information on whether the State Party has undertaken any action as follow-up to the outcomes of the 2011 reactive monitoring mission whose report provided information on three major topics:

- a) *Deterioration of the property as a result of exposure to difficult environmental conditions*

The mission recommended that an effective monitoring system be set up at all five individual components that make up this property, taking into account early and more recent photographic evidence to serve as a baseline comparison for future monitoring. It also recommended that no major conservation interventions be planned or implemented until such time as more accurate information on the deterioration could be obtained and appropriate actions identified through a more broad-based consensus with national and international expertise. It further recommended that studies on the carrying capacity of the sites be carried out to establish a maximum number of daily visitors.

The State Party was requested by the World Heritage Committee in 2011 to develop an ongoing monitoring system to ensure the continued stability of these structures, archaeological remains, and mural paintings, and to refrain from planning or implementing

restoration projects prior to obtaining more accurate information on deterioration mechanisms from the monitoring process.

b) *Implementation of the management plan for the property*

Considering the the lack of human and financial resources of the National Corporation of Antiquities and Museums (NCAM), the mission recommended a capacity building session for the staff of the NCAM and local stakeholders related to the implementation of the management plan. The State Party was requested by the World Heritage Committee, in 2011, to put the 2007 Management Plan in operation as soon as possible, by reinforcing the management structure and staff at the property, by providing this staff with an executive summary in Arabic and by developing a detailed, costed revised action plan with clear timelines and responsibilities for implementation. It was also urged to ensure that site staff and other stakeholders receive necessary capacity building in order to effectively implement the management plan.

c) *Urban encroachment and other development projects*

The mission noted the pressure for tourism developments within the property and its potential buffer zone. A new hotel project was planned and preparation works were already carried out at the time of the mission, at a location within view of the World Heritage property. It also noted that the perimeters of the buffer zones had not yet been finalized and that there were no planning regulations for control within these buffer zones. The mission team considered it crucial that the buffer zones be finalized, and that they remain free of construction to ensure there is no adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. The mission recommended, based on discussion with local authorities, that a letter be sent by the World Heritage Centre stressing the need to develop planning controls to ensure that the property and its surroundings remain clear of any new construction or development projects. Such letter was sent on 14 April 2011 but remained unanswered. Nevertheless, the State Party submitted an international assistance request early 2012 related to the monitoring system. The request was incomplete and has not been re-submitted since.

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

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

The State Party was requested by the World Heritage Committee to finalize the limits of the buffer zones and their associated planning controls as soon as possible, to ensure that pressure from tourism, urban and infrastructure development do not have a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The State Party was also requested to provide, in the framework of the Retrospective Inventory, detailed topographical maps of the five component parts of the property by 1 December 2011, and to submit a minor boundary modification by 1 February 2012 for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012. To date, none of these documents has been submitted.

The State Party sent a letter to the World Heritage Centre on 4 July 2012 by which it informed it of the launching of the Sudan-Qatar Archaeological Project (QSAP), an important project funded by Qatar for the promotion of archaeology in the Northern part of Sudan. The QSAP aims at funding archaeological missions to conduct surveys, protection, conservation

and presentation of sites. It also foresees a conservation and promotion project for the pyramids of Meroe, Gebel Barkal, Nuri and Kurru. No technical details or specifications were provided on the proposed actions foreseen for the component parts of the property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to recommend to the World Heritage Committee to express its concern at the absence of report from the State Party on the state of conservation of the property, as well as on the implementation of the measures recommended by the 2011 reactive monitoring mission. They wish to recall the urgent need both to make the management plan operational and to develop a comprehensive monitoring system in order to better understand the long term conservation needs of the property. They also wish to underline the need for the State Party to deal with concerns related to tourism and urban development pressures, and in particular, large development projects, to ensure that they do not have a negative impact on the OUV of the property. Finally, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the QSAP is an opportunity for the State Party to reinforce the protection and conservation of the property. Notwithstanding, they reiterate the importance of clearly identifying rate and extent of decay mechanisms so that appropriate measures are implemented.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.56

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.57**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit neither the report nor detailed topographical maps of the five component parts of the property, as requested;*
4. *Expresses its concern about the absence of information on the state of conservation of the property and about the implementation of the recommendations of the 2011 mission;*
5. *Urges the State Party to implement the actions requested in paragraphs 4, 5, and 6 of Decision **35 COM 7B.57**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011);*
6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to provide, in the framework of the Retrospective Inventory, detailed topographical maps of the five component parts of the property by **1 December 2013**;*
7. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to finalize the limits of the buffer zones and their associated planning controls as soon as possible, to ensure that pressure from tourism, urban and infrastructure development do not have a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and to submit a minor boundary modification by **1 February 2014** for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;*
8. *Encourages the State Party to benefit from the Sudan-Qatar Archaeological Project (QSAP) in order to address the above issues and requests it to keep the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies informed of any major conservation, restoration and development projects related to the property;*

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.

57. World Heritage properties in Syria (Syrian Arab Republic)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

Ancient City of Damascus:	1979
Ancient City of Bosra:	1980
Site of Palmyra:	1980
Ancient City of Aleppo:	1986
Crac des Chevaliers and Qal'at Salah El-Din:	2006
Ancient Villages of Northern Syria:	2011

Criteria

Ancient City of Damascus:	(i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)
Ancient City of Bosra:	(i) (iii) (vi)
Site of Palmyra:	(i) (ii) (iv)
Ancient City of Aleppo:	(iii) (iv)
Crac des Chevaliers and Qal'at Salah El-Din:	(ii) (iv)
Ancient Villages of Northern Syria:	(iii) (iv) (v)

Current conservation issues

Since March 2011, the uprising in Syria had led to thousands of deaths, displaced population, and caused turmoil and destruction, including that of the exceptional archaeological and historical heritage of the country. Since the beginning of the armed conflict in Syria, UNESCO has called for the safeguarding of the country's cultural heritage and alerted the international community, INTERPOL and the World Customs Organization, regarding the risk of illicit export of cultural objects. This issue was also highlighted at the UN Security Council by the joint UN-Arab League Special Envoy for Syria on 24 September 2012.

Syria has six properties on the World Heritage List: Ancient City of Damascus, Ancient city of Bosra, Site of Palmyra, Ancient City of Aleppo, Crac des Chevaliers and Qal'at Salah El-Din, and Ancient Villages of Northern Syria. Aleppo in particular has suffered considerable damage. The available information about the destructions is partial and comes from various sources, not always verifiable, such as the social networks, media, etc. In light of the present situation and the threats facing these properties, the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to provide, in addition to the two state of conservation reports requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session on Damascus and the Ancient Villages of Northern Syria, a report on the state of conservation of its World Heritage properties, which was received on 28 March 2013. The report collates available information from the branches of the Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums. However, it notes that ground access in Syria is extremely limited for antiquities experts, therefore the extent of the damage cannot be assessed at this time. Photos included were taken from social networks and the media. It is to be noted that this report represents an official statement from the Syrian authorities, but does not necessarily reflect the actual situation. The text of the report is reproduced hereunder.

Ancient City of Damascus (C 20)

The report from the State Party indicates the following: "The Heritage city has been targeted in explosion several times, but no damages for its monuments had accrued inside. One

illegal building (with three floors) had been built in the historical districts south of the old city (Midan district).”

Ancient City of Bosra (C 22)

The report from the State Party indicates the following: “During the crises on 2012 the old city witnessed several damages: The residents found the right moment to push through illegal projects (construction in protected area), it is difficult to assess today the extent of their illegal actions.” The report also includes images of damage to historic buildings, the al Mabrak Mosque, among others.

Site of Palmyra (C 23)

The report from the State Party indicates the following: “Several stone sculptures apparently stolen from the unexcavated tombs especially in the South east and South west of the site and illegal excavations conducted with the help of heavy equipment. Clandestine excavations have increased, these violations are taking place right now throughout the site (accompanied by sabotage and cracking of the foundations of ancient buildings and blocks). Some parts of the monuments like Camp of Diocletian, are being degraded because of the bulk removal of foundation stones. The entrances of the excavated Cemeteries, were buried by the antiquities authority before the end of 2010 (approximately the beginning of the events) in order to protect them from theft. But unexplored tombs in the Valley of the tombs and in the area of the Southwest and Southeast tombs (passage-graves or underground tombs), were exhumed and looted. In some parts foundations stones has been completely removed by heavy machinery to be used as barriers for roads.” Photos included show damage to the Western façade of the Bel Temple, to the ancient oasis and the opening of new trails through the oasis and also from the North West of the cemeteries area to the southern slope of the Mount Arab castle.

Ancient City of Aleppo (C 21)

The report from the State Party indicates the following: “The old city witnessed some of the conflict’s most brutal destruction. The Aleppo’s citadel had been caught in the line of fire. The crises that began in 2011 has done grave damage to the outer gate of the 13th century citadel (one of the remarkable examples of military architecture in the Middle East), its 700-year old wooden door which damaged the place where the explosives were placed is now a hole on the ground. Many of Aleppo’s historical sites stand damaged, including the 17th-century market, or souk, in the Old City, which was engulfed by fire in September 2012. What happened to Aleppo’s ancient Souk happened also to the city’s oldest and largest Mosque (the 12th century Ummayyad mosque), the Mosque suffered extensive damage, as has the nearby medieval covered market, or souk, which was gutted by a fire. Despite the fire, the structure of the mosque appeared to be intact, although a gate that leads to the ancient market was burned*. Many monuments and houses occupied by fighters (like Bimaristan Al Argwany, Dar Zamarya hotel, museum of science, etc.), most of the inhabitants had to flee away. Additional destructions are possible at any moment. The immediate, near-term and long-term effect of the crises on the cultural heritage of Aleppo cannot be overstated. It also, in several respects, is not yet fully known, because ongoing problems such as site looting continue in the area. The situation of the Old City of Aleppo seems the most worrisome, because of the scale of damage as well as the fragmentation of private ownership.”

Crac des Chevaliers and Qal’at Salah El-Din (C 1229)

The report from the State Party indicates the following: “Crac des Chevaliers has been exposed to clashing and gunfire. Gunmen is using the ancient Crac des Chevaliers fortress west of the flashpoint town of Homs, it was apparently occupied before July 2012 by gunmen issued from the close village of Al Husn. We think that the ancient mosque (the chapel) in the

* Since this report, the minaret of the Great Mosque was totally destroyed on 23 April 2013.

centre of the citadel, which still retained traces of original paintwork, has been damaged. Till now it is unknown what damage has been caused to the site. We didn't inform about any damages in Qal'at Salah El Din in spite of the conflict, which was taken place on 2012 in the "Al-Hafeh" district of Lattakia."

Ancient Villages of Northern Syria (C 1348)

The report from the State Party indicates the following: "The impact of the crises from the beginning in Ancient Villages was complex, the 4 parks (1-2-5-6) in (Jabal Zawiye and Jabal Simeon Sanctuary) face serious conservation issues, including illegal excavation, inappropriate development such as: illegal buildings, soil erosion. The lack of security has allowed illegal construction works to be undertaken inside the parks (Bara, Simeon and Rweha). In the rural of Aleppo, the gunmen have taken strategic places, including ancient hilltop as Saint Simeon Sanctuary and they spread also in some of the parks (Bara and Rweha parks). Gunfire damage has been seen at several areas in particular in al-Bara, (Deir Sunbel, Qal'at Abu Sifian, Pyramidal tombs, Monastery monks). The parts known to have been damaged are: In Deir Sunbel, Al-Bara, 3 tombs were damaged inside the pyramid tomb and 4 decorated crown stones have been stolen. Clandestine excavations have found in several villages (Bara, Kafer Aqab), antiquities authority didn't find any archaeological evident in the mentioned digging areas. In Sergilla, Shinshrah, Rabia, Majlia, Deir Loza and Jaradeh refugees have re-inhabited buildings and rock shelters and digging latrines amongst the Ancient Villages. Theft and vandalism had shown in Sergilla, the new equipment's in the visitor bathroom had broken with many panels inside the archaeological site and the stone coffin at the entrance of the site had broken also."

Actions implemented by the Advisory Bodies and UNESCO

Early January 2013, ICOMOS, in close cooperation with ICCROM and the Syrian Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums (DGAM), and in coordination with UNESCO, organized an e-learning course through video conference at the National Museum of Damascus. The course was designed to assist Syrian cultural heritage professionals in the management and response to the multi-layered effects of armed conflict on their sites and museum collection. It provided essential information about documentation in emergency for sites and collections, disaster risk management and emergency response, evacuation and temporary storage of collections, assessment of damage and first aid to sites, safety and security procedures during the response phase, network building and capacity building for the recovery phase. About 75 DGAM managers, directors, curators, architects and staff, together with Syrian members of ICOMOS, university professors and students from the Faculty of Architecture at the University of Damascus, benefited from the course. Further seminars on additional subjects could be foreseen to assist in the recovery phase, depending on additional international support. The booklet from the e-learning course is available on the web at the following link: http://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Secretariat/Syria%20E-Learning%20Course%20Booklet-%20Final%20Version_09_January%202013.pdf

In addition, as part of UNESCO's action in response to the current Syrian crisis, the UNESCO Amman Office and the UNESCO Cultural Heritage Protection Treaties Section organized a four-day regional training, with the support of the Swiss Federal Office for Culture and the UNESCO Offices in Iraq, Beirut and Venice, entitled "Syrian cultural heritage: addressing the issue of illicit trafficking", which took place in Amman (Jordan) from 10-13 February 2013. The meeting aimed to assess the situation of the cultural heritage, its illicit trafficking and the risk of looting of Syrian cultural objects, and promote cooperation in the region as a priority, as well as in the rest of the world. The initiative brought representatives of the police, customs and heritage departments from Syria and neighbouring countries together with international organizations involved in cultural heritage management and protection, as well as international experts in Syrian archaeology and law enforcement agencies from countries such as Switzerland, Italy, France, Germany, United Kingdom and

the United States. The objective of the training was to contribute to the safeguarding of Syrian cultural heritage, providing a venue to discuss the current situation and develop an Action Plan to address the issue of illicit trafficking, in coordination with all relevant stakeholders and making use of the experience gained by UNESCO in other conflict and post-conflict situations.

The report presented by the Syrian authorities at that occasion is available in English at the following address: <http://dgam.gov.sy/index.php?d=309&id=717>.

The report of the Amman February meeting is available at the following address: http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/FIELD/Amman/pdf/20130322_Report_Syria_workshop_FINAL.pdf

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that due to the armed conflict situation in Syria, the conditions are no longer present to ensure the conservation and protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the six World Heritage properties located in the Syrian Arab Republic and that they are threatened by a specific and proven imminent danger, in accordance with Paragraph 179 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

They recommend that the World Heritage Committee calls upon all parties associated with the situation in Syria to refrain from any action that would cause further damage to the cultural heritage of the country and to fulfil their obligations under international law by taking all possible measures to protect such heritage. They also recommend that the World Heritage Committee draws the attention of the State Party to the need to also safeguard all the properties inscribed on the Tentative List of Syria.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are at the disposal of the State Party to identify the necessary corrective measures and the Desired state of conservation for the properties, following an assessment which could be undertaken once the situation allows.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.57

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Deplores the conflict situation prevailing in the country and the loss of human lives;*
3. *Takes note of the report provided by the State Party regarding the state of conservation of the six Syrian World Heritage properties and expresses its utmost concern at the damage occurred and threats facing these properties;*
4. *Considers that the optimal conditions are not present anymore to ensure the conservation and protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the properties and that they are threatened by both ascertained and potential danger, in accordance with paragraphs 177 to 179 of the Operational Guidelines;*
5. ***Decides to inscribe the Ancient City of Damascus, Ancient city of Bosra, Site of Palmyra, Ancient City of Aleppo, Crac des Chevaliers and Qal'at Salah El-Din, and Ancient Villages of Northern Syria (Syria) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;***

6. Launches an appeal to the neighbouring States Parties to Syria (Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey) and to the international community to cooperate in fighting against the illicit trafficking of cultural property coming from Syria;
7. Urges all parties associated with the situation in Syria to refrain from any action that would cause further damage to cultural heritage of the country and to fulfil their obligations under international law by taking all possible measures to protect such heritage, in particular the safeguarding of World Heritage properties and those included in the Tentative List;
8. Requests the State Party to invite the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to undertake a mission to Syria as soon as the security conditions permit in order to assess the state of conservation of the properties and elaborate, in consultation with the State Party, an action plan for their recovery;
9. Also requests the State Party in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to prepare, as soon as the situation allows, the corrective measures as well as a Desired state of conservation for the removal of the properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger, once a return to stability is effective in the country;
10. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2014**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties in Syria for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986

Criteria

(iv) (v) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

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

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 72,000

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/385/assistance>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

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

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Uncontrolled vertical and horizontal additions;
- b) Use of inappropriate building materials and techniques;
- c) Densification of the historic fabric through occupation of green areas;
- d) Functional decay of the residential neighborhoods.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/385>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

At the time of drafting the present document, the State Party has not yet submitted a state of conservation report as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session. Nor was a report submitted in 2012.

The prevailing difficult security situation meant that the reactive monitoring mission requested by the Committee at its 35th session still could not be undertaken.

There has thus been no official report of the prevailing condition at the property since the State Party reported in March 2011. In that report, it was stated that the conservation of the property had not improved over the previous ten years. The inappropriate use of modern materials and uncontrolled vertical development, which threatened the city's skyline, were continuing as was the limited maintenance of old buildings and the gardens. The State Party reported that the lack of a functioning management system, a conservation plan, adequate resources and a functioning legal system meant that little progress could be made.

In the 2013 report submitted by the State Party on the property of Zabid, it was reported that a draft law of the Protection of Historic Sites, Monuments, Cities and their Urban and Cultural Heritage had been submitted to Parliament and is expected to be issued officially in 2013. On 6 January 2013, the Yemen Times reported that this bill was designed to preserve historic cities, to allow funds to be allocated for the preservation of historic sites, especially World Heritage properties such as Old Sana'a and Zabid, and to allow the General Organization for the Preservation of Historic Cities in Yemen to have full authority to take measures to care for such sites.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, while understanding the difficult situation that prevails in the country, underscore the urgent need for substantial actions to be undertaken to preserve the historic city from deteriorating to such an extent that it might be considered by the Committee to be endangered.

They recommend that the Committee welcome the draft Heritage Protection Bill being considered by Parliament as a very positive step forward.

They also reiterate the need for a reactive monitoring mission to visit the property as soon as the security situation allows, in order to ascertain the current conservation of the property.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.58

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.60**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit the report as requested;
4. Expresses its concern at the apparent continuing vulnerability of the property as a result of the current difficult situation;

5. *Calls upon the international community to support the State Party, in co-operation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, in any way possible for priority conservation, management measures and capacity building programmes;*
6. *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 identify measures needed to reverse the decay and ensure the conservation and protection of the property, as soon as the security situation allows;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to provide information to the World Heritage Centre on progress with the Heritage Protection Bill being considered by Parliament;*
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.*

ASIA-PACIFIC

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

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/115/documents/>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount granted: 5,710 Euros (France/UNESCO Cooperation Agreement)

Previous monitoring missions
July 2002: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; October 2002: World Heritage Centre/World Bank mission; June 2004 and May 2005: UNESCO Tehran Office fact-finding missions; May 2006: World Heritage Centre mission; June and December 2006, April 2007, October 2008, and October 2009: UNESCO Tehran advisory missions; March 2010: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; May 2013: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Uncoordinated urban development - construction of a large scale commercial complex;
b) Subway route under the historical axis of Esfahan.

Illustrative material
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/115>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation as requested by Decision **36 COM 7B.62** adopted at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee (Saint Petersburg, 2012). Therefore, no update is available on the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations related to the proposed route of metro line 2 and its potential impacts on the property and its setting, completion on the reduction in the height of the Jahan-Nama building, development of a Management Plan, and maps indicating the property boundaries and buffer zone.

The joint World Heritage Centre/Advisory Bodies reactive monitoring mission scheduled for 5 to 9 May 2013, primarily to consider the impact of the proposed metro line, has not been carried out at the time of drafting this report, and its recommendations will therefore be presented orally to the Committee.

Conclusion

Due to the absence of updated information, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies cannot estimate the progress made by the State Party in implementing the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee in relation to the new metro line and its potential impact on the property and its setting, progress made in reducing the height of the

Jahan-Nama Building, the development of a Management Plan, or the delineation of the property's boundaries and buffer zone.

They therefore recommend that the World Heritage Committee consider amending the draft decision according to the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission that will be reported at the Committee session.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.62

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.62**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party has not submitted a state of conservation report that addresses the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit, as a matter of urgency, to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, detailed information and documentation on the proposed route of metro line 2, and on its impact on the property and its setting;*
5. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to develop a Management Plan for the property, in consultation with all stakeholders, and to ensure that this Management Plan becomes part of a larger strategic vision for integrated urban development and conservation;*
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.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2012

Criteria
(ii)

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/1397/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/1397>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party did not submit a report on the state of conservation as requested by Decision **36 COM 8B.23** adopted at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee (Saint Petersburg, 2012) at the time of inscription of the property. The State Party was requested to report on the following: revision of the Meydan-e Atiq project, strengthening the protection of the buffer zone and wider setting, putting in place monitoring indicators, and the development and adoption of an integrated conservation and Management Plan.

An ICOMOS Advisory Mission to the property has been invited by the State Party by letter of 13 March 2013 but had not taken place at the time of the preparation of this report.

Meydan-e Atiq project:

This proposed project is located partly in the buffer zone and is designed to adjoin the eastern bazaar structures connected to the walls of the property.

In its evaluation, ICOMOS considered that the project required revision both in terms of design and safety, preliminary archaeological investigations should be undertaken and that a Heritage Impact Assessment would be needed in order to review the potential impact of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the mosque and its setting.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee regret that no information has been provided by the State Party on the requested revisions to the Meydan-e-Atiq project or on other requests made by the Committee in Decision **36 COM 8B.23** relating to the protection and management of the property.

They understand that an Advisory Mission is being planned which should provide the opportunity to consider any revised plans for the Meydan-e-Atiq project and related archaeological and impact assessments before decisions have been made. They consider that, in order to ensure that a satisfactory level of protection and management is in place for the property, measures to strengthen the protection of the buffer zone and its wider setting need to be taken, and monitoring indicators should be put in place, as soon as possible, as does the completed and adopted integrated conservation and Management Plan.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.63

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 8B.23**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*

3. Regrets that the State Party did not provide a state of conservation report as requested;
4. Reiterates its requests to the State Party to urgently revise the Meydan-e Atiq project, in particular its north-western corner in the immediate vicinity of the Masjed-e Jāmé of Isfahan, in a way that will:
 - a) not foresee any structural connection between the new galleries and the historic walls of the mosque or the structures connected to the mosque walls, which could transmit loads or vibrations to these,
 - b) provide ample passage for pedestrians, in particular through redesign of the entrance gate situation to the Meydan in the north-western corner, to ensure that the mosque and its adjacent historic structures are not endangered by crowds accessing the square during major events,
 - c) ensure that the overall design is appropriate to the local urban design tradition and setting of the mosque and sensitive to its Outstanding Universal Value,
 - d) following the availability of a revised project design (following the criteria listed above) as well as a revised implementation schedule, conduct a comprehensive Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and further archaeological excavation in order to ensure that the revised project proposal does not cause any negative impact on the historic structure of the mosque or its setting;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre detailed information on the revision of the Meydan-e Atiq project, including independently prepared HIA for the revised proposal, for review by the Advisory Bodies;
6. Also reiterates its recommendation to the State Party to give consideration to the following:
 - a) ensure that the design and presentation of information in the property are based on the principle of minimal intervention in full respect for the aesthetic and religious significance of the Masjed-e Jāmé of Isfahan,
 - b) give priority attention to the challenge posed by the necessary removal of the bracings in the shabestani domed areas;
7. Further reiterates its requests to the State Party to strengthen the protection of the buffer zone and its wider setting and expand the monitoring mechanisms related to urban development, in particular through:
 - a) integration of the buffer zone in the Isfahan Master Plan and municipal by-laws;
 - b) development and adoption of an integrated conservation and Management Plan, with special sections on visitor management and risk-preparedness strategies;
8. Reiterates furthermore its recommendation to the State Party that Heritage Impact Assessments are carried out for any future developments in the buffer zone, such as further rehabilitation of the surrounding historic bazaar or the envisaged ablution facilities to the north-west of the mosque, in particular if these are intended to be directly attached to the mosque complex or in its immediate vicinity, to ensure that any developments do not impact adversely on the property and its wider setting;
9. 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, including progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2003

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/1103/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/1103>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

Reports on the state of conservation of the property were submitted by the State Party on 7 September 2012 and on 3 March 2013. These reports address the construction of a new mosque outside the buffer zone, changes to the zoning plan and development of the Master Plan, as well as the completion of a management and conservation plan for the property.

a) *Construction of a new mosque*

In 2010, the authorities of the South Kazakhstan Region commenced the construction of a new mosque located approx. 500 metres south of the Mausoleum of Khaja Ahmed Yasawi and approximately 70 metres south east of the buffer zone. The new construction was initially planned at 38.5 metres height for the minarets and 31.5 metres for the domes.

In view of the potential impact of this mosque on the ability of the Mausoleum to stand out as a key monument within its wider setting, an advisory mission visited the property in December 2010. The mission recommended that the height of the mosque should be reduced (from 31.5 to 28 metres) so that its dome and minarets do not compete visually with the dominant form of the Khoja Ahmed Yasawi mausoleum; the design of the New Mosque should be reworked at the national level in a local or regional style, with the assistance of local architects; the project should be approved by the Ministry of Culture and Information, so that it could pass all legal and institutional procedures; a site plan should be drawn up to show to scale of the overall mosque construction site in relation to the Mausoleum, as well as to the contemporary city of Turkestan with clear explanations of further development of the mosque's services, engineering and transport infrastructure in order to consider potential impact.

In response the State Party agreed to reduce the height of the minaret of the mosque from 38.5 to 26.5 meters, and the height of the top of the dome of the mosque from 31.5 to 25 meters. As a result, the height of the minaret of the mosque is now 15.5 meters below the height of the Khoja Ahmed Yasawi Mausoleum. One sketch of the revised design has been provided but no detailed plans.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the height reduction may diminish the visual impacts on the property but as detailed drawings of the revised design have not been received, a full analysis is still to be undertaken. It also remains unclear how the infrastructural development foreseen around the mosque will progress.

Moreover, the December 2010 advisory mission strongly recommended that the various stakeholders including national experts, professionals and the local community should be involved so that their views could be reflected in the process. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS have received an appeal from the architectural conservation community of Kazakhstan, which mentions that the construction of the mosque has been resumed without consultations with stakeholders. As recommended by the advisory mission, the project should also follow mandatory regulations established at the national level and this is still to be confirmed.

b) *Newly developed Master Plan*

Information provided by the State Party in September 2012 referred to changes related to the urban development Master Plan of Turkestan. While the formal adoption of a revised Master Plan is welcome in principle, detailed information on the new regulations has not been provided. These need to endorse the commitments made at the time of the inscription which were also included in the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), to strengthen control over construction outside the buffer zone and to ensure that Turkestan retains a low skyline of 2-3 storey buildings.

c) *Buffer Zone*

The State Party reports that, due to changes related to urban development in the city, work on the refinement of the buffer zone of the medieval fortress of Turkestan has been carried out. This project was coordinated with the Governor's Office of the South Kazakhstan region and was approved by the regional legislative body (Maslikhat). The revised buffer zone was included in the revised Master Plan of Turkestan. No details have been provided as to what changes to the Buffer Zone have been made and the revised buffer zone has not been submitted for approval to the World Heritage Committee.

d) *Conservation and Management Plan*

The State Party reports that a new Management Plan and conservation programme have been finalized. A summary of the detailed programme for the conservation of the Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi, to be implemented between 2012-2016 has been submitted. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would also appreciate the formal submission of the management plan for their review, as well as details of responsibility for its implementation.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the overall height reduction of the new mosque. They are of the view that the Committee should regret that its construction has been approved before detailed plans were provided for examination by the Advisory Bodies. They suggest that the Committee strongly recommend to the State Party to provide detailed drawings to ensure that the architectural design does not have any negative impacts on the setting of the World Heritage property, and that various stakeholders including the local communities are involved in the process.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee request further detailed information on the revised Master Plan, in particular an official commitment to retain the standard construction height of 2-3 storeys in Turkestan, the non-construction regulation in the buffer zone, and the control over tall buildings in the wider setting.

They also consider that the new Management Plan should also be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.64

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party, in particular concerning the actions that have been taken to reduce the potential negative impact of the new mosque construction on the setting of the property;*
3. *Requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *Submit detailed drawings of the latest mosque design, including the proposed exterior infrastructure, to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies,*
 - b) *Involve key stakeholders, including national experts and local community in the process of the new mosque project to seek their views and recommendations,*
 - c) *Provide information on the revised Master Plan of Turkestan, and an official commitment to retain the standard construction height of 2-3 storeys in Turkestan, the non-construction regulation in the buffer zone, and control over tall buildings in the wider setting,*
4. *Also requests the State Party to provide details of any construction proposals in the buffer zone and in the wider setting of the property which might impact adversely on the historic landscape of the property, with appropriate Heritage Impact Assessments to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
5. *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, together with the Management Plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1988

Criteria
(iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/451/documents>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

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

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

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

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/451>
and <http://hwbc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 8 April 2013 providing information on the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (**36 COM 7B.68**). The State Party apologised for not responding to the previous Committee decisions due to major structural changes within the ministries handling World Heritage matters.

a) Proposed Port Development

The State Party reports that the scale of the port development has been reduced and that the new proposal has been sent to the Department of Archaeology for approval together with the Archaeological Impact Assessment. While the assessment concludes no negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, the Department of Archaeology expresses its concerns regarding the potential impacts on the underwater structures of the fortification should this project be implemented and seeks UNESCO's assistance on this issue. Neither the Archaeological Impact Assessment nor detailed revised plans for the Port Development were received.

b) Boundaries and buffer zone

The report states that as part of the Periodic Reporting process, a buffer zone has been defined in consultation with stakeholders and will be submitted following the internal approval process. No information has been provided on the extension of the boundaries to include the maritime archaeology of the bay.

c) International Cricket Stadium

No information has been provided on the current intentions with regard to the international cricket stadium.

d) Management System/structure

The State Party reports that a comprehensive management system is in place for the property. The Department of Archaeology which has the primary mandate for the protection of the property, and manages the property through the Galle Heritage Foundation by bringing all relevant stakeholders together and sharing the resources (human and financial) with other

institutions including universities. The State Party indicates that detailed conservation plans are being developed and also implemented at present at the property in line with the Galle Management Plan (2010). The concerns raised by the February 2010 reactive monitoring mission remain unanswered. In particular, no information has been provided on the implementation of recommendations relating to the management weaknesses such as lack of resources, empowerment and support of Galle Heritage Foundation or a creation of a cross-departmental Government Agency in Galle, a Conservation and Development Authority with delegated powers, to take actions and decisions.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the information provided by the State Party on the revision of the port development project, although no detailed plans have been received. They consider that a Heritage Impact Assessment of the proposed revised port development should be carried out including a specific technical component to ascertain the potential impacts on the underwater archaeological structures, before any formal commitment to this project is given.

They underline the importance of revising the buffer zone surrounding the Old Town of Galle and its fortifications in the context of protecting its setting from adverse effects of any future development and in responding to the request of the Committee to clarify the boundaries as well as to consider an extension of the property to include maritime archaeology.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recall the previous Committee decisions on the need to provide detailed information on the current intentions with regard to the International Cricket Stadium and note that no information has been received.

They also recall that the lack of a detailed state of conservation report by the State Party since 2009 appears to reflect the need to further empower and support the Galle Heritage Foundation in its role as the managing authority for the property, as encouraged by the Committee at its 34th and 36th sessions in order to address the lack of a satisfactory management system as identified by the 2010 reactive monitoring mission. They further recall the need to establish a cross-department Government Agency, with delegated executive authority, to manage all planning and development issues within the Property including the buffer zone surround it for a efficient coordination and management.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.67

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions 34 COM 7B.72, 35 COM 7B.78 and 36 COM 7B.68, adopted at its 34th (Brasilia, 2010), 35th (UNESCO, 2011) and 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) sessions respectively,*
3. *Regrets that the State Party has provided limited or no response to the decisions of the Committee and expresses its concern that no details have been given on the following:*
 - a) *the revised port development project and its Heritage Impact Assessment or of its proposed timescale,*
 - b) *the extension of the property to include maritime archaeology and the definition of a buffer zone,*
 - c) *the proposed intentions for the International Cricket Stadium,*

- d) *strengthening the role of the Galle Heritage Foundation and the overall management system for the property;*
4. *Requests the State Party to supply detailed plans for the revised port project and to conduct a comprehensive Heritage Impact Assessment study, in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidance for World Heritage cultural properties, to assess the impacts on Outstanding Universal Value of the property, including a technical study to ascertain potential impacts on the underwater archaeology and submit these as a matter of urgency to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies in advance of any irreversible commitments;*
 5. *Also requests the State Party to formally submit the proposals for the revision of the buffer zone and encourages them to consider an extension of the property to cover maritime archaeology of the bay;*
 6. *Further requests the State Party to provide updated information on their intentions in relation to the International Cricket Stadium;*
 7. *Reiterates its request to strengthen the Galle Heritage Foundation or establish a cross-department Government Agency, Galle Conservation and Development Authority, in line with the recommendations made by the 2010 reactive monitoring mission, with a view to enhancing the management mechanism of the property;*
 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.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1993

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

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

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 71,960

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/602/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

October 2010: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a proper conservation and management plan;
- b) Recent hotel constructions which would negatively affect the integrity of the property;

- c) Heavy traffic, pollution and poor sewage system;
- d) Use of new building material and methods.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/602>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 28 February 2013, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property, providing an overview of actions carried out to address the decisions made by the World Heritage Committee and the recommendations of the 2010 reactive monitoring mission.

a) *Management Plan*

Since 2008, the Principle Department on Preservation and Utilisation of Cultural Heritage Properties in cooperation with UNESCO Office in Tashkent have been developing a GIS database of the Historic Centre of Bukhara. The final field surveys, planned for June to September 2013, will provide the essential information for the development of the management plan. These include identification of conservation issues as a means to develop conservation scheme and guidelines for housing; identification of sustainable human use and benefits with the property and its buffer zone; collection of legislation, decrees and local programmes for the definition of management objectives; identification of weaknesses and gaps in institutional and economic frameworks; and development of monitoring and reporting based on the GIS system. The potential management plan shall be integrated into the urban development master plan. Pending its completion, annual maintenance works are based on the existing legal frameworks under the responsibility of the Board of Monuments, the Bukhara Regional Inspection and regional authorities.

b) *Potential negative impacts on the authenticity and integrity of the property*

The State Party reports that no major conservation and restoration projects have been carried out within the property and its buffer zone. The national laws and decrees regulate and protect the property, namely restricting and prohibiting construction activities within the property and its buffer zone to ensure that these do not affect the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property.

As part of the “State Program on research, conservation, restoration and adaptation to the modern use of cultural heritage of Bukhara until 2020”, adopted by the Cabinet of Ministers in March 2010, works are being carried out to eliminate negative factors threatening the authenticity of the property. These include a transportation scheme regulating traffic within the property and its buffer zone (part of the Master Plan of the city of Bukhara); improvement to historic streets through demolition of unauthorised buildings and shops; improvement of architectural facades through removal of later additions, advertisement panels and signboards; cleansing of historical irrigation networks and canals. Large-scale constructions beyond the buffer zone are regulated according to their effects on the property.

The 2011-2012 tourism development programme, approved by the Cabinet of Ministers, includes conservation of individual monuments and creation of tourism facilities.

c) *Potential projects within the property and/or buffer zone*

The State Party reports that there are no major projects planned which may affect the property's OUV.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the information on the progress made with the development of the GIS system, as a basis for the preparation of the

Management Plan for the property. They recommend that the Committee requests the State Party to finalize the management plan and develop a coordinated conservation approach to bring together key conservation activities for the improved protection of the Historic Centre.

In addition, they also recall that the establishment of a Steering Committee, as recommended by the World Heritage Committee and the reactive monitoring mission, is essential to ensure that all activities within the property and its buffer zone are adequately overseen and coordinated.

Recalling the potential threats identified by the reactive monitoring mission in 2010, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee expresses its concern about the slow progress made with the Management Plan and the lack of coordination with regard to the conservation and restoration activities carried out as part of the State Program.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7B.68

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.79**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Notes the progress made by the State Party with the development of the GIS database as part of the development of the Management Plan;*
4. *Requests the State Party, as a matter of urgency, to complete the Management Plan and implement it as soon as it is finalized and to establish a Steering Committee for the property to ensure its proper management and conservation;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to develop a coordinated conservation approach to bring together key conservation activities carried out and planned within the property and its buffer zone;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2015**, an updated report on the state of conservation and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.*

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

72. Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(ii)(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/784/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2009: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; April 2013: ICOMOS advisory mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressure, high-rise projects;
- b) Hydroelectric power station Salzburg-Lehen;
- c) Train station project outside the buffer zone;
- d) Integrated approach towards management.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/784>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 30 January 2013 the State Party submitted a state of conservation report in response to Decision **35 COM 7B.83**. Based on a number of proposed new development projects on which the State Party provided information in 2012 and 2013, an ICOMOS Advisory Mission took place on 2-3 April 2013 to consider the recent developments on projects previously discussed by the Committee as well as new proposals, to assess their potential impact on the World Heritage property and to advise the State Party on avoiding potential negative impacts on its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). The current developments follow several previous occurrences of ongoing or planned construction projects which raised the concerns of the World Heritage Committee and which highlighted weaknesses in the approval system for new constructions in the property and buffer zone. A principle challenge lies in the fact that the National Monument Protection Law recognises monuments only as individual objects and provides no legislative context for the protection of historic ensembles or urban landscapes, as would be required for the case of Salzburg. Legal protection is instead offered by a Historic City Preservation Law (Altstadterhaltungsgesetz) at municipal level, which despite its introduction of expert commissions and architectural advisory boards, is not always guided by the OUV of the property and does not provide protection at the highest national level.

a) *Hydroelectric Power Plant Lehen*

In response to Decision **35 COM 7B.83**, the State Party provided a revised Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), which analyses the impacts of the project on the OUV of the property. The HIA concludes that the main impact would be a minimal rise in water level in the river Salzach, which seems to correspond to its historic water level and is accordingly considered a negligible change of minor beneficial impact.

b) *Residential Buildings City Life Rehrplatz*

The residential project at Rehrplatz is situated in an ensemble of 19th century villas along the river banks of Salzach River in the World Heritage property. The selected design, result of an international competition, features four to six storey buildings in innovative cubic design structures with large, often irregular window openings and terraces. The expert commission for the preservation of the historic city has surprisingly approved the project, while the Federal Office for the Protection of Monuments and the ICOMOS Advisory Mission have come to the conclusion that its character is incompatible with the World Heritage city of Salzburg. Likewise, resident initiatives have collected more than 25,000 signatures against this project, which they think threatens the OUV of the property.

Despite not being covered by national legislation, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that the selected design is not in line with the stipulations of the Historic City Preservation Law (Altstadterhaltungsgesetz), which was referenced as a basis for legal protection for the World Heritage property and that the project has the potential to negatively affect the OUV of the property. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS recommend to redesign the project in light of this legislation, in particular by reducing its height and modifying its design to ensure a harmonious integration in the spatial proportions of the surrounding 19th century villas.

c) *Project Schwarzstrasse 45 / Ernest-Thunstr. 2*

This project is situated in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property and proposes to demolish the existing four-storey building at Schwarzstrasse 45 to be replaced by a pentagonal and hexagonal conical building with up to seven storeys. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that the proposed seven storeys surpass the average building heights in the area and have the potential to disturb the setting of the World Heritage Site. They recommend that the project is modified in its present proportions and that a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) in light of the visual and physical impacts on the setting of the World Heritage property is presented for the revised design proposal.

d) *High-rise structure Nelböck Viaduct Rainerstrasse/Bahnhofsvorplatz*

The proposed high rise structure of 58 meters is suggested to be constructed on a property which according to the valid development plan (from 2007) foresees permission of structures up to 42 meters height. The higher structure was designed to constitute a new architectural highlight next to the central station. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that Salzburg is characterized by a number of architectural highlights of OUV, steeples and domes of churches as well as the fortification Hohensalzburg and the mountain setting at a distance. It is recommended to abandon proposals aiming at creating architectural highlights in favour of structures that harmoniously blend with the setting of the World Heritage property.

e) *Other projects*

The State Party provided notification on additional developments at Priesterhausgarten, the replacement of a 1950 structure at Paracelsusbad, the enlargement of a garage at Mönchsberg and 33 additional so-called small scale projects. Among the positive aspects reported upon is that the group of high-rises in Itzling ("Utzingling") previously discussed and addressed in the 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission report, has been abandoned and will continue only within the dimensions of the already existing

high-rises in the area near the station, fully taking the view axes of the World Heritage property into account.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS acknowledge the appointment of a site manager for Salzburg as a positive step, but also consider that the number of projects under discussion illustrates the need for a strengthened and revised management system which integrates regular procedures for HIAs, according to the ICOMOS Guidance on HIAs for World Heritage cultural properties. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS further recommend to, within the on-going revision of the Management Plan, explore possibilities for the creation of legal mechanisms that allow for the protection of monuments in their wider setting.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS recommend that the Committee request the State Party to reconsider the designs and proportions of the development projects Residential Buildings City Life Rehrplatz, Schwarzstrasse 45 / Ernest-Thunstr.2, and Nelböck Viaduct Rainerstrasse/Bahnhofsvorplatz. It is further recommended to integrate a regular mechanism for the preparation of HIA for all development projects within the property and its buffer zone in the management system. Of particular importance is a general revision of the legislative and planning mechanisms, which have facilitated the approval of inappropriate development projects impacting on the OUV of the property. Such revision should primarily be focused on the Austrian Monument Protection Law, which requires additional monument categories to gain capacity for the recognition and protection of historic city ensembles and historic urban landscapes. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are of the view that a short-term provision to integrate the Federal Office for the Protection of Monuments in any approval procedure could be stipulated in the revised management plan but that a medium-term revision of the Austrian Monument Protection Law should remain an important goal for the protection of World Heritage cities in Austria.

Draft Decision 37 COM 7B.72

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.83**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Notes the results of the April 2013 ICOMOS advisory mission to the property, invited by the State Party;*
4. *Takes note of the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the hydroelectric power plant Lehne and information provided by the State Party concerning a number of proposed new projects which may constitute negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV);*
5. *Encourages the State Party to continue to provide to the World Heritage Centre any development proposals before their official approval in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines for review by the Advisory Bodies;*
6. *Requests the State Party to initiate the modification of the project designs and proportions of the Residential Buildings City Life Rehrplatz, the project at Schwarzstrasse 45 / Ernest-Thunstr. 2 and the Nelböck Viaduct Rainerstrasse / Bahnhofsvorplatz and to carefully consider all other developments proposed on the*

basis of HIAs, in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidelines on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties, before any building permission is granted;

7. *Reiterates its request to revise the draft Management Plan and to fully implement the recommendations of the 2009 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission;*
8. *Expresses its concern about the apparent lack of adequate, legislative and planning mechanisms to protect the property from the various proposed, often aggressive, urban and infrastructure developments as well as a lack of an officially approved management system, which regulates compulsory participation of all concerned agencies in the review of these proposals;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to integrate standard requirements for HIA in urban planning and development approval policies, and to strengthen legal mechanisms for the protection of monuments in their setting, especially through an expansion of the Austrian Monument Protection Law;*
10. *Further 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 and 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)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2002

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/1066/documents>

International Assistance
N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
February 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS advisory mission; December 2012: ICOMOS advisory mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports
a) Noise pollution and traffic increase;
b) Potential impacts of the Rhine crossing project;
c) Lack of a Master Plan for the sustainable development of the property.

Illustrative material
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1066>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 8 August 2012, the State Party invited an ICOMOS advisory mission to evaluate the operation of a cable car in the city of Koblenz, located in the World Heritage property. As proposed by ICOMOS, the scope of the advisory mission was broadened to also address other development issues related to the property. It took place on 13 and 14 December 2012 and the report was transmitted to the State Party on 6 February 2013.

On 1 February 2013 and 7 March 2013, in response to Decision **35 COM 7B.93** (UNESCO, 2011) and recalling Decision **34 COM 7B.87** (Brasilia, 2010), the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre its “World Heritage Master Plan – Challenges and Visions for Future Development of the Upper Middle Rhine Valley” (*Masterplan Welterbe Oberes Mittelrheintal – Herausforderungen und Visionen für die zukünftige Entwicklung*), which is intended to set out how the property might develop in a sustainable way while sustaining its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

On 28 March 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report in response to the ICOMOS advisory mission. A supplementary brief report specifically addressing the “World Heritage Master Plan” document was prepared by the technical advisory mission on 26 February 2013. These advisory mission reports are available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1066/documents>.

a) *Master Plan for the property*

The State Party describes the “World Heritage Master Plan” document as an informal plan and political declaration of intent that relies on self-regulation and voluntary commitment by the respective stakeholders. In the Plan the present condition of the Upper Middle Rhine Valley and the World Heritage property is described and analyzed, current strengths and weaknesses are pinpointed, future challenges identified, and ten visions for the future presented. The spatial analysis referenced by the World Heritage Committee in 2011 is included. A key objective of the Plan is “to clarify the prospects for the future development of the unique cultural landscape between Bingen am Rhein/Rüdesheim am Rhein and Koblenz.”

The Master Plan is not binding, but the State Party reported that there is a pledge by participants to turn the jointly identified objectives into binding specifications (formal law) and to independently implement appropriate projects and measures. The drafting of an integrated regional “implementation concept” for the Master Plan was mandated on 21 January 2013. Based on this implementation concept, it is intended to reach consensus and agreement on short-, medium- and long-term projects designed to develop the World Heritage property. The State Party draws attention to the “powerlessness” of the federal state regarding competence for planning, which lies with the relevant municipal authorities.

The advisory mission concluded that a Master Plan is needed, as the current Management Plan has proven inadequate. The process of elaboration of the Master Plan has been exemplary, according to the mission: it has taken a broadly participatory, “bottom-up” approach. Moreover, its primary value may be in the highly democratic approach taken.

The mission however considered that the Master Plan is generic, since only two of its ten “visions for the future” are specific to the property: the wish to lessen the noise caused by the railway; and the goal to create “a sense of identity and responsibility for the Upper Middle Rhine Valley World Heritage Area”. The mission also noted that the Master Plan would need to include a procedure for future revision to clarify the time-bound actions. Furthermore, it has been considered imperative that the implementation concept be part of the Master Plan.

The mission concluded that it is essential to clearly define in the Master Plan the World Heritage property’s importance, and especially the Plan’s position in balancing the various interests. Furthermore, procedures need to be clarified and decision-making authority

defined. Clarification is also needed regarding the mutual responsibilities of the two federal states; the relationship between the Master Plan and the encircling planning regions; the ambiguity in the Plan between the World Heritage property and the larger geographical entity of the Upper Middle Rhine Valley; and terminology.

b) *New bridge across the Rhine River*

The State Party confirmed on 1 February 2013 that the federal state of Rhineland-Palatinate has decided to give up the plan to build a bridge across the Rhine River in the vicinity of St Goar and St Goarshausen for the remaining legislative period, which is due to end in 2016. Instead, an extended ferry service is being implemented on a probationary basis until 2016.

The mission concluded that, while the bridge project has been stopped, it could be reactivated in a changing political constellation. It therefore considered appropriate, before the problem reappears in some years, for the Master Plan to give clear advice about an acceptable form of a crossing (ferry, tunnel, bridge), based on the impact on the OUV, authenticity and integrity of the property.

c) *Cable car transportation system installed between the town of Koblenz and the fortress*

The State Party stated that the purported negative impact of the temporary cable car system on the OUV, authenticity and integrity of the 65-km-long property is inconclusive, inconsistent and inadequately demonstrated. It also noted that the federal state of Rhineland-Palatinate reserves the right to extend the cable car's operation by two years, to 30 June 2016. Moreover, the State Party has requested that the temporary cable car system be allowed to remain in operation until 30 June 2026 if agreed to by the World Heritage Committee in order to allow authorities to pursue a long-term solution for barrier-free, energy-efficient access to the fortress with reduced visual impact on the cultural landscape.

The mission concluded that the cable car system constructed over the Rhine River for the 2011 National Garden Show is not compatible with the OUV of the property and harms its authenticity and integrity. The mission recommended that the cable car system be dismantled, as promised by the Ministry for Education, Science, Youth and Culture in its letter to the Director of the World Heritage Centre dated 3 April 2008, and that this dismantling respect the agreed deadlines; that is, to begin in autumn 2013 and end in spring 2014.

d) *Large-scale hotel buildings contemplated for the Loreley Plateau, and the summer bobsleigh track*

The State Party reported that it has requested authorities to postpone all further procedures concerning the planned hotel development on the Loreley Plateau pending a decision by the World Heritage Committee, and has advised authorities that the ICOMOS advisory mission report's comments serve as the basis for any redevelopment.

The mission concluded that the project for three hotels on the Loreley Plateau is not compatible with the OUV of the property; in particular, the six-star hotel due to its position on the edge of the plateau and its dimensions. It would seriously alter the cultural landscape and damage its authenticity and integrity. The mission recommended stopping all associated public planning measures and informing the private investor that this project should not be implemented in its current form. However, the mission believed that a project for a smaller hotel may be possible if it complies with the development plan for the plateau that is currently being prepared, particularly regarding location, size and architectural quality.

The mission likewise concluded that the summer bobsleigh track on the Loreley Plateau is not compatible with the OUV of the property, since it would considerably alter the cultural landscape and negatively impact its authenticity and integrity. The mission therefore recommended refusing the final permit for the bobsleigh track, ensuring that the parts already installed are dismantled, and returning the site to its previous state.

e) *Alternative energy production installations such as wind turbines and pump storage stations*

The State Party reported that a draft partial update of the federal state development plan on wind energy specifies that wind turbines will not be allowed within the boundaries of the property. They could be allowed within the buffer zone; however, only where the property's OUV would not be impaired, based on a sightlines study due to be completed in May 2013. A moratorium exists in the meantime. According to the State Party's report, the authority responsible for the pump-storage hydroelectric plant has been informed that World Heritage considerations must be taken into account and that the federal state will inform the World Heritage Centre on developments.

The mission concluded that, while no definite projects for energy production installations are pending within the property or its buffer zone, the evolution of such projects can nevertheless be dynamic and should therefore be closely monitored, and the World Heritage Centre be informed if such projects are proposed. The mission also recommended completing the sightlines study, with the goal of ensuring that no wind turbines are visible from the property, and submitting it to the World Heritage Committee for consideration.

f) *Noise from the railway*

The mission confirmed that noise from the railway heavily affects the quality of life of inhabitants and the experience of visitors to the property. The mission recommended that efforts to reduce noise in the most effective and sensitive way be reinforced. The mission cautioned against sporadic measures leading to unsightly solutions such as noise-protection walls. It suggested that short-term solutions – including improvements to the technical infrastructure, noise-reduction of vehicles, and further organisational measures – be realised while also developing a long-term solution such as another rail transport corridor.

Concerning noise from the railway, the State Party reported that the federal state of Rhineland-Palatinate calls on UNESCO and ICOMOS to continue supporting its efforts to induce the federal government and the national railway company to take responsibility for and within the World Heritage property.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made by the State Party in developing the "World Heritage Master Plan" document, and in particular the exemplary participatory process used in its elaboration. They recommend that the Committee request the State Party to refine the Master Plan to clearly define the World Heritage property's importance, and the Plan's position in balancing the various interests; to complete the "implementation concept"; to include a procedure for future revision; and to clarify procedures, authorities, responsibilities, ambiguities and terminology. Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend to the Committee to request that the Master Plan provides for a clear definition of an acceptable form of river crossing (ferry, tunnel, bridge), based on the impact on the OUV, authenticity and integrity of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the cable car transportation system between the town of Koblenz and the fortress, the large-scale hotel buildings contemplated for the Loreley Plateau, and the summer bobsleigh track on the Loreley Plateau are not compatible with the OUV of the property, and would negatively impact its authenticity and integrity. They also stress that the cable car system and bobsleigh track should be dismantled, and approval be denied for the large-scale hotel buildings. They however suggest to the Committee to recommend that viable possibilities for a smaller-scale redevelopment of the Loreley Plateau be discussed by the State Party, the Advisory Bodies and all stakeholders. They also recommend the Committee to request the State Party to closely monitor the situation related to alternative energy production installations such as wind turbines and pump storage stations, and complete the related sightlines study and

submit it to the World Heritage Committee; and encourage the State Party to reinforce efforts to reduce the noise from the railway in the most effective and sensitive way.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.75

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decisions **34 COM 7B.87**, **35 COM 7B.93** and **35 COM 8E**, adopted at its 34th (Brasilia, 2010) and 35th (UNESCO, 2011) sessions respectively,
3. Notes the State Party's decision not to pursue the plan to construct a bridge across the Rhine River in the vicinity of St Goar and St Goarshausen for the remaining legislative period, which is due to end in 2016, and to implement an extended ferry service on a trial basis until 2016 instead;
4. Also notes the recommendations of the ICOMOS advisory mission carried out to the property in December 2012;
5. Welcomes the progress made in developing the "World Heritage Master Plan" document, and in particular the exemplary participatory process used in its elaboration, and requests the State Party to refine the Master Plan in order to:
 - a) clearly define the World Heritage property's importance, and the Master Plan's position in balancing the various interests,
 - b) complete the "implementation concept", and include a procedure for future revision,
 - c) clarify procedures, authorities, responsibilities, and terminology, and
 - d) provide for a clear definition of an acceptable form of river crossing (ferry, tunnel, bridge), based on the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
6. Recommends that the State Party:
 - a) dismantle, as previously agreed, the cable car system between the town of Koblenz and the fortress Ehrenbreitstein,
 - b) refuse the final permit for the bobsleigh track on the Loreley Plateau, dismantle the bobsleigh track, and rehabilitate the site to its previous state,
 - c) deny approval for the large-scale hotel buildings contemplated for the Loreley Plateau;
7. Encourages the State Party to consider viable solutions for a smaller-scale redevelopment of the Loreley Plateau in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and all stakeholders;
8. Also requests the State Party to closely monitor the situation related to alternative energy production installations such as wind turbines and pump storage stations, complete the related sightlines study, and submit this study to the World Heritage Centre for examination by the Advisory Bodies;
9. Also encourages the State Party to reinforce efforts to reduce the noise from the railway in the most effective and sensible way;

10. 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 consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.

76. Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

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/400/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided: 800 million HUF (ca. 2.7 million EUR) EU support for the "Street of Culture" project

Previous monitoring missions

March 2005: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission; November 2007: ICOMOS advisory mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Demolition and inappropriate development in the buffer zone known as the 'Jewish Quarter';
- b) Inappropriate use of public areas and street amenities;
- c) Lack of conservation of residential housing in the area inscribed as World Heritage;
- d) Increased traffic volume.

Illustrative materials

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/400/>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 30 January 2013 as requested by the World Heritage Committee Decision **35 COM 7B.95**. A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was invited by the State Party, and visited the property from 25 February to 1 March 2013. The mission's report of April 2013, while concluding that the general state of conservation of the property is satisfactory and its value maintained, adds important information to the State Party's report; its main recommendations pertain to institutional co-ordination and protective regulation. The mission report is available online at the following web address:

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM/documents/>.

a) *Legislation and Management of the Property*

The State Party reports that its new World Heritage legislation, Act LXXVII on World Heritage, came into force on 1 January 2012. It further reports that a Government Decree 315/2011 (XII.27), which took effect on 1 January 2012, regulates the preparation of World

Heritage Management Plans. The new Law requires the publication of management plans as governmental decrees ensuring their legal status.

The report provides detailed information about the reorganisation of the institutions concerned with protection of Hungary's national heritage. Nationally, three governmental ministries (Interior, Human Resources and Public Administration and Justice) have responsibilities for different aspects of World Heritage properties, while in Budapest protection is regulated by two regional agencies overseen by an appeals mechanism administered by the Budapest Metropolitan Government. The Management Plan for the property is now in preparation and the body responsible for the management has been appointed.

The mission report notes the State Party's legislative and regulatory innovations but concludes that, prior to the development and implementation of the Management Plan and legal approval of the new regulations, the existing administrative system for the building permits could jeopardise the urban fabric of the whole World Heritage area. It recommends the following urgent measures: no new construction should be allowed nor permits granted in this interim period; and there should be established appropriate restrictive regulations, clear and transparent procedures and monitoring for application by the local governments of the 'Governmental Decree 314/2012', which took effect on 1 January 2013, and in particular the establishment of rules for concluding agreements with partners (a Partnership Plan), prior to making town development or regulatory plans, in order to prevent serious deterioration of architectural and urban coherence.

b) *Demolition and New Development*

The State Party reports that there have been no demolitions nor permits issued in the 'Jewish quarter' during the reporting period. No significant construction has occurred but two major proposals on Dob Street have attracted significant opposition. No.19 comprised the restoration of the street front, as well as raising the courtyard roof level and replacing the courtyard wing with a new four storey building for shops and apartments. The permit was upheld after appeal but is now suspended under judicial review. No.21 had a permit for development of the ruinous building into a youth hostel supplemented by commercial and entertainment facilities. The permit was not upheld on appeal; this too is under judicial review. The work of historic rehabilitation of the two properties is underway and demolition, research and excavation will be officially supervised.

21 Klauzal Street has a permit for rehabilitation with the construction of an additional storey on the courtyard wing and renovation of properties in Gozsdu Courtyard and Inner Erzsebetvaros have been undertaken, while several listed historic buildings have been converted into pubs. At 10 Dohany Street and 8-10 Sip Street, permitted demolition has been completed but street frontages retained. After the collapse of the upper storey of 10 Sip Street, the authorities have imposed a requirement to rebuild.

The planned demolition in Becsi Street was initially reduced in scale from five to three buildings, but permits for the latter three were refused. Thus, there is no permit for any demolition or construction associated with this proposed development.

The joint mission report notes the above, but states that despite the withdrawal of the proposed plans for demolition at Becsi Street, the deteriorating condition of the buildings continues to give grave concern. They consider that merely withdrawing schemes of demolition does little to protect this area and suggest that neglect by owners is sometimes a deliberate plan to make collapse, and thus, redevelopment, inevitable.

c) *Street of Culture*

This programme of conservation in Kazinczy Street, aided with European Union resources, was completed in 2012 and comprised the renovation of the orthodox synagogue, the Electrical Technology Museum and two further buildings as well as the facade of the Eotvos

Lorand University. Traffic enhancement and reduction in public spaces and streetscapes was undertaken.

d) *Further Developments within the World Heritage property and Buffer Zone*

The State Party report mentions that planning for a new Budapest Museum Park bordering on Heroes' Square and City Park in the buffer zone is at preliminary concept design stage and detailed information will be sent to the World Heritage Centre as it becomes available. The report also appends details of four projects that affect the property, which had been submitted to the World Heritage Centre in August 2012, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The State Party suggests that the restoration of the Royal Castle Garden Pavilions, rearrangements in Kossuth Square to better reflect the original architectural concept and provide better access, parking and information, a new Museum Park and restructuring at Szechenyi square to reduce traffic and enhance access will serve to increase the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property.

The mission recommends that further details should be sent to the World Heritage Centre, including Heritage Impact Assessments, to support the Royal Garden project; and studies of soils, geology and hydrology to underpin the Kossuth Square and Parliament Visitor Centre project. The projects are of a scale that could have an adverse impact upon the OUV of the property if not carefully designed and evaluated.

e) *Enlargement and Revision of the property buffer zone*

The State Party reports that enlargement of the buffer zone should be considered during the process of preparation of the Management Plan.

Conclusion

The State Party has responded to all the matters raised by the World Heritage Committee and has supplied welcome and detailed information about the new legislative and regulatory framework for the protection of this property and the other World Heritage properties in Hungary. It is noted that progress is now being made on the management plan and management structure during which process the proposed enlargement of the buffer zone will be considered and submitted in due course. The control of inappropriate development in the property and buffer zone has led to the withdrawal of various proposals, especially that in Becsí Street, and the State Party has given notice of proposed new developments as required by Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The reactive monitoring mission concurred with the above but recommended urgent measures to protect the property from inappropriate development before the management plan and detailed regulation and monitoring procedures are in place. The mission remains concerned by the deteriorating condition of some historic buildings in the property.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.76

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.95**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Notes the recent withdrawal of demolition and development schemes in the Jewish quarter and Becsí Street but notes with concern the deteriorating condition of existing historic buildings;*

4. Welcomes the new World Heritage legislation that took effect on 1 January 2012, and the statutory underpinning of World Heritage management plans;
5. Also notes the reorganization and enhancement of administration of World Heritage properties protection both at the national and at the municipal level;
6. Encourages the State Party to continue the work of preparation of the management plan and management structure for the property and its buffer zone, and the proposed enlargement of the buffer zone;
7. Requests the State Party to implement the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission by establishing stringent controls over applications for new development within the property and buffer zone;
8. Further notes the details of proposed developments in the property and also requests the State Party to supply the World Heritage Centre with details of the Royal Garden project, detailed reports concerning soils, geology and hydrology in order to underpin the project at Kossuth Square; and details of the proposed new Museum Park as soon as design work is completed, with Heritage Impact Assessments, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
9. 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.

77. Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata (Italy) (C 829)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

Criteria

(iii)(iv)(v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/829/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

Total amount granted: USD 183 487: Italian Funds-in-Trust

Previous monitoring missions

December 2010 and January 2011: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission

January 2013: Joint WHC//ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) A series of structural collapses at the property;
- b) Building projects in the vicinity of the property;
- c) Management system;

- d) Inadequate restoration and maintenance; lack of skills;
- e) Ineffective drainage systems;
- f) Visitor pressure.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/829>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

A report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party in March 2013 and a World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out from 7 to 10 January 2013. The mission report is available online at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM/documents>

The 2013 mission considers that there has been progress on a number of the recommendations by the 2010 advisory mission to the property, both concerning the management system and the conservation issues. However, much remains to be done, as specified below.

a) *Management*

The Italian Government launched a series of initiatives aimed at addressing the management deficiencies identified at the property. The main activities of the Funds in Trust project “Towards a system of governance to coordinate the updating and implementation of the Management Plan for the archaeological sites of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata”, funded by the Italian authorities and implemented by UNESCO, were undertaken by March 2013, with the involvement of numerous stakeholders. The Italian authorities reported that the new Management Plan will be completed by the end of December 2013.

One of the issues addressed during the preparation of the Management Plan concerns the extension of the buffer zone to ensure that not only the currently inscribed archaeological sites themselves are correctly safeguarded, but also their setting. The Italian authorities will use the already existing landscape plan for the Vesuvian municipalities as the basis for a buffer zone proposal. The mission recommended that a minor boundary modification to the property at Herculaneum should be considered to include the area excavated in the 1990’s, between the main site and the Villa of Papiri, and to ensure that the property does actually include the known remains of the Villa and of the Theatre.

A draft Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) has been submitted by the State Party, as requested by Decision **35 COM 7B.96**, and will be reviewed by the Advisory Bodies.

b) *Restoration and maintenance*

The mission stated that there has been significant progress in the regular maintenance programme and that extra professional staff has been sent to Pompeii to prepare work for the “Great Pompeii Project”, funded by the European Commission. The aim is to carry out systematic and integrated interventions that address the problems of maintenance, conservation and public appreciation. Structural consolidation and restoration works have already begun, as well as reconnaissance and documentation campaigns. To prevent criminal infiltration into the planned works, a Protocol of Legality was established. Therefore, the Ministry of Interior will autonomously check the procurement processes.

However, many of these initiatives are still at an early stage and have yet to deliver substantive results in terms of improved conservation and access to Pompeii. The mission has some concerns over aspects of the Great Pompeii Project, particularly the speed with which these funds will have to be used and the potential impact of this on the quality of the

works to be done. Therefore, external monitoring of the quality of the interventions would be desirable.

In addition, while the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been maintained, the mission has identified significant continuing deterioration and confirms that parts of the property continue to be at risk at present, as the numerous collapses over the years show, and that urgent remedial action is needed. Moreover, a big part of the buildings in the property are closed to the public. The lack of guardians and technicians for basic management, supervision and maintenance of the site continues to be a problem at the property.

Further, the mission notes that while the Great Pompeii Project can have considerable achievements, there will still remain much ongoing work after the project is over. The long-term sustainability of future management and conservation of the site should be a priority.

Conclusion

The reactive monitoring mission considers that parts of the property are at risk of deterioration at present and that the next two years will be crucial in demonstrating the effectiveness of the diverse ongoing initiatives. Failure to deliver the initiatives could be disastrous for the state of conservation of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies therefore do not recommend, at present, to the World Heritage Committee to consider the possibility of inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as suggested by the Committee in its Decision **35 COM 7B.96**.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend therefore to the Committee to monitor closely the state of conservation of the property, by requesting annual progress reports. If for any reason, the on-going initiatives fail to deliver substantial progress in the next two years, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend to the Committee to consider the possible inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2015.

Draft Decision **37 COM 7B.77**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **35 COM 7B.96** and **36 COM 7C**, adopted at its 35th (UNESCO, 2011) and 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) sessions respectively,*
3. *Takes note of the numerous initiatives put in place by the State Party, including the “Great Pompeii Project”, supported by the European Commission, and the “Towards a system of Governance” project;*
4. *Notes that a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property took place in January 2013 and requests the State Party to implement the recommendations of the mission, in particular:*
 - a) *finalize the new management plan, with the involvement of all the authorities in charge at different levels, different stakeholders and the community, and submit it to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies by **1 February 2014**,*

- b) *include in the new management plan a public use plan and a risk management plan, as well as provisions to regulate and control development at the vicinity of the property,*
 - c) *ensure, through the new management plan, that adequate qualified staff, contractors and funds are allocated for the supervision and maintenance of the site,*
 - d) *officially submit the proposal of the new buffer zone to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, in accordance with Paragraphs 163-165 of the Operational Guidelines,*
 - e) *closely monitor the quality of work in the interventions to be done in the framework of the “Great Pompeii Project” and the daily maintenance of the site;*
5. Also requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre regularly and in due time about any project planned in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
6. Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in 2014-2015 in order to assess the progress achieved in implementing the measures outlined above;
7. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a progress report **by 1 February 2014**, and an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above by **1 February 2015**, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

80. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1990

Criteria

(i) (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/544/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 38,540

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/544/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1992, 1993, 1994, 2011: ICOMOS mission; 2002: UNESCO/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission and on-site workshop; 2007, 2010 et 2013: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Structural integrity of the Church of the Transfiguration;
- b) Lack of an integrated management plan addressing the overall management of the World Heritage property;
- c) Tourism development pressures.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/544>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

A state of conservation report was submitted by the State Party on 18 February 2013. A joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was undertaken from 1 to 6 April 2013. Link to the mission report: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM/documents>

a) Site Management

The State Party reports that the site is being managed in accordance with the legislative arrangements in place and with the strategic planning of the Kizhi Federal Museum of Architecture and Cultural History. The Management plan for the property was finalised in 2012. The planning process included the participation of different parties and sets out goals to ensure the efficient protection, preservation and development of the property. It includes criteria for conservation methods and integrates concerns for the preservation of the historical landscape and the development of the cultural destination through a tourism strategy.

The mission noted that the property continues to be managed under the Technical and Economic Development Plan approved by the Government of Karelia on 1 March 2002. The draft Management Plan of the World Heritage Site "Kizhi Pogost 2012 – 2022 was submitted to the World Heritage Centre in late March 2013 and only portions of it were presented to the mission. Notwithstanding, the mission noted that the draft is a comprehensive and detailed document about site management and includes a list of planned and ongoing projects but does not make clear the importance of sustaining the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property as a priority in all management decisions. The presented draft plan is also weak in terms of integrated management, of the regulation of the buffer zones and new development, and of a tourism strategy, all pressing concerns that need to be comprehensively and sustainably addressed. The participatory process in developing the Management Plan includes a function of a Public Council, which is foreseen to be established in 2013.

b) Buffer zone

The State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre geographical and cartographical information on the clarification of the boundary of the property, which will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document *WHC-13/37.COM/8D*). In addition, it reports that specifications for land use and town planning within these buffer zones have also been developed and the information on protected areas boundaries has been submitted to the Karelia Republic to be entered on the state cadastre of immovable property. The Management Plan includes a programme for the landscape and there is a decision to maintain visual links between the different monuments on Kizhi Island. An environmental monitoring programme has also been implemented that, in tandem with work on waste management, should improve conditions.

The mission could only do a preliminary review of the land use plan as it has not yet been translated. It noted that it includes a visual corridor analysis of the landscape, based on the visual and aesthetic perception of Kizhi Pogost. However, it considered that it needed to be revised in order to not only consider aesthetics and views but also include historical land-use, environmental and overall sustainability factors. The mission further noted that proposed development on Kizhi Island and the surrounding areas are excluded from the overall

regulations of the buffer zones. Land use regulations and design guidelines for the setting of the property should include the provisions for new development including visibility analysis, functions, massing, materials, volume and location, etc. It also pointed out the need to prepare detailed Heritage and Environmental Impact Assessments (HIAs and EIAs) on all new proposed development.

The mission noted that the new pier for tourist boats and the load terminal at the north end of Kizhi Island have been completed and that a new road from Velikaya Guba to Oyativshena Village is under construction. No HIAs were undertaken prior to these new developments nor were they submitted for review prior to implementation so as to assess their potential impacts on the property. It was also presented with the project proposal for the new administrative and visitor centre which needs to be thoroughly reviewed, including considerations to use existing buildings, in terms of architectural quality, function, design and environmental compatibility and subject to EIA and HIA prior to approving its construction.

c) Conservation, protection and monitoring

The State Party reports on protection measures that have been implemented to enhance the security of the property. These include fire alarms and outdoor and indoor fire fighting equipment and close circuit televisions. Security officers have been appointed to monitor compliance with regulations for the property and museum employees have received technical capacity building to address emergencies. As for conservation interventions, the State Party provided a detailed report on the complex interventions that have been carried out to date both at the Church of the Transfiguration and at the Church of the Intercession. In 2012 the 1st stage of restoration of the Church of the Transfiguration was completed and the 2nd stage started which is expected to be finalised in 2016. The second state will follow the methods and approaches that have been tested and proven effective as part of the 1st stage, which effectively constitute guidelines for future interventions. The three year period that was planned for the Church of Intercession was finished in 2012. Monitoring actions have been implemented to assess the rate and extent of potential deformations and bio- deterioration. Regular inspections have continued for structural elements. Monitoring results have been used to identify a series of preventive measures to address the sources of decay and mitigate deterioration effects.

The mission noted that at present the fabric and structure of the Church of Transfiguration is in an advanced state of deterioration but not in danger of imminent collapse or loss. Conservation work is progressing well and the approach undertaken is consistent. The mission noted that continuity and progress of the project are critical to maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, therefore funding needs to be secured to sustain interventions. It also noted that the preventive maintenance programme is currently underway at the Church of the Intercession.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress that has been made by the State Party in addressing the recommendations of the reactive monitoring and advisory missions to the property, as well as Decisions of the World Heritage Committee. They also consider that the development of the management plan is essential, in addition to the definition of the buffer zone, in ensuring the conservation, protection and management of the inscribed property and its landscape setting. They are also of the view that conservation works at the Church of Transfiguration and the Church of the Intercession have progressed positively but need to be sustained in order to ensure that no further loss of fabric and design features occurs.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note with concern that pressures derived from the increase of tourism and the development of infrastructure, as well as continuing changes to land use (from agricultural land to land for new construction) and the unplanned constructions of various facilities and housing. The cumulative impacts and

effects of these facts could represent a potential threat to the protection of the setting and OUV of the property. They highlight that the need for a sustainable tourism strategy remains and that the management plan needs to be revised to include stringent regulations and design guidelines for new development within the setting of the property. They further note that detailed heritage and EIAs need to be carried out for all new proposed developments and that these need to be submitted, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, for review prior to approving their implementation at the Federal level.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.80

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.83**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Notes the progress made by the State Party in the conservation and protection of the Church of the Transfiguration and on the Church of the Intercession and urges it to sustain these efforts in timely manner and secure the necessary resources to ensure that no further loss of fabric and design features, which could constitute a threat to the property, occurs;*
4. *Takes note of the steps the State Party is making towards developing legal measures for the protection of World Heritage cultural properties;*
5. *Also takes note of the recommendations made by the April 2013 reactive monitoring mission to the property and also urges the State Party to implement its recommendations, in particular:*
 - a) *Revise the management plan to ensure that the conservation and protection of attributes that convey the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property drive decision-making ; the revised Management Plan should include regulations for land use and for new developments, provisions for the management of the agricultural landscape, a sustainable tourism strategy, risk preparedness measures and measures for monitoring the state of archaeological resources,*
 - b) *Halt all proposed new developments in the buffer zone and setting of the property, including visitor and administration facilities, until the Management Plan has been revised and until Heritage and Environmental Impact Assessments have been undertaken to take into account the expected impacts and compatibility of development with the OUV of the property,*
 - c) *Enhance the implementation of the fire protection and security plans to improve the level of protection and quality of the environment at the property,*
 - d) *Finalise the development of Guiding Principles for the restoration projects that relate the conservation work to the key attributes of the property ;*
6. *Requests, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, the State Party to submit the project proposal, technical specifications and heritage and environmental impact assessments, for the Office and Public Centre of the Kizhi Museum and for any other planned development projects, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies prior to committing to its implementation;*

7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies the draft Management Plan in three printed and electronic copies;
8. Further requests the State Party to invite an ICOMOS advisory mission in early 2014 to assess the progress made in the restoration works and on the implementation of the above;
9. Requests furthermore 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.

81. Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslav (Russian Federation) (C 1170)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2005

Criteria
(ii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1170/documents/>

International Assistance
Total amount granted: USD 9,348
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1170/assistance>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
May 2009, 2012: joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Gradual changes to the urban fabric: construction and restoration projects;
- b) Inappropriate urban development;
- c) Major changes to the property's skyline through the construction of the new Cathedral of the Assumption;
- d) High rise projects;
- e) Management system.

Illustrative material
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1170/>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party has not submitted a state of conservation report. The ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission that visited the property from 13 to 21 February 2012 had expressed concern over significant weaknesses in protective legislation and regulation at regional and national level and in the management of the property. The planning system does not allow for rigorous examination of new development with regard to its impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the attributes of which seem poorly identified. Consequently since 2005, 35 new developments had been constructed in the property and its buffer zone

without the benefit of Heritage Impact Assessments; in addition, these had not been submitted to the World Heritage Centre in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. New buildings were often inconsistent in scale, materials and massing with the cityscape's Neo-classical radial urban plan and the 18th century town planning, cited in the criteria for inscription.

The mission report identified as particularly concerning the greatly enlarged scale of the reconstruction of the Cathedral of the Assumption, which had gone ahead despite protests from professional and civil organisations and which had resulted in the destruction of important archaeological features; this would be more worrying still if the planned reconstruction of the bell tower were to go ahead. This, it was considered, would have an irreversibly adverse impact upon the skyline of the property. A new hotel planned within the vicinity of the cathedral was judged as inappropriate in height and design.

The conservation of the property, while impressive in scale during the 2008-2010 preparations for the 1000th anniversary of the city's foundation, nonetheless suffered from the lack of a consistent strategy underpinned by research and guided by a conservation plan.

The World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) noted the recommendations of the mission report and urged the State Party to improve the management system for the property, develop a Management Plan and conservation strategy and appoint a property manager. The Urban Master Plan and Traffic Plan should be completed, and legislation, regulation and guidance should be strengthened to ensure the compatibility of new development with the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. New development proposals should always be supported by Heritage Impact Assessments and should be accompanied by appropriate archaeological recording.

The World Heritage Centre was informed by the UNESCO Moscow Office that draft amendments to the Federal Law on Cultural Heritage of the Russian Federation have been introduced by the Russian Government following the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee. It was also informed that a Round-Table on implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Russian Federation had taken place on 21 March 2013 organised by the Cultural Committee of the Russian Duma in Moscow further to a request of the World Heritage Committee to review the legal framework for the protection of World Heritage in the Russian Federation. The World Heritage Centre is in contact with the Russian authorities concerning further details on these matters.

Conclusion

As no state of conservation report has been submitted since 2009, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies have no further information beyond that detailed in the 2012 mission report. In the report, it was noted that some development had been halted and the mission report urged a reconsideration of some of the new constructions. It is impossible to know whether or not this reconsideration has taken place and whether developments have continued. The apparent lack of management structure and lack of expert input from professional conservation bodies is also a cause for concern.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies note the steps made by the State Party to address the legal framework as requested by the Committee.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.81

The World Heritage Committee,

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

2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.84**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit a state of conservation report in 2012 or 2013 despite the requests of the Committee at its 35th and 36th sessions and that therefore the concerns raised by the 2012 reactive monitoring mission have not been addressed;
4. Urges the State Party to strengthen the national and regional legislative and regulatory protection for the property and its buffer zone;
5. Also urges the State Party to improve the management structure of the property and its buffer zone, produce a Management Plan and consider appointing a site manager with an appropriate advisory board with representation from national and regional professional conservation bodies;
6. Notes the significant number of conservation projects undertaken on the property since 2008 but considers that a Conservation Strategy for the property, appropriate conservation guidance underpinned by research and archaeological recording would result in more consistent and better quality results;
7. Reiterates its concerns that new development with inappropriate scale, height and mass, or incorporating non-traditional materials, imposes a particular threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property inscribed for its importance in town planning and spatial relationships between buildings;
8. Strongly reiterates its request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, details of any proposed developments, including those said to have been halted in 2012, that may have an adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, accompanied by heritage impact assessments, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
9. 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 progress with the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

82. Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1992

Criteria
(iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/632/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 joint management system;
- b) Lack of monitoring mechanisms;
- c) Lack of appropriate legal measures and rules for conservation, restoration, management and use of religious World Heritage properties.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/632>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

At its 35th (UNESCO, 2011) and 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) sessions, the World Heritage Committee had requested the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre a report on the state of conservation of the property, as well as to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to the property to a) review the existing management system and decision-making mechanisms, b) assess the overall state of conservation of the property.

The State Party did not submit a state of conservation report as requested. Thus no information has been provided on the possible reconstruction of the monastery buildings and other major interventions in the landscape of the property for which the Committee requested information in 2011. During the last two years, the mission has continuously been postponed due to various reasons.

According to information available on the website of the Russian Orthodox Church, an agreement between the Ministry of Culture and the Russian Orthodox Church was signed on 3 May 2012, in order to establish cooperation in the sphere of culture and cultural heritage with a specific focus on the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

On 6 September 2012, the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that a Committee on the conservation of the spiritual, cultural and natural heritage of the Solovetsky Archipelago was established within the framework of the "President's working group on matters relating to the restoration of cultural heritage sites of religious significance and other religious buildings and artefacts". The State Party also informed that within the framework of the Instruction by the President of the Russian Federation of 25 June 2012 "on measures to conserve and develop the Solovetsky Archipelago as a cultural and natural site", the Ministry of Culture is working to develop and implement a range of mechanisms to safeguard and develop this site. An inspection visit to the site was carried out by the representatives of the Ministry of Culture.

Upon request of the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation, the World Heritage Centre jointly developed with ICCROM and ICOMOS a concept note for a special training workshop for the religious representatives involved in the management and use of the World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation. The State Party proposed to organize this workshop, which had been requested by the World Heritage Committee since its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011) in May 2013.

The World Heritage Centre was informed by the UNESCO Moscow Office that draft amendments to the Federal Law on Cultural Heritage of the Russian Federation have been introduced by the Russian Government following the 36th session of the World Heritage

Committee, as well as that a Round-Table on implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in the Russian Federation has taken place on 21 March 2013 by the Cultural Committee of the Russian Duma in Moscow further to the request of the Committee to review the legal framework for the protection of World Heritage in the Russian Federation. The World Heritage Centre is in contact with the Russian authorities concerning further details on this issue.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the State Party's efforts to develop a range of mechanisms to safeguard and develop the property but note as well that no state of conservation report has been submitted regarding the majority of the World Heritage Committee's requests. They draw attention to the fact that, as no reports have been received for the past two years, no information has been provided on the possible reconstruction of the monastery buildings and other major interventions in the landscape of the property for which information was first requested in 2011.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies therefore recommend that the Committee reiterate all requests included in the decisions taken at the 35th (UNESCO, 2011) and 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) sessions of the Committee.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.82

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **35 COM 7B.107** and **36 COM 7B.86** adopted at its 35th (UNESCO, 2011) and 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) sessions respectively,*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit a state of conservation report;*
4. *Takes note of the steps the State Party is making towards developing legal measures for the protection of World Heritage cultural properties, as well as for the establishment of a "Committee on the conservation of the spiritual, cultural and natural heritage of the Solovetsky Archipelago";*
5. *Notes that the State Party decided to organise, further to the Committee's request and in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre, ICCROM and ICOMOS, a training workshop for the religious representatives involved in the management and use of the World Heritage properties in the Russian Federation;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre detailed information concerning the Master Plan of the Solovetsky Monastery and any other planning documents prior to the reactive monitoring mission;*
7. *Reiterates its concern about the possible reconstruction of the monastery buildings and other major interventions in the landscape of the property in terms of the impact on its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), and also requests the State Party to provide detailed information to the World Heritage Centre prior to the mission;*
8. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre all project proposals that may threaten the OUV of the property, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, as well as to submit alongside all new*

proposals Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs), in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidance on HIAs for World Heritage cultural properties;

9. *Further reiterates its request to the State Party to invite, as a matter of urgency, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the overall state of conservation of the property and recommends that the mission be scheduled as soon as possible;*
10. *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 and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1990

Criteria

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

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/545/documents>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

December 2007: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Erection of a monument in honour of Marshal G. Zhukov (constructed)
- b) Ongoing and accelerated urban development pressures

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/545>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

At its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011), the World Heritage Committee reiterated its grave concern about the lack of response to its previous decisions and requested the State Party to submit a state of conservation report for the property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013. The Committee also reiterated its request for the State Party to produce a management plan, approved buffer zones, improved legal and institutional mechanisms for the protection of the property and a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Information and studies concerning on-going developments at the site were also requested. The State Party did not submit a state of conservation report as requested.

a) *Construction and restoration works*

In response to the World Heritage Centre letters of 6 August 2012 and 23 January 2013 concerning the property, the State Party transmitted on 20 February 2013 some information regarding the nature of the construction works within the property and its vicinity. The World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to submit additional information and supporting material concerning the projects.

b) *Legislative and administrative arrangements*

The World Heritage Centre was informed by the UNESCO Moscow Office that draft amendments to the Federal Law on the Cultural Heritage of the Russian Federation had been introduced by the Russian Government following the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee; also that a Round-Table on the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in the Russian Federation took place on 21 March 2013. This was undertaken by the Cultural Committee of the Russian Duma in Moscow in accordance with the request of the Committee that the legal framework for the protection of World Heritage in the Russian Federation should be reviewed. The World Heritage Centre is in contact with the Russian authorities concerning further details on this issue.

c) *Boundary issues*

On 28 February 2012, the State Party submitted a report on cadastral works which took place from 2007 to 2011, for the first time since the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List. The World Heritage Centre reviewed the report and informed the State Party that the maps did not comply with all the technical requirements of the *Operational Guidelines*. The World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to revise the maps in order to reflect the delimitation of the property at the time of the inscription, or to submit a proposal for a boundary modification in conformity with paragraphs 163-165 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the State Party's efforts to develop a range of mechanisms to safeguard and develop the property but note as well that no state of conservation report has been submitted in response to the majority of the World Heritage Committee's requests. They therefore recommend that the Committee reiterate all requests included in the decisions taken at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011).

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies emphasize that the State Party's authorities should inform the UNESCO World Heritage Centre of any intention to undertake or authorize major restoration or any new constructions within the boundary of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone in compliance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.83

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **35COM 7B.105** adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Takes note of the efforts the State Party is making towards to developing legal measures for the protection of World Heritage properties;
4. Regrets that the State Party did not submit a state of conservation report;

5. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, all project proposals that may threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of the property accompanied by appropriate Heritage Impact Assessments, in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage cultural properties;*
6. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies three copies of a management plan for the property;*
7. *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 implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.*

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

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

Criteria

C (i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

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/356/documents/>

International Assistance

Total Amount granted: USD 437,208

For further detail, see <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/356/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-Budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 211,900 (Conservation of Hagia Sophia); USD 36,686.30 (Convention France-UNESCO); USD 155,000 (in the framework of the International Safeguarding Campaign for Istanbul and Göreme)

Previous Monitoring Missions

January 2000, May 2001, 2002, December 2003, 2004: World Heritage Centre missions; April 2006, May 2008, April 2009, November 2012: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Continued degradation of the vernacular architecture within the protected zones (particularly Ottoman-period timber houses in the Zeyrek and Süleymaniye core areas);
- b) Quality of repairs and reconstruction of the Roman and Byzantine Walls and associated palace structures, including Tekfur Saray and the "Anemas Dungeon" (Blachernae Palace);
- c) Development and absence of a World Heritage management plan (issue resolved: a Management Plan was submitted and reviewed in 2012);
- d) Lack of coordination between national and municipal authorities and of decision-making bodies for safeguarding World Heritage at the site;
- e) Impacts of new buildings and new development projects on the World Heritage property, mainly within the framework of Law 5366, and the lack of impact studies before large-scale developments are implemented;
- f) Potential impacts of the new metro bridge across the Golden Horn as well as of the Bosphorus Transition Tunnel Project for Motor Vehicles.

Illustrative Material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/356> and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 31 January 2013. Between 19 and 23 November 2012, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited the property, as requested by the Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012), to assess progress in mitigating the visual impacts of the proposed Golden Horn Bridge, to consider proposed renewal and conservation projects, as well as progress with the overall strategic management of the property, and to assess the overall state of conservation of the property. The mission report is available at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM>.

a) *Mitigating the Impacts of the Haliç metro crossing (Golden Horn) Bridge*

The mission acknowledged the considerable work that has been undertaken to mitigate the impacts of this bridge, including resources committed to halting its construction for a year, and the careful thought being put into deciding upon the remaining design details. The mission reported that, in November 2012, the bridge pylons were nearing structural completion, with sections of the deck at their base in position, and that the north (Beyoglu) abutment was substantially in place. It further reported that the refinement of the engineering design, by reducing bulk and height, had provided some mitigation of the effect of the bridge on its historic context and improved the design. However, the metro bridge will still be the largest structure in the Golden Horn estuary and its elevated bulk, set across the waterway, will certainly have a negative impact on people's ability to appreciate aspects of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, particularly of views looking down the Golden Horn towards the Historic Peninsula such as Sinan's masterpiece, the Süleymaniye Mosque.

The only design aspects now remaining for decision are colour, lighting, the design of the (non-structural) pylon caps, the detailed design of the station, and the form and landscaping of the pedestrian entrance structures and their setting. All of these elements need very careful detailing, for which the mission provided recommendations.

b) *Bosphorus Transition Tunnel Project for Motor Vehicles*

The Eurasia Tunnel project for a double-deck tunnel limited to cars and minibuses, with improved approach roads, is planned to connect the European and Asian sides of Istanbul. The current proposal is for a 5.4km tunnel that would emerge close on the European side to the south-west corner of the property. Its impact on the Historic Peninsula would arise from the widening of the existing coast road alongside the Sea Walls to 8-13 lanes westwards to the Land Walls and the Marble Tower. The mission considered that it would therefore directly affect the character of almost all of the south shore of the Historic Peninsula, and that due to an interchange at Yenikapı, it would also direct traffic into the Historic Peninsula.

An Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for the project, commissioned by the Contractor (ATAS) in order to satisfy the requirements of international lenders, considered other options such as an 18km tunnel that would emerge west of the Land Walls. However, because of its length and depth and substantially higher cost and technical risk, it was not selected as the preferred route. Despite 'intermediate' impact on above and below ground heritage, the shorter proposal was seen to be least harmful.

The mission considered that a longer tunnel continuing to Kazlıçeşme beyond the Land Walls would not only remove threats, but would have the potential to valorise the Sea Walls and the Mamara shore, not only for visitors but also as a "green lung" and amenity for the city.

The mission considered that in evaluating tunnel options, there was a need to consider four parameters: cultural (impact on archaeology and the property), environmental (impacts on quality of life and human well-being resulting from air and noise pollution), technical (the engineering feasibility of certain options) and economic (the overall cost of the project and its viability). The mission further considered that substantial, negative cultural and environmental impacts could not simply be weighed against economic benefits.

From discussions with the State Party, it appears that the economic arguments for a longer tunnel might not be insurmountable, taking account of the way the project is financed, but that technical and ventilation requirements needed more exploration.

The mission considers that more detailed technical assessments of these issues are needed such as the possibility of cut and cover construction rather than boring.

On 13 March 2013, the State Party informed that a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) based on ICOMOS Guidelines is currently being conducted for the 5.4km tunnel and will be made available in May 2013.

c) *The Yenikapı Assembly Ground*

The mission was made aware of this project to reclaim some 58 hectares of land from the sea between the Yenikapı Ferry Terminal and Samatya, to the southwest of the Historic Peninsula, in order to provide an area for meetings and public recreation for up to one million people. The project was approved on 27 September 2012 by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation, and an EIA was not deemed necessary, as the sea is not part of the conservation zone of the Peninsula. In a plan submitted in May 2013, it is shown as being a major recreational area for the city, with green areas and areas planted with trees along the shoreline.

There is a long history, particularly from the mid-20th century, of reclaiming small areas of land outside the sea walls, for Kennedy Cadessi, for port activities, and towards the west of the Peninsula, to provide urban recreation areas. None, however, has yet fundamentally altered the shape of the Peninsula and its silhouette from the coast to the south and the sea, as this proposal would.

Following the mission, a preliminary scoping study for a *Heritage Impact Assessment on the Yenikapı Coastal Land Reclamation Project*, produced by the Rheinisch-Westfaelische Technische Hochschule Aachen, was sent to the World Heritage Centre on 15 February 2013. By that point, construction had already started and completion is envisaged in spring 2014. The preliminary HIA was evaluated by ICOMOS and their comments were sent to the State Party on 8 April 2013.

The mission expressed concern that the Heritage Impact Assessment was commissioned only after construction had begun, rather than well in advance, before any irreversible decision was made by the authorities. It considered that the HIA should nonetheless address not only the direct and indirect physical impacts of the project, but also the potential impacts of gatherings of up to 1 million people on the environment and infrastructure of the peninsula as a whole.

d) *Proposed renewal and conservation projects*

The State Party provided details of a number of restoration projects on Ottoman houses as well as of training initiatives for architects and craftspeople, all of which demonstrate the availability of good technical expertise.

The mission noted the importance of the Ottoman houses and street patterns for the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Although these houses can be found around major religious monuments in the Süleymaniye and Zeyrek quarters and in the southern end of the Sultanahmet area, in other areas such as Sulukule or Ayvansaray, only scattered Ottoman houses survive; even the Süleymaniye area, with its distinctive tall houses, is at risk of losing its coherence as an historic area. The mission noted that in formal 'Renewal Areas', the projects have involved demolition and rebuilding largely unrelated to the historic character of the areas. The vulnerability of these Ottoman houses was recognised at the time of inscription and addressed by several reactive monitoring missions. Since so many houses have now deteriorated to a great extent, after half a century or more without repair, or have been demolished, the 2012 mission considered that a crisis point has been reached and

rapid action is needed, if the future of a substantial number of the authentic structures is to be secured. The mission's recommendations are reflected in the conclusion.

e) *Strategic Management of the property*

The State Party reports that projects and programmes to increase public awareness and the promotion of the Management Plan have been started.

The mission reported that the adoption of the 2011 Management Plan for the property marked a major step towards resolving the issues that it identifies. There is now a need to review this plan to define clearly the attributes of the OUV, and consider how each of the four parts of the property relates to the others and to the Historic Peninsula as a whole. The mission was informed that work is also on-going to produce defined policies for the effective conservation of the property, to which the plans and proposals of all relevant public bodies are aligned. The mission also recommended, in line with earlier missions, that transportation should be a priority issue in developing clear and definite policies through the Management Plan and city-level transport planning.

The State Party reports that coordination meetings have been organized among the related institutions and the Coordination and Supervision Board, in order to provide coordination of the management plan with the Fatih Conservation Master Plan and major infrastructure projects.

The State Party provided details of the Silhouette Master Plan that has been developed and implemented as requested by the Committee. This plan aims to prevent the negative impact of high rise buildings on Historic Peninsula by setting maximum eaves height for buildings in the districts of the periphery (which have the potential of influencing the silhouette from the west and northwest).

f) *Other issues*

The future of the Atatürk (Unkapanı) Bridge: The mission was informed that the future of this floating bridge, built in 1936-40, is being examined. Its removal would not in itself adversely affect the setting of the property, but any replacement could have the potential to do so, despite the intervening Haliç Metro Bridge.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the strong commitment demonstrated by the State Party, through the development of the Management Plan and mechanisms such as the Silhouette Master Plan, to move towards a sustainable approach to development of the property within the overall Historic Peninsula. They note however that the Management plan has highlighted major challenges to be addressed with regards to large scale public and private projects.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge the commitment of the State Party to halt work on the Golden Horn Bridge for a year in order to consider ways of improving its design and mitigating its intrusion into the historic landscape. They note that amendments over the last two years to resolve the remaining design details have considerably refined the original design. However, the 2012 mission confirmed that the bridge will still impact adversely on views of the Historic Peninsula and on the ability of the property to convey certain aspects of its Outstanding Universal Value.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies understand the logic and benefits of a third Bosphorus road crossing through a tunnel, but note that the current preferred shorter 5.4km tunnel option emerges partway along the southern shore of the Historic Peninsula. With its wide 8-13 lane approach road, toll plaza, intersection, and pedestrian bridges, it would have a highly significant impact on the Sea Walls, the Marble Tower, on the overall relationship between the Historic Peninsula and the sea, on noise and environmental pollution levels, and thus overall on the Historic Peninsula. The World Heritage Centre and

the Advisory Bodies consider that a shortened tunnel would not only be highly detrimental, but would also irremediably sever the connections between the Historic Peninsula and the sea, just at a time when many other cities are reversing interventions now seen as costly mistakes and restoring healthy links to their waterfronts.

As recommended by the mission, they emphasize the need for further detailed multi-disciplinary studies on the feasibility of extending the tunnel beyond the Land Walls (perhaps as a cut and cover construction). These should include technical aspects (ventilation issues, vibration concerns), social issues (the potential benefits in social and environmental terms) as well as cultural aspects (conservation of the property within the Historic Peninsula and its setting) and economic issues, in order to ensure that the impacts on the Peninsula are both limited and largely positive.

Any option would need to be considered through a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) before commitments are made. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the mission's concern that the condition of remaining Ottoman timber buildings has now reached a crisis point, and that 'Renewal Areas' under Law 5366 appear to be adding to the loss of these buildings. They consider that there is a need for a rapid assessment of buildings at risk, an urgent need for reconsideration of renewal area schemes, for first-aid works to slow down the rate of decay and loss, and if possible for the re-instatement of grants to allow private owners to repair their buildings. The mission stressed the quality of work that was being undertaken to conserve some Ottoman buildings and the high level of skills and expertise that is available.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that an HIA for the extensive Yenikapı land reclamation scheme was only commissioned in parallel with its construction, and that so far only a scoping study for the HIA has been produced for a project that is due for completion in 2014. While they understand that a recreation area is needed for the Historic Peninsula, they consider that the very large assembly area proposed could fundamentally alter the shape of the Historic Peninsula and its profile from the south. They suggest that the Committee request the State Party to take into account ICOMOS' evaluation of the preliminary HIA when finalising this assessment.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also recommend that the Committee welcome the speed with which a Silhouette Master Plan has been put into place to define height restrictions that will protect the silhouette of the Historic Peninsula, and further request that the authorities share their views about the future of the Atatürk (Unkapanı) Bridge with the World Heritage Centre at the options appraisal stage, before any decision is taken.

They finally recommend that the Committee endorse all the recommendations of the mission.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.85

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.89**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Take notes of the results of the 2012 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and requests the State Party to implement its recommendations and to duly proceed with the annual review of the Management Plan;*
4. *Acknowledges the commitment of the State Party to halt work on the Golden Horn Bridge for a year in order to consider ways of further improving its design and*

mitigating its intrusion into the historic landscape, but notes that although amendments have refined the original design, the bridge will still impact adversely on views of the Historic Peninsula and on the ability of the property to convey certain aspects of its Outstanding Universal Value;

5. Recognises the logic and benefits of a Bosphorus road tunnel, but also notes that the currently preferred shorter 5.4 km tunnel option, emerging partway along the southern shore of the Historic Peninsula with a wide 8-13 lane approach road, would have a highly significant, negative impact on the Sea Walls, the Marble Tower, and the overall relationship between the Historic Peninsula and the sea;
6. Urges the State Party to undertake multi-disciplinary studies (technical, environmental, social, cultural and economic) as a basis for considering the extension of the tunnel beyond the Land Walls and to remove an intersection at Yenikapı in order to ensure that the impacts on the Historic Peninsula are both limited and largely positive; and to duly take all options into consideration when finalising the Heritage Impact Assessment, and submit this to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies before any irreversible decision or commitment is made;
7. Notes with concern that the Yenikapı project for reclaiming a large area of land (58 hectares) to the south-west of the Historic Peninsula and thus create a recreation area for up to a million people, was started before a Heritage Impact Assessment had been undertaken, and without any advance notification being provided to the World Heritage Committee; and also requests that the State Party finalise the Heritage Impact Assessment, which should include the potential impact of such large gatherings on the environment and infrastructure of the peninsula as a whole, and submit it as soon as possible to the World Heritage Committee for review by the Advisory bodies;
8. Also notes with concern the mission's opinion that a crisis point has been reached for the remaining Ottoman timber buildings, and further requests the State Party to consider a rapid assessment of Ottoman buildings at risk, to reconsider renewal area schemes, to undertake first-aid works in order to slow down the rate of decay and loss, and, if possible, to reinstate grants allowing private owners to repair their buildings;
9. Welcomes that height restrictions have been put in place by the State Party in a timely manner to protect the silhouette of the Historic Peninsula;
10. Requests furthermore 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.

89. Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1215)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2006

Criteria
(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/1215/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) Resumption of mining activities
- b) Harbour development

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1215>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 30 January 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report, including further details on the resumption of mining at South Crofty and the development proposal for Hayle Harbour.

a) The resumption of mining at South Crofty

The State Party reiterated its view that the resumption of mining at the South Crofty site, which would relocate mining activities from outside the property to just inside the boundaries, would not have any negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, noting that the OUV of the property is linked to the long tradition of mining present at the property. It further pointed out that while the South Crofty mine ceased operations in 1998, it has retained its classification as an active mine and that the current proposal should therefore, in its view, be seen not as a new proposal, but the resumption of an already existing activity. It further noted that the management plan submitted at the time of inscription recognized the possibility of restarting mining activities where they do not have an adverse impact on the OUV of the property.

The State Party stated that a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been carried out for the proposed resumption of mining, including an assessment of the impact of the development on the OUV of the property. It also reported on discussions between the developer, Cornwall Council, and English Heritage leading to a considerable redesign of the new mine building, which is now considered by English Heritage not to have an adverse impact on the OUV of the property. The State Party further stated that there would be no new waste tips above ground. Rock waste would be used as secondary aggregate or stored in the mine voids underground and fine tailings would be treated and transported or pumped back underground into the mine voids.

In regard to the recommendation by the Committee that the State Party consider a significant boundary modification to exclude the proposed mining activities from the property, the State Party is of the opinion that such a modification would not protect the OUV in regard to important views or other impacts. It considers as well that a significant boundary modification would correspond to a new nomination and that the preparation would be excessively costly.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to point out that the property was inscribed for its exceptional contribution to the mining industry for the period 1700 to 1914 and the attributes have been identified accordingly. It is thus inscribed as a relict cultural

landscape, in spite of the designation of the South Crofty component as an 'active' mining site at national level. The continuing evolution of the cultural landscape and mining traditions is not, therefore, part of the justification for the criteria. Any mining activity needs to be looked at from the point of view of its impacts on the attributes from the period of 1700 to 1914 that have been identified as contributing to the OUV, the authenticity and integrity of the property and its setting. They further note that the boundary of the property was carefully drawn to exclude the South Crofty mine that had only recently been closed and was still technically a working mine.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further point out that the Committee at the time of inscription, recognized the vulnerability of the property to any future mining activities and therefore specifically requested that any proposals concerning the re-opening of mines in the property be forwarded to the World Heritage Committee for debate and scrutiny (**30 COM 8B.50**, paragraph 4). They also note that this vulnerability has also been recognized in the retrospectively adopted Statement of OUV in 2010 (**34 COM 8E**). According to the conditions of authenticity, the features expressing the property's OUV that are located in the areas of Redruth and Camborne are particularly vulnerable to developments.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that an EIA has been carried out, assessing the impact on the component part of the property near the mine, but not assessing the impact on the OUV of the serial property as a whole. The EIA, although considering World Heritage status, does not consider in detail the reasons for inscription nor the attributes of OUV of the serial property. More attention is given to considering the impact of the new building on important views but no details are provided on the way the area around the mine contributes to the OUV of the serial property. The EIA also notes that the effects of the past mining operations have not been completely mitigated and are detrimental to the character of the wider area. It considers that the "South Crofty Mine site can be said to be a poor example of the Cornish Killas and Redruth, Camborne and Gwennap landscape character areas". These current conditions could be further exacerbated by resuming mining operations. The EIA has thus been technically carried out but falls short of a thorough cultural Heritage Impact Assessment.

b) Development Proposal for Hayle Harbour

In its report, the State Party recalled that on 14 March 2012 the Secretary of State decided not to call in the application. The decision to grant planning permission therefore remained with the Cornwall Council which can now confirm permission.

English Heritage has maintained its objection. The Cornwall Council is reported to consider the supermarket development as the only viable solution for sustainable development and use of the South Quay at Hayle Harbour. It is found that funds made available as a result of the project will allow reinstating the traditional system of dredging the harbour on a regular basis. Restarting the traditional dredging system would allow the continuing functioning of the harbour, avoid the worst effects of flooding, and also avoid the need to build a sea wall which would also impact on the OUV of the property. The State Party further pointed out that the proposed supermarket development would occupy approximately 24% of the land which roughly corresponds to the historical land coverage in that part of Hayle Harbour. The State Party concluded that the proposed development at Hayle Harbour would help preserve the property as a whole, for the sake of which it may be necessary to accept a degree of adverse impact.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party itself has acknowledged that there will be adverse impact if the supermarket development was implemented as designed. The problem with the development as currently proposed is the intensity of construction and in particular the massing, scale, and design of the supermarket, rather than the percentage of the footprint. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the supermarket will have a high adverse impact on the ability of Hayle

Harbour to display its role as the port through which much of the copper and tin was exported, and which has been the primary reason for including it in the serial property. The proposals would therefore impact adversely on the integrity and authenticity of this component part of the property. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that there may be design solutions of a less intense nature which could be compatible with the OUV of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies are in full agreement with the State Party that the traditional dredging system for the harbour would be the best way to ensure that it continues its good functioning and reduces the risks of flooding. They do not, however, see an inextricable link between the traditional dredging system and the current supermarket proposal. It may be possible through different design solutions, or other sources of funding, to allow for maintaining the traditional dredging system.

Finally, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that consent for the development has been granted and that according to the State Party no other regulatory or administrative obstacles would halt the development from going forward. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies nevertheless consider that in order to maintain the relevance of this component to the series, other options must be explored.

c) Other Issues

Waste Management Facility at the Gwennap Mining District

The State Party reported that this facility is not located within the World Heritage property, although it is located within its setting. It further stated that its proximity to the World Heritage property was considered when the scheme was examined and that the State Party's statutory advisors have found no adverse impacts on the World Heritage property.

Robinson's Shaft Site in Pool and Consolidated Mines near Crofthandy

The State Party reported that it has obtained funds from various sources to carry out conservation and interpretation work at the two mentioned components of the property.

Reporting on other Developments in Conformance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines

The State Party reported that it is aware of a proposal for exploratory drilling at the Redmoor Mine (which closed around 1908) in the Tamar Valley area of the property, as well as of a proposal for a mixed use development on land adjacent to Callington Road, Tavistock, Devon, including housing, commercial buildings, open space, educational and health care facilities, and the reinstatement of a railway line. The majority of this latter project will be located outside the World Heritage property but it may impact on its setting.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies underline the importance of the Committee's request, at the time of inscription, that any proposals for mining within the property be referred to the World Heritage Committee for debate and scrutiny. Acknowledging the report of the State Party that an EIA has been carried out (although this is limited to impacts on the setting of the mine), that modifications have been made to the design of the main building (although no new plans have been submitted) and that the issue of management of the mine waste has been addressed, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would recommend to request that comprehensive latest information be forwarded to the World Heritage Centre so that it can be evaluated by the Advisory Bodies. They do not consider, at this time, that sufficient information has been provided by the State Party to demonstrate that the resumption of mining at South Crofty will not have a negative impact on the OUV of the serial property, and hence that the resumption of mining cannot be justified on the basis of the arguments brought forward by the State Party. The requested further information is necessary to evaluate the potential impacts of mining activities on the

setting of the property. While appreciating the information provided by the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that a more in-depth assessment of the proposed project is necessary, including visual documentation (plans, elevations, landscape views and other photographs and drawings which show the design and its relationship with the property and its surroundings), in order to establish its impact on the attributes expressing the property's OUV, including underground attributes. It would be important to be able to evaluate the most current state of the development proposal. They also consider that the issue as to whether mining might impact adversely on OUV needs to be set into the context of the Committee's past decisions on mining in World Heritage properties, and of the ICMM Position Statement not to explore or mine in World Heritage properties. Finally, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies point out that consideration of the Management Plan at the time of inscription as an adequate system does not mean approval of every part of the document. As a planning tool, provisions made at the time of inscription need to be revised to respond to diverse emerging conditions, always in relation to the need to sustain OUV.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note that exploratory drilling is being undertaken at the Redmoor mine within the property in the Tamar Valley, and that this might lead to further applications to re-instate mining activities. They consider that it is essential that applications for new mining activities do not overlap with the property and do not impact adversely on OUV.

In regard to the proposed supermarket development at Hayle Harbour, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the current supermarket development proposal would have a potential negative impact on the authenticity and integrity of Hayle as a port and harbour and thus on the OUV of the serial property, and recall the Committee's request to the State Party at its 36th session to consider a smaller-scale heritage-led regeneration. As the supermarket development project has not been altered and as there are apparently no regulatory or administrative mechanisms remaining to halt or alter the design, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would advise the Committee to consider placing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2014, should the development project be implemented as currently planned.

Based on the above, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies propose that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to the property in order to assess the overall state of conservation of the property and the strategies in place to deal with mining exploration and sustainable development within the whole serial property.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.89

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 8B.50**, **34 COM 8E**, and **36 COM 7B.94**, adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006), 34th (Brasilia, 2010) and 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) sessions respectively,*
3. *Also recalling past decisions regarding mining 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",*
4. *Notes the information provided by the State Party on the resumption of mining at South Crofty and on various development proposals;*

5. *Requests the State Party to provide updated information on the proposed mining project at South Crofty including comprehensive graphic documentation of the project and its relationship to the property and its setting, for review by the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, and also requests the State Party to halt any resumption of mining at the property until such time as the World Heritage Committee has been able to examine and scrutinize all of the necessary documentation;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, details of any mining proposals for Redmoor mine, Tamar Valley, as soon as possible and before any decision is made that would be difficult to reverse;*
7. *Regrets that the State Party has not complied with the request expressed by the Committee in Decision **36 COM 7B.94** to halt the Hayle Harbour project, and, given that planning permission has already been granted, strongly urges the State Party to halt the development of Hayle Harbour in the light of its potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and to consider, as a matter of urgency, all possible ways to develop alternative solutions for smaller-scale heritage-led regeneration for the Hayle Harbour site that respect its role as the port and harbour for the mining industry;*
8. *Decides, in case the Hayle Harbour development project is not halted and reconsidered, to consider inscribing Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) on the List of World Heritage in Danger at its 38th session in 2014;*
9. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit additional relevant information on the proposal for a mixed use development on land adjacent to Callington Road, Tavistock, Devon, when it becomes available;*
10. *Requests moreover the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to assess the overall state of conservation of the property and the strategies in place to address mining exploration and sustainable development within the whole serial property;*
11. *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.*

90. Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 426bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1987

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/426/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; December 2011: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Construction proposals in the immediate vicinity of Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church that could have an adverse impact on the setting, related vistas and integrity of the property;
- b) Lack of an in-depth visual impact study on possible impacts of development projects, as well as lack of an approved management plan;
- c) Need for protection of the immediate surroundings of the property through an adequate buffer zone.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/426/gallery/>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

Over the last years, the World Heritage Committee has repeatedly expressed concern about the actual or potential adverse impact of tall buildings on the setting of the property. Reactive monitoring missions to the property were carried out in 2006 and 2011 that focused on the need to strengthen the systems for protecting the immediate and wider setting of the property, which does not have a buffer zone.

On 29 October 2012 and 2 April 2013, the State Party provided updated information on the development projects in the vicinity of the World Heritage property that had been identified by the December 2011 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission as having potential negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. These projects are Nine Elms Regeneration Development, Vauxhall Island Site, Heygate Estate and, in particular, Elizabeth House.

In response to the Committee's request for a definition of the setting of the property (Decision **36 COM 7B.92**), the State Party stated that discussions are underway between English Heritage, the Mayor, relevant local planning authorities and with key stakeholders in view of developing an agreed understanding of how to define the immediate and wider setting of the property in relation to its OUV.

The State Party informed that all four above-mentioned development projects were objected to by English Heritage, the State Party's statutory advisor. Notwithstanding these objections, three out of four projects have already been granted planning consents by the respective Local Authorities and, despite the advice of English Heritage, they have not been called-in by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

Elizabeth House

The 2011 mission considered that tall buildings included in the redevelopment project of Elizabeth House at Waterloo Station, depending on the absolute heights, might have adverse impacts in the backdrop of the view that encompasses Westminster Palace and Big Ben. While the project area falls under the jurisdiction of the Borough of Lambeth, the key concern lies with the Borough of Westminster.

At the time of the 36th session of the Committee, a revised development project for Elizabeth House had been submitted proposing the construction of a tower structure with a reduced height of up to 29 storeys.

The State Party reported that English Heritage had raised strong objections to the proposal on the grounds that its impact, as result of its design and size, would cause a substantial and unacceptable degree of harm to the OUV, setting and views from the property. It further informed that English Heritage has maintained objections to the Elizabeth House proposals because the new building, from within the boundaries of the property, would be clearly visible across the gap between Westminster Palace and Portcullis House, appearing above County Hall on the South Bank. In some views, part of the development would appear to be visually attached to the north face of the Queen Elizabeth Tower (formerly known as St Stephen's Tower, which houses Big Ben).

In its letter of 2 April 2013, the State Party reported that, because of the concerns of English Heritage, the proposal had been referred on 4 January 2013 to the Secretary of State for his consideration whether to call it in for decision at national level following a public inquiry. The Secretary of State decided not to call in the application but to leave it to the London Borough of Lambeth. He considered that the proposed development does not "involve a conflict with national policies, have significant effects beyond the immediate locality, give rise to substantial cross boundary or national controversy, or raise significant architectural or urban design issues". Following this decision, consent can be granted in accordance with the previous intention of the Borough of Lambeth.

Other development projects in the vicinity of the property

Nine Elms Regeneration Development Market Towers: The State Party reported that this development proposal consists of the demolition of the existing buildings and structures, and the erection of two new towers of 58 storeys (up to 200 m above ground) and 43 storeys (up to 161 m above ground) as part of a mixed use development of residential units, including amenity and public open space. The project has been approved by the Local Authority, against the advice of English Heritage, and has not been called-in by the Secretary of State, therefore consent can be granted by the Borough Council.

Vauxhall Island: The State Party reported that this proposal concerns a mixed use development on "Vauxhall Island" next to Vauxhall Bus Station, including two tall buildings of 41 storeys, approximately 140 m and 32 storeys, approximately 115 m. The project has been approved by the Local Authority, against advice of English Heritage, and has not been called-in by the Secretary of State; it can thus be approved by the Borough Council.

Heygate Estate: The State Party reported that this proposal for the redevelopment of the Heygate Estate and its surroundings was submitted to the London Borough of Southwark for consideration. It consists of a mixed use scheme, articulated in block form including nine tall buildings ranging in height from 55 m to 104 m. English Heritage stressed its concern about the potential cumulative impact of tall buildings on the property. The State Party informed that the applicants have amended the design of one of these tall buildings to English Heritage's satisfaction but not the other, and that it has therefore written to Southwark Council objecting to the granting of outline planning permission for this proposal.

Planning Policy Framework

The State Party expressed its view that the planning systems in place in the United Kingdom provide robust processes based on law, policy guidance and development plans, for assessing the potential impact of proposals on heritage assets and dealing appropriately with them. In particular, it pointed to the revised London Views Management Framework (2010), the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance *London's World Heritage Sites – Guidance on Settings* (March 2012), and policies for the protection of World Heritage properties in the Mayor's Plan for London and in the local plans of the various boroughs. The State Party further underlined that the National Planning Policy Framework states that World Heritage

properties should be treated as designations of the highest significance. It also admitted, however, that, on occasion, considerations other than those of heritage may take precedence, and English Heritage's advice, based on heritage considerations, will be considered but may not always be accepted in order to come to a balanced conclusion on whether or not a development should be granted consent.

Conclusion

While the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in 2011 had recognized progress in strengthening guidance to protect the setting from negative impacts on views to and from the property, it should be recalled that the mission had also considered the development project of Elizabeth House a crucial case for testing the effectiveness of the strengthened policy framework in relation to further planning applications.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that most of the development projects have already been approved or are close to approval, given that the Secretary of State has decided not to call-in the development projects of Elizabeth House, Nine Elms and Vauxhall Island for decision at national level, and that these approvals can be granted despite objections from English Heritage.

They are of the view that there do not seem to be defined settings or overall agreed constraints in place to ensure that new tall buildings do not impact on important views and other attributes of the property. They also point out that, due to the advanced stage in the planning process, any recommendations on the projects are more difficult to be taken into account by the responsible authorities.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party to halt the development projects Elizabeth House, Nine Elms and Vauxhall Island and to revise the projects in line with the concerns raised by English Heritage. They would also advise the Committee to request the State Party to consider reinforcing its legal provisions and planning framework to allow the national authorities to ensure their responsibilities for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* at the national level.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would also recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the State Party, as a matter of urgency, to define the immediate and wider setting of the property in relation to its OUV and embed these in the policies of all the relevant planning authorities, as well as to define specific measures and ensure that adequate mechanisms are in place to protect the property and minimize its vulnerability to potential threats to its OUV.

They would further advise the Committee to consider placing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2014, should the foreseen development projects be approved as currently planned.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.90

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.92**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Expresses its concern about the proposed developments at Elizabeth House, Nine Elms Regeneration Development and Vauxhall Island Site and their potential adverse

impact on the setting and views of the property and urges the State Party to ensure that these proposals are not approved in their current form and that they be revised in line with the concerns raised by English Heritage;

- 4. Requests the State Party to strengthen its policy and planning frameworks to ensure the adequate protection of the setting of the property by defining the immediate and wider setting and view cones of the property in relation to its Outstanding Universal Value and by identifying adequate mechanisms within the respective policies of all relevant planning authorities to ensure that new constructions do not impact on views and other attributes of the property;*
- 5. Also urges the State Party to refrain from approving any large-scale development projects in the vicinity of the property until an adequate protection of its immediate and wider setting is in place;*
- 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 on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

91. City of Potosi (Bolivia) (C 420)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1987

Criteria
(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/420/documents>

International Assistance
Total amount granted: USD 53, 785
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/420/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds
Total amount granted: USD 10 000 for a World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS technical mission in 2005 financed by the Spanish Funds-in-Trust for World Heritage

Previous monitoring missions
November 2005 and February 2011: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS technical mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Potential degradation of the historic site by continued and uncontrolled mining operations in the Cerro Rico Mountain;
- b) Instability and risk of collapse of the Cerro Rico;
- c) Deficiencies in conservation: special attention required for the restoration and upgrading of structures with residential use and the archaeological industrial heritage;
- d) Inefficient enforcement of protective legislation;
- e) Environmental impacts on the river which in turn affects the historic fabric and the local population.

Illustrative material
See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/420>
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 8 March 2013 which comprises information on the history of mining at Potosi, on the legal framework for the property and on the current situation of the Cerro Rico. Also, information was received on August 2012 pertaining to the project “Morphological preservation of the Cerro Rico – Potosi, a study carried out by SGT *Consultora*”, dated January 2011. A progress report by the Ministry of Mining and Metallurgy, submitted to the General Director of Cultural Heritage on August 2012, was also submitted for review.

a) *Emergency Committee*

The State Party reports that the Inter-institutional Committee was formed in 2007 and includes representatives from the Ministry of Mining and Metallurgy, the Ministry of Cultures, the Government of Potosi, the Municipal Government of Potosi, the Autonomous University Tomas Frias, the Regional Potosi Bolivian Mining Corporation (COMIBOL), the Civic Committee from Potosi, the Federation of the Mining Cooperatives of Potosi (FEDECOMIN),

the Departmental Council of Cultures, the Society of Engineers of Bolivia and the National Service of Geology and Mining Technical (SERGEOTECMIN).

The progress report submitted in August 2012 noted that the Inter-institutional Committee had resumed periodic meetings and the Autonomous University Tomas Frias had drafted a project proposal for the stabilisation of the collapse at the top of Cerro Rico. It was then mentioned that the Inter-institutional Committee would draft a final project proposal, based on the project from the Autonomous University and the action plan presented by COMIBOL in November 2011. No further details were provided in the 2013 March report regarding this proposal or the functioning of the Inter-institutional Committee.

The report does not provide clarifications on whether Article 6 of Supreme Decree 27787 adopted in October 2004 was modified and if the moratorium on all exploration, extraction and any other interventions under and above ground between altitudes 4400m and 4700m is currently enforced.

b) *Geophysical and topographic studies, stabilisation of the top of the mountain and monitoring system*

The State Party notes that the tomography study for Cerro Rico is being finalised; the report analysed the geology and morphology of the mountain, mining activities, security, pollution, environmental conditions and threats to heritage and provided recommendations for each of the 3 sectors (top, middle area and lower area). To further control mining activities, a plan is being proposed to identify pollution levels and measures to protect workers. However, no timeframe for completion of these studies and the implementation of recommendations has been mentioned.

The report includes information on the serious current conditions and the four high risk areas identified at Cerro Rico, as well as identified risks within the interior of the mines. The State Party notes that on 9 November 2012 a USD 2.3 million contract was awarded to Q & Q, a Bolivian company, to carry out preservation and conservation works at the subsidence located at summit of the Cerro Rico and identified collapses. It is expected that works will be finalised in November 2013. Specifications and contracting processes for works were established; but not yet submitted for review. The report mentions that for the works, the San Luis mine was rehabilitated and that a road was built so that materials could be transported to the top. Planned safety measures are mentioned but no detail about the timeframe for their implementation has been provided.

The State Party further comments that the COMIBOL has included the preservation of the characteristics, topography and natural setting of Cerro Rico as an important objective in relation to future mining activities. No detailed information or timeframe is provided on how this intent is going to translate into actions. It also mentions current figures for mining extraction and the intent of the Ministry of Mining to develop legal frameworks to permanently control operations.

In addition, the report notes that there is a proposal, from the Maniquiri Enterprise, to establish a tourist route to visit 140 mine entrances located through the operations area, which would include visits to the Museum and the restoration of the colonial channel between the San Sebastian and Chalviri lakes. No technical details are included regarding this proposal.

c) *Management Plan*

The State Party submitted information on the Master Plan for the rehabilitation of historic areas of Potosi (1991-2009) which was produced by a team of experts from both Spain and Bolivia. The Master Plan comprises the Strategic Educational Plan, the Environmental Master and Action Plan, the Reorganizational Transportation and Road Traffic Plan and the Strategic Health Plan. Additional printed documentation sent by the State Party includes the Programme for housing rehabilitation at the historic centre of Potosi, developed by the *Junta de Andalucia* which includes some successful cases of restored buildings; Regulations for

the preservation of the historic areas of Potosi, developed in 1992 and approved by Municipal Ordinance in 1993; Inventory and Master Plan for the Ribera de los Ingenios Mineros in Potosi; and the Master Plan for the rehabilitation of the Historic Centre of Potosi, as well as the corresponding report on the results and figures for investment.

Given that the provided documentation on the Master Plan has no date and that no further information is provided in the state of conservation report about these planning documents, it is not clear if they have been implemented, if they were reviewed or what the current status is regarding the recommendation made by the World Heritage Committee on the development of a participatory management plan.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the report on the state of conservation of the property does not provide detailed information on the implementation of the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee to improve the security and stability of the site, as well as other conditions necessary to allow for sustainable mining activities. With the data provided, it is not possible to ascertain whether management arrangements have been successfully set in place, if the management plan has been comprehensively reviewed and updated nor the current state of conservation of the City of Potosi. Furthermore, no information has been submitted with regard to the reinforcement of Supreme Decree 27877 and the modification of its Article 6 to halt all exploration, extraction and any other interventions that might constitute a serious risk for the stability of the Cerro Rico Mountain.

They are of the view that progress has been made in undertaking the necessary scientific research to assess the current state of the Cerro Rico. However, they underscore that it is crucial to finalise the scientific studies of the Cerro Rico so that a comprehensive strategy for its stabilisation can be formulated and implemented as a matter of urgency, including systematic monitoring of stability conditions. In this respect, the cost and the availability of the technology used for the various studies will need to be considered when drafting the strategy. They note that the final reports and strategy need to be submitted for consideration and review prior to commencing implementation works.

They further note that works started in spite of the lack of a comprehensive strategy for the stabilization of the Cerro Rico. They underscore that caution should be exercised in carrying out further interventions until all requested information has been properly collated, systematized and analysed so that all factors are taken into account for informed decision-making. They recommend that the Committee express its concern about the road to the top of the Cerro Rico that might be justified to gain access to the areas identified for priority intervention but which might be conducive to continuing illegal mining operations between the altitudes of 4400m and 4700m, unless the moratorium is effectively enforced. They suggest that information should be provided in this respect and the measures currently in place to ensure that access is limited to priority emergency works.

In view of the above, the World Heritage Committee might wish to recommend that a reactive monitoring mission to the property be carried out to assess the current conditions and to evaluate whether there are ascertained or potential dangers to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property that would warrant inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.91

The World Heritage Committee,

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

2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.96**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Takes note of the information submitted by the State Party and regrets that insufficient details were provided to comprehensively assess the current factors affecting the property;
4. Reiterates its requests the State Party to:
 - a) Clarify whether Article 6 of Supreme Decree 27787 of October 2004 has been modified and if the moratorium on all exploration, extraction and any other interventions under and above ground between altitudes 4400m and 4700m is currently enforced,
 - b) Provide further details on the scope and extent of operations foreseen for interventions at the summit of the Cerro Rico,
 - c) Finalise the scientific studies for Cerro Rico and develop a comprehensive strategy for its stabilization and monitoring,
 - d) Provide details on the current arrangements for the management system for the property, including information on provisions and timeframes for conservation and rehabilitation works, proposals for public use and plans for risk management;
5. Also requests the State Party to invite an ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission during 2013 to assess the current state of conservation of the property and to evaluate whether there are ascertained or potential dangers to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property would warrant inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger;
6. 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.

92. Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia) (C 567rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2000

Criteria
(iii) (iv)

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

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/567/documents/>

International Assistance
Total amount granted: USD 8,000
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/567/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 870,000 for the project 'Preservation and Conservation of Tiwanaku and the Akapana Pyramid (UNESCO/Japan Funds-in-Trust for World Heritage). Moratorium from March 2010 to May 2012.

Previous monitoring missions

November 2007: World Heritage Centre Preparatory Mission; February – March 2009: World Heritage Centre Technical Assessment Mission for the implementation of the JFIT project; November 2009: World Heritage Centre. UNESCO Quito Office monitoring mission; November 2010: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; August 2012: World Heritage Centre Mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a management plan for the site;
- b) Lack of coordinated conservation policies and interventions between the national government and the Municipality of Tiwanaku;
- c) Need for the designation of a national counterpart for the JFIT project and a site manager at the local level;
- d) Lack of governance.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/567/> and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 8 March 2013, the State Party submitted a report addressing the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee in Decision **35 COM 7B.119** on management and conservation measures taken at the property since 2010. The final draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) for the property is submitted for approval by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session.

a) *Legislative and regulatory frameworks*

The lack of coordination among the institutions of the central and local governments, the traditional authorities of the *malkus* and mayors of adjacent villages was identified as a crucial management issue at the property to be addressed. The State Party reported that in October 2011, the Plurinational State of Bolivia adopted Presidential Decree 1004, which created the Centre of Archaeological and Anthropological Research and Management of Tiwanaku (CIAAAT) to provide a clear distribution of responsibilities and decision-making process between national and local levels for the management of the property. It is expected that the CIAAAT will enable stable cooperation between institutional, political and technical working environments in order to facilitate and ensure efficient implementation of the conservation plan. The CIAAAT has been created as a decentralized body that will act under the direct supervision of the Ministry of Cultures. It has the entire responsibility for the management of the property, with its own administrative, financial and technical resources. Moreover, the CIAAAT holds overall responsibility over the Tiwanaku regional museums.

b) *Institutional Arrangements*

The Ministry of Cultures appointed the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage, and its related Archaeology and Museums Unit, as the focal point for management issues regarding the property and a site manager in charge of the archaeological site. Terms of reference under the administrative national system to hire qualified experts to undertake research and conservation work were put in place. Despite these institutional arrangements, which are expected to improve co-ordination and facilitate dialogue among the national and local stakeholders, the process for the appointment of the Executive Director of the CIAAAT is still pending.

c) *Preventive conservation projects*

The State Party provided extensive reports on the interventions and conservation activities made in 2010-2012 for the following buildings: Akapana Pyramid, Puma Punku (2010-2012),

Putuni (2010-2012) and the Headless Monolith (2010). The Municipality of Tiwanaku, in compliance with the decisions made by the CIAAAT's Board, has managed eight preventive conservation actions at the site. Other conservation measures were implemented at the museums' building affected by water infiltration and structural problems, in particular with the roof. In the case of the Ceramic Museum the roof was renovated and adequate maintenance ensured. These interventions were financed by the resources generated from visitor revenue, in accordance with Article 10 of the Supreme Decree 1004 of 2011.

d) *Installation of an integrated water drainage system for the property*

While the conservation plan for the property has been developed together with an integrated drainage system based on interdisciplinary studies and assessments, the State Party reports that in order to control flow of rainwater and ensure proper drainage of the main buildings, preventive conservation projects were undertaken between (2010-2012), contributing to ensure adequate protection. In spite of the conservation measures undertaken in the main buildings, Akapana, Putuni, Pumapunku and Headless Monolith, the integrated conservation plan is far from complete and a monitoring system should be put in place as a matter of urgency.

e) *International Meeting of experts in Tiwanaku (27-29 August 2012)*

The State Party reports that following Decision **35 COM 7B.119** adopted by the World Heritage Committee, an International Expert's meeting on the elaboration of a Conservation Plan for Tiwanaku was held in Tiwanaku from 27 to 29 August 2012. Organized by the Ministry of Cultures, in close coordination with the World Heritage Centre and the Quito UNESCO Office and with financing from the UNESCO/*Japan Funds in Trust for the Preservation of the World Heritage*, the meeting formulated a set of recommendations which will serve as the basis for the development of Tiwanaku's Conservation plan. International experts in several fields, such as archaeology, architecture, engineering, geology/geomorphology, biology, as well as intervention, participated in the meeting together with national specialists, including the national focal point for culture and Tiwanaku's site manager.

The multidisciplinary group of experts adopted a set of recommendations together with a work-plan including the institutions responsible for each proposed activity. In the field of conservation, it was considered important to elaborate an integral and interdisciplinary plan for archaeological investigation of the site with emphasis on (i) defining the intangible and public use zones, research, protection and corresponding regulatory measures and (ii) identifying, registering, and rehabilitating the pre-hispanic drainage system in the different areas of the site. A continuous monitoring and research of mortars, both *in-situ* and in laboratory, to evaluate their physical and chemical behaviour was also recommended, among others. The experts made a call for the immediate appointment of the new Director of CIAAAT and for the appointment of a new Director of Archaeology in the research area foreseen in the Presidential Decree. In the legal field, it was recommended to promote and support the development of an urban plan for Tiwanaku's town (identification of areas for urban growth, height of buildings, building materials and architectural typology) with particular emphasis on the area adjacent to the protected area and to establish an adequate buffer zone to ensure the protection of the property.

f) *UNESCO Project for the Conservation and Preservation of Tiwanaku and Akapana Pyramid*

The State Party reports that the guidelines provided by the meeting and the conservation measures identified will serve as a basis for the revision of the extra-budgetary project entitled "Preservation and Conservation of Tiwanaku and the Akapana Pyramid" financed by UNESCO/Japan FIT for the Preservation of World Heritage, in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The role of the CIAAAT as a focal point for activities to be undertaken within the framework of the project should enhance and ensure

the level of coordination among national stake-holders to facilitate the project's implementation.

Conclusion

Despite the progress made by the State Party regarding the implementation of preventive conservation measures and the adoption of the Presidential Decree for the creation of CIAAAT, as well as the organization of the International Expert's meeting in September 2012, it is crucial to proceed with the revision of the work plan of the JFIT project and to establish close monitoring for the implementation of conservation measures. In this process, a close cooperation with CIAAAT regarding its functioning and the immediate appointment of its Executive Director is essential. In addition, the process for the establishment of an adequate buffer zone and land use plans at the municipality level should be finalized in order to ensure that the integrity of the site is maintained.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.92

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.119**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the adoption of the Presidential Decree of September 2011, creating the Centre of Archaeological and Anthropological Research and Management of Tiwanaku (CIAAAT);*
4. *Also notes the results of the International Meeting of experts held at Tiwanaku, Bolivia in August 2012 and organized within the framework of the Japanese Funds-in-Trust project to define regulations and guidelines for the development of a conservation plan for the property, and endorses its recommendations;*
5. *Requests the State Party to finalize the Conservation Plan for Tiwanaku and submit it to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review by 1 February 2014;*
6. *Also requests the State Party upon approval of the Conservation plan, to develop the Management Plan for the property, which should include risk preparedness and public use components; and articulate it with other existing planning tools, such as the land use plan and submit the draft to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for evaluation;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to finalize the process of appointment of the Executive Director of the CIAAAT, to ensure adequate staffing for the implementation of the conservation measures and the management plan of the property, and to inform the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies on the activities undertaken by the CIAAAT.*
8. *Requests furthermore the State Party to establish a buffer zone for the property to ensure the protection of its Outstanding Universal Value and conditions of authenticity and integrity;*
9. *Request moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, as per Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, technical*

specifications on planned projects relating to interventions at the property and its museums, for consideration and review prior to implementation;

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 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)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

Criteria

(iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/180/documents>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 246,110

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/180/assistance>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount granted: USD 14,780 for the July 2010 Technical Mission partially funded by the Spanish Funds-in-Trust for World Heritage

Previous Monitoring Missions

September 2006: UNESCO Havana Office Technical Visit; July 2010: Joint Expert Technical Mission; March 2011: UNESCO Preparatory Mission for Haiti Donor's Conference; January 2012: World Heritage Centre Technical Mission; March 2012: Multidisciplinary Technical Mission; May 2013 ICOMOS Mission; May 2013 Multidisciplinary Technical Mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a Management Plan;
- b) Lack of a Conservation Plan;
- c) Water damage;
- d) Vandalism;
- e) Seismic activities;
- f) Infrastructure projects;
- g) Lack of a Risk Preparedness Plan;
- h) Potential non controlled touristic development

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/180>

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

Current conservation issues

A very brief report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party on 13 February 2013, accompanied by a provisional Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, prepared by the Institute for the Preservation of the National Heritage (ISPAN).

a) *National Road RN003*

The State Party confirmed the decision to respect the recommendations and warnings of ISPAN and the World Heritage Committee. The Ministry of Public Works invited a World Heritage Centre/Advisory Bodies technical mission in respect of the third section of the National Road RN003, funded by the European Union, to identify the final route and evaluate the project for improvement of the section between Milot and Dondon.

b) *Roads in the National History Park*

ISPAN began repair work and improvement to the roads in June 2012, between Sans-Souci and Choiseuil, from there to the Citadel and from there to Ramiers. These works responds to recommendations and drafted specifications taking into account the two missions in 2012, in order to enable the interventions. However, the secondary road project concerning the hills below the Citadel has not yet been implemented, although the road located between Ramiers and the Citadel has been improved. Some of the sections have been widened to improve drainage and for security reasons. Furthermore, between June and September 2012, ISPAN implemented a signage project, and road signs and information panels on the monuments were prepared and installed. The information panels of a historical and cultural nature concerning the Park and its monuments are graphic and multilingual.

c) *Constructions in the National History Park*

Two tourist constructions were built in the Park with the authorization of ISPAN. They concern a small pavilion at the main gate, where the church and the Sans-Souci Palace are located, and are destined to welcome and inform visitors. With regard to the welcome buildings at Choiseuil, they comprise stands for artists, information buildings, services and ramps for the horses. Two temporary structures were built and dismantled immediately after two brief events organized for the promotion of the Sans-Souci Palace. Thanks to private sector initiatives, the Sans-Souci church and its surrounds have undergone some repair work. Events such as the National Carnival in Cape Haitian were carried out to promote increased awareness of national heritage and cultural potential of the territory.

d) *Conservation actions*

Work has been carried out on the different floor levels of the Palace, such as cleaning up following rain damage and the installation of a mobile passage between the main stairs and the King's terrace. The access to the Coidavid Fort was closed on 23 March following the expertise of the technical and multidisciplinary mission. An important awareness-raising message to the public was addressed by ISPAN. On 16 July 2012 a violent storm heavily impacted Haiti and a part of the roof of the Coidavid Fort was damaged. The essential repair work has been completed. The Ministry of Tourism granted additional emergency funds to ISPAN in October 2012. The equivalent of USD 200,000 was used to consolidate the emergency work at Coidavid Fort in response to the recommendations of the multidisciplinary mission report of 2012. Another multidisciplinary mission is foreseen between April and May 2013, to develop, among others, recordings of typical damage at the Citadel, sampling and analysis of stonework, the establishment of a microclimate surveillance station and mechanical samplings at the Batteries; as well as planning a campaign to measure water distribution in the masonry by IR thermographic methods, biocidal treatment tests, photographic documentation of the reference zones and archaeological excavations in the courtyard of the Citadel. Individuation of security measures for the Batteries and verification of the efficiency of security measures for the Sans-Souci building will also be developed.

e) *Cadastral study*

A cadastral survey was initiated in June 2012. Between June and September, the agreement protocol between ISPAN and the Inter-ministerial Council for Territorial Development (CIAT) was updated. The difficulties encountered in 2011 were broached. Work at the site will be terminated at end-2013.

f) *Cooperation between ISPAN, the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Tourism*

Currently, since 16 August 2012, the State Party deals with an Inter-ministerial Commission comprising the Ministries of Culture, Tourism, Interior and Territorial Communities, and of Planning and External Cooperation, the mandate of which is to participate in the preparation and the implementation of national strategies for the management and development of the Park; to enforce the legal instruments and regulations for the management of the Park; to create and execute promotional programmes for culture, tourism, agriculture and the environment; to enhance ecotourism in liaison with territorial and local communities. The Ministries of Culture, Tourism and the Environment appointed the Director of the Park on 20 September 2012, and the Minister of Culture, Mario Dupuy, declared a National Heritage Day. Access to the Park was restricted and work coordinated by ISPAN, the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Tourism.

g) *The World Bank*

Following different meetings and discussions between the World Bank, the Ministry of Culture and the World Heritage Centre, it was decided to finance a World Heritage programme for the Citadel. This project will develop the capacities of ISPAN and result in a process of more rapid and secure decision-making for the conservation and management of the monuments of the Park. The Conservation Plan and management protocol are fully coherent with the emergency conservation operation. The immediate actions are to fund a Technical Unit at ISPAN, comprising a project coordinator, a junior architect-conservator, a junior engineer-conservator and an administrative assistant.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies observe that, although the State Party has begun, as far as it is possible to implement little by little the Committee decisions, it is extremely urgent to carry out an intervention to ensure the stabilisation of the structures that risk collapse. The conclusions of studies carried out and the diagnostics of components and structures have revealed the extreme vulnerability of the site, and the urgent measures to be undertaken are clearly identified in the recommendations.

The Order declaring the state of emergency throughout the territory and flagging up the particular status of the Park constitute a very positive measure. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend the finalization and approval of the Conservation Plan and consider essential to complete the implementation of the Conservation Plan as of December 2013.

Furthermore, the new government, in place since 24 January 2013, has promised to continue conservation and protection efforts for the National History Park, and to strengthen ISPAN's capacities. Thus, the Management Plan must be coherent with the Conservation Plan that has already been established. Finally, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies insist upon the importance of establishing participatory mechanisms in the management for the site to improve the quality of life of the local population.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.98

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.99**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),

3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and the World Bank concerning the measures undertaken to implement the decisions of the World Heritage Committee and acknowledges the efforts made by the Institute for the Preservation of National Heritage (ISPAN) to ensure the safeguarding of the property;*
4. *Thanks the Government of Spain and the Spanish Agency of International Development Cooperation for its generous contribution that enabled the continued implementation in 2013 of the World Heritage Committee decisions;*
5. *Also takes note of the State Party's invitation for a World Heritage Centre/Advisory Bodies technical mission to examine the final project for the construction of the last section of National Road RN003, as well as the environmental, heritage and socio-economic impact studies on the site, and endorses the recommendations of the mission;*
6. *Requests the State Party to continue its efforts to complete the cadastral survey as well as the delineation of the boundaries and regulations of the buffer zone and to await the results of this study before proceeding with the physical marking out of the property and to facilitate the establishment of a participatory strategy for the conservation and management of the Park;*
7. *Further takes note of the latest results of the structural stabilization studies for the Citadel and urges the State Party to undertake the necessary measures to initiate emergency actions in cooperation with the technical and financial institutions to ensure the integrity of the fortified structures of the Citadel and Ramiers, as well as the Sans-Souci Palace;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to await the finalization and approval of the Conservation Plan before pursuing tourism development projects and further requests the participation of local communities in the conservation and management process for the site;*
9. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit a study on visitor capacity levels for the Citadel, Ramiers and the Sans-Souci Palace to guarantee correct access conditions for visitors;*
10. *Requests, in addition, the State Party to submit by **30 December 2013**, the Action Plan relating to the project for the Citadel, coordinated by the World Heritage Centre in close collaboration with ISPAN;*
11. *Requests moreover the international community to ensure by every possible means, its support in the implementation of the recommendations to rapidly approve financial and human resources in order to assist the State Party to ensure the conservation of the entire property and in particular the quality of life of the inhabitants;*
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 and the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

100. Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997, extension in 2003

Criteria

(ii) (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/790/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; March 2010: On the occasion of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to Portobelo and San Lorenzo, a technical visit to the Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and the Historic District was undertaken, as requested by the authorities of Panamá; October 2010: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) The severe deterioration of historic buildings which threatens the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
- b) Conflicting interests of different stakeholders with regard to the use, management and conservation of the historic centre;
- c) Limited capacity for the rehabilitation and maintenance of historic structures;
- d) Deficiencies in the implementation of the legislative framework for protection;
- e) Lack of implementation of clear conservation and management policies for the property;
- f) Demolition of urban ensembles and buildings;
- g) Forced displacement of occupants and squatters;
- h) Urban development projects within the protected area (i.e. Cinta Costera).

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/790>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a comprehensive report on the state of conservation of the property on 31 January 2013 and complementary information was submitted on 12 February 2013. Additional detailed information on the Cinta Costera III project, including information on the impact of the project and on the urban transportation and mobility strategy for the Historic District of Panamá had already been submitted by the State Party on 21 September and 9 November 2012. On 14 March 2013, the State Party made a presentation at the World Heritage Centre on progress with the formulation of the joint Management Plan for two World Heritage properties in Panamá: The Fortifications of the Caribbean side of Panamá, Portobelo and San Lorenzo in conjunction with the Historic District and Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo.

a) *Buffer zone and retrospective inventory*

A request for a minor boundary modifications was submitted by the State Party on 29 January 2013 and related additional information on 15 February 2013. On 14 March 2013 a supplementary map was also submitted. However, the proposal for minor boundary

modification did not comply with the requirements of the Operational Guidelines and the State Party has been requested to clarify and complete it.

b) Legislative framework, management system and policies for the property

The submitted information included a report on the progress with the elaboration and implementation of the standards and procedures manual for the restoration and rehabilitation of the Old Quarter of Panama City that was approved in 2004. This manual sets out the basic requirements for approval of plans and building and occupancy permits. No precise information was yet provided on the actual enforcement of these tools.

The State Party also provided information about the formulation of the "Panama UNESCO Heritage Management Plan" in a presentation made at UNESCO on 14 March 2013. The information provided notes that a protocol was prepared for the management of the two cultural World Heritage properties in Panama on August 2012; it is stated that the protocol subscribed to by all the main actors guarantees an operational plan. A coordinating body has been established and also a National Natural and Cultural Heritage Commission that will function as a technical assistance body. The Commission integrates several ministries and the management entities of Portobelo and San Lorenzo as well as for Panama Viejo. The Presidential Decree to officially set up this Commission is currently under revision.

The outline Management Plan included in the report lists a series of aims for the conservation and management of both cultural World Heritage properties in Panama. The Plan contains background information, an assessment of the current situation and proposed strategies and actions for different sectors, structured under the following headings: knowledge plan, protection and conservation plan, urban planning, public space and landscape plan, economic development plan, cultural promotion plan, and monitoring plan. The document also includes a table of actions to be implemented, with proposed costs and identified timeframes for implementation (urgent, medium and long term). While the Management Plan includes a useful systematic assessment and identifies specific activities, it would benefit from the identification of a precise course of action to address the state of conservation of the built environment, and criteria and guidance for interventions that could be used as a coherent framework to guide decision-making in consideration of the conditions of authenticity and integrity of the property. Further information is needed on whether the proposed management arrangements are fully operational and on whether funding has been secured to implement the identified urgent actions.

The report submitted by the State Party also included the Master Plan for the rehabilitation and restoration of the historic monumental ensemble of the Casco Antiguo of Panama City, dated January 2011. The extent of the implementation of this Master Plan was not provided and clearly it will be essential to integrate it with the developing Management Plan.

c) State of conservation of the property

Since 2008, the World Heritage Committee has expressed its concern about the state of conservation of the Historic Centre, particularly in regard to the existence of a significant number of largely deteriorated and neglected historic buildings.

The State Party reports progress with certain measures to begin to address these issues. For example, actions have been undertaken for the replacement of sidewalks and painting of curbs, for paving, for the installation of storm drains, for the underground burial of electric and telecommunications installations and for the rebuilding of sewage infrastructure. It also notes that visits through the historic centre were carried out to monitor progress on actions implemented, including the state of conservation of the historic buildings.

Further detailed information presented by the State Party analyses the extent of the problem: of the 845 lots in the Historic District, 40,3% are considered to be in good conditions, 5,8 % have unfinished works, 9,8% are vacant lots, 26,4% are inhabited and in bad conditions and 17,6 % are uninhabited and in bad conditions. It is stated that this analysis will be used for the citation of their owners to start processes of "unlocking value" by the National Heritage

and to enforce fines where applicable. However, no further information has been provided on whether the Emergency Plan for interventions, drafted in 2009, will be reviewed in accordance to the provisions made in the outline Management Plan to identify priority measures for implementation and to include a practical plan for implementation, including required resources and expected timeframes for implementation. This review has been requested by the World Heritage Committee since its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011).

As for the *Via Cincuentenario*, the State Party reports that work has continued for its relocation outside the Archaeological site of Panama Viejo. In consideration of the new alignment, actions such as archaeological surveys, relocation of utilities, and relocation of affected families, are being implemented. As requested by the Environmental Impact Study (EIS), a Plan for the Archaeological Rescue in Panama Viejo was implemented. However, no Heritage Impact assessment has been completed yet for review.

d) *Cinta Costera project*

i. *Background*

The 2009 reactive monitoring mission to the property noted that the Phase II of the Cinta Costera project, located at the seaside area of Terraplan, had been constructed without carrying out environmental impact studies or a heritage impact assessment, and without informing the World Heritage Committee. Additionally, the mission noted that the Phase III project foreseen at the time could have an impact on the property; consequently the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) requested the State Party to provide a final report, including the analysis and monitoring of the impacts derived from the construction of the Cinta Costera Phase II and the potential impacts on the property from the possible continuation of Phase III.

In 2010, the state of conservation report examined by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) noted that Phase III of Cinta Costera was expected to continue at the time with a tunnel that would cross approximately 1 km. of the Historic Centre or by surrounding the Peninsula of the Historic District. The 2010 reactive monitoring mission to the property verified that works had continued on Phase II and that no additional information could be procured regarding the social impacts, conservation requirements, or impact assessments of the project. It also noted that Phase II of the Cinta Costera had resulted in the radical transformation of the waterfront and the impacted on the character of the old harbour area at Terraplan. The mission noted that the proposal of Cinta Costera Phase III to surround the peninsula could have an aggressive impact on the view sheds to and from the Historic Centre and could impact on the conditions of authenticity and integrity of the property. It further noted that no other alternatives for the continuation of the project at Phase III had been sufficiently explored at the time. In Decision **34 COM 7B.113**, the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to halt the Cinta Costera Project and to submit the necessary technical studies and impact assessments prior to approval and implementation, as well as to explore and submit other alternative proposals to address the traffic concerns effectively.

At its 35th Session (UNESCO, 2011) the World Heritage Committee noted the commitment made by the State Party at the Committee session to submit all projects, studies and proposals related to alternatives for future works of the Cinta Costera Phase III for evaluation, including technical specifications and heritage impact assessments. The Committee also requested that the construction of Phase III of the Cinta Costera be discontinued, as it would potentially have an adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

On 31 January 2012, the State Party presented, as the only alternative it was submitting for consideration and review by the World Heritage Committee, a definitive proposal to construct a Maritime Viaduct, Phase III of the Cinta Costera, to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. In the state of conservation report examined by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) it was noted, based on the evaluation of the

Heritage Impact Assessment, that the project posed a potential threat to the integrity and authenticity of the property as it would transform the Historic District's traditional form, its appearance on the coastline and would irreversibly compromise the existing relationship between the Historic Centre and the sea and particularly impact the setting of the property in the peninsula and the singularity of the fortified precinct. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies considered that alternative solutions had not yet been sufficiently explored nor had comprehensive technical assessments to discard other options had been presented. The statement requesting the evaluation of only one proposal also precluded the possibility for dialogue about other potential solutions. The World Heritage Committee requested, in Decision 36 COM 7.B103, that impact studies on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property be carried out and also requested the State Party to implement a series of measures to comprehensively address the precarious state of conservation of the property.

On 21 January 2013 the State Party provided a report "Solution for the future traffic demand of Panama City", elaborated by Halcrow Consulting. This report explains the rapid growth of Panama City and details of the traffic problems and states that the Maritime Viaduct will have urban expressways with three lanes in each direction, connecting directly to Avenida de Balboa and Avenida de los Poetas. The report does not provide any details for alternative options to face the acknowledged increasing growth of traffic.

ii. Current situation

On 7 September 2012, the State Party made a presentation at UNESCO of the "Impact Study of the Cinta Costera III Maritime Viaduct to its Outstanding Universal Value under the currently inscribed criteria of C790 Property, Archaeological Site of Panama Viejo and Historic District of Panama". In further communications with the World Heritage Centre, throughout September 2012, the State Party indicated that the presented option had been revised to address impacts identified through the incorporation of mitigation measures and compensations. It underscored that the San Felipe Island, which would have faced the Presidential Palace, had been removed from the final design.

On 24 September 2012, a letter from civil society organizations in Panama was received by the Director General of UNESCO providing notification of the construction of the maritime viaduct. On 17 October 2012 a letter from the Permanent Delegation of Panama to UNESCO was received in response to the request for information regarding claims of the commencement of construction works. The State Party indicated that the impact study delivered in September 2012 for evaluation was considered as formal compliance with paragraphs 6 and 7 of the decision of the World Heritage Committee (36 COM 7B.103) and that it therefore considered the construction of the Road Interconnection on Maritime Viaduct could commence. The letter also confirmed the disposition of the State Party to receive suggestions, contributions and inputs on the necessary technical viability for optimizing the design and informed that Delegations of the World Heritage Committee had visited the site to this purpose. As of January 2013, information available in the public domain states that almost 50% of the Viaduct has been constructed. By official communication, the State Party confirmed on 25th April 2013 that 55% of the infrastructure has already been completed.

iii. Assessment of impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property

The impact study submitted by the State Party noted that the Maritime Viaduct, Phase III of the Cinta Costera does not affect the criteria for inscription of the property. However, the report highlighted the attributes of the property in terms of the shape and design that influenced the evolution of military architecture in the Americas. It underscored their low profile and adaptation of the settlement to the shape of the peninsula, and considered the prime importance of the location and the setting, both critical attributes to the authenticity of the property. The report indicates "the main reason why the city was moved after the destruction of Panama Viejo was the desire to fortify it. As the site of the cove lent itself to the building of a walled enclosure, it was chosen despite its narrowness. The peninsula afforded an additional advantage: on its eastern and southern flanks the beach has a surface

of sharp rocks that would have significantly hampered any attempt to attack from there. Given these characteristics, this environment was an integral part of the defensive system”.

The study highlighted that the setting and current landscape, understood as being comprised of the Historic District, the surrounding Bay of Panama and its panoramas, the waterfront, the skyline of Panama City and Ancon Hill, that had remained unaltered in terms of the location of the Historic Centre, the environment of sharp rocks to the east and south of San Felipe, around three crags which appear in historical cartography as "The Three Sisters", would be altered. The report included a photo, taken from Google Earth, corresponding exactly to a 18th century map of the city and it further highlighted that “from a distance, the landscape of the Historic Centre seems to be largely unchanged since the 19th century”. The report also mentions that “the unobstructed view, in its perception of foreground and background, is part of the collective memory of the capital's population”. The indirect impacts noted are classified to include visual repercussion, noise impact, tidal, background of the metropolitan scene, functional, and territorial relation on the site. The report acknowledges the indirect, visual impact on the waterfront setting of the property and ranks them as large to very large major changes (pages 209, 213-215). Notwithstanding these considerations, the report considered that the visual impact on the waterfront setting could be mitigated through changes to the design. No technical details were provided in terms of the mitigation measures foreseen to ensure the viaduct did not impact adversely on the waterfront setting.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies wish to draw the attention of the Committee to the current state of conservation of the property, where 44% of the historic buildings inventoried are reported to be in an extremely poor condition, an issue that has remained unaddressed since 2008. Although the proposed development of the Management Plan can be considered as a positive step forward, so far there are no indications that the prescribed system is fully operational or that adequate resources have been secured.

To date, in spite of the requests made by the World Heritage Committee, there is unfortunately no indication as to whether the Emergency Plan for interventions, drafted in 2009, will be reviewed in accordance with the provisions made in the outline Management Plan in order to identify priority measures and to include a practical plan for implementation, including required resources and expected timeframes to carry out actions. This needs to be urgently implemented to ensure the conservation and protection of the built fabric.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies concur with the need to consider improvements to road infrastructure to meet increasing traffic demands but point out that no alternatives to the Maritime Viaduct were sufficiently explored and that the construction began without allowing the World Heritage Committee appropriate time for evaluation, and identification of possible recommendations. They note the efforts made in carrying out the impact studies but consider that, although adverse impacts had been identified with the option selected for the Maritime Viaduct, there was not a clear explanation in any of the documents provided on why other alternatives were totally rejected. In addition, the report “Solution for the future traffic demand of Panama City” underscores the accelerated growth of Panama City and the challenges it faces in regard to traffic demands and the urgent need to reorganise road infrastructure. However, it focuses on justifying why the Maritime Viaduct is the only alternative without contemplating any other alternatives or balancing their pros and cons. There are no substantiated justifications that would indicate that the viaduct will effectively and, most importantly, sustainably provide long-term solutions to these traffic issues.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies underscore the negative visual impacts of the Maritime Viaduct that will adversely impact on and transform the setting of the Historic Centre. They further note that the Maritime Viaduct is a structure of a very strong shape with a high visual impact which does not integrate harmoniously with the Historic District and establishes an undesirable contrast with regard to its maritime context. They consider that

the ability of the property to convey its Outstanding Universal Value, as a fortified settlement in a Peninsula and as a testimony to the nature of the early settlements, with a layout and urban design adapted to a particular context, are being adversely compromised. The urban layout and scale and the relationship between the city and its setting, attributes crucial to the understanding of the evolution of the property, will also be adversely impacted.

The Maritime Viaduct, which, when complete in a few months' time, will closely encircle the coastline that has been the edge of the Historic District since its foundation in the 17th century, will alter view sheds to and from the Historic Centre. Furthermore, the work already carried out on this large-scale infrastructure is impacting significantly and adversely on the integrity and the authenticity of the property, in terms of the way it conveys its historic strategic and defensive location on the Central American isthmus, a crucial attribute of its Outstanding Universal Value.

Given the current degree and extent of the adverse impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property derived from the construction of the Maritime Viaduct and the state of conservation of the built fabric, the World Heritage and the Advisory Bodies note that the World Heritage Committee might wish to inscribe this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.100

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **33 COM 7B.141, 34 COM 7B.113, 35 COM 7B.130, 36 COM 7B.103**, adopted at its 33rd (Seville, 2009), 34th (Brasilia, 2010), 35th (UNESCO, 2011) and 36th (Saint Petersburg, 2012) sessions respectively, and its concern that the construction of the Cinta Costera Phase III (Maritime Viaduct) would adversely impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property,*
3. *Also recalling the state of conservation reports and reactive monitoring mission reports of March 2009, March 2010 and October 2010 that underscored the impacts of the Cinta Costera project, in particular the Maritime Viaduct, and the poor state of conservation of the property;*
4. *Notes progress with developing a Management Plan, with quantifying the number of buildings at risk and with work on the streetscapes, and undergrounding infrastructure, and reiterates its deep concern about the overall state of conservation of the property and regrets that no sufficient progress has been made in comprehensively and sustainably addressing critical issues, or in implementing the emergency Action Plan agreed in 2009;*
5. *Also regrets the fact that the authorities did not yet sufficiently explore alternatives, long-term sustainable traffic management solutions and decided, unilaterally, to proceed with the construction of the Cinta Costera Phase III (Maritime Viaduct) and that the entreaties of the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd, 34th, 35th, and 36th sessions failed to protect the property;*
6. *Considers that the work already undertaken on the new construction of the Maritime Viaduct impacts adversely on the property and **decides to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in conformity with Paragraphs 177 and 179 of the Operational Guidelines;***

7. *Requests the State Party to invite as a matter of urgency a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to verify the degree of impact that the Construction of the Cinta Costera Phase III (Maritime Viaduct) has had on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and to prepare the Desire State of conservation, including the corrective measures and the timeframe for their implementation;*
8. *Also requests the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to submit a report on the findings of the reactive monitoring mission for examination and decision by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th Session in 2014.*

102. Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1988 extension in 1991

Criteria
(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/500>

International Assistance
Total amount granted: USD 48,000 for emergency works in the historic centre; USD 56,500 for conservation works.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
1994: Systematic monitoring report UNDP/UNESCO; March-April 2003: reactive monitoring mission ICOMOS; January 2010: WHC / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Formalization of the procedures to set up a Management Coordination Unit to implement the Strategic Plan;
- b) Revision of the Master and Strategic Plans;
- c) New development projects within the Historic Centre including urban transportation systems (*Corredor Segregado*) and interventions in historical buildings;
- d) Development of the cable car project for tourism purposes.

Illustrative material
See pages: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/500>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre received the state of conservation report on 12 March 2013 in response to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011). The draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been finalized by the State Party.

- a) *Regulatory framework and policies for the Historic Centre*

The State Party reports that several legal tools have been approved and are in the process of approval for the Historic Centre. The four Municipal Ordinances and one City Hall Resolution include the creation of a Management Office for Urban renewal, provisions for zoning and for location of urban activities, and the establishment of building heights, among others. It also reports that there is a project to update the Master Plan of the Historic Centre which should be concluded by May 2013.

b) Management system

The State Party indicates that the Framework Agreement for Interinstitutional cooperation between the Ministry of Culture and the Metropolitan Municipality of Lima was signed on July 2012. This is expected to ensure that appropriate mechanisms are in place to coordinate conservation and management actions at the property. An additional cooperation agreement between the Municipality of Lima, the Municipality of Cusco and the Municipality of Arequipa is foreseen to create a network of World Heritage Cities in Peru to strengthen regulatory frameworks and ensure adequate conservation of the properties. The State Party also mentioned in its report the Project to integrate the Lima Workshop School Project of the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID) to the Metropolitan Municipality of Lima to contribute to the social, economic and cultural development of the Historic Centre. No further information is provided on how the management system is expected to function.

c) Projects at the property

The State Party reported that no project is planned with regard to a creation of a commercial centre in Rimac.

i. Linea Amarilla project

The Linea Amarilla project includes the design, construction, operation and maintenance of existing and new urban roads to improve transport and mobility at Lima. The Linea Amarilla Expressway is a multimodal road corridor and entails the construction of 9 km of new roads that will connect to the existing Via de Evitamiento and with a tunnel that will cross under the Rimac River. The tunnel option was selected in order to preserve the characteristics of the monument area at this sector and to avoid potential negative impacts on this portion of the inscribed World Heritage property. Works started in January 2012 and are expected to be finalized in 2015.

ii. Urban renewal project for Monserrate

The State Party reports this project part of the Municipal Urban Renewal Programme which focuses on revitalizing sectors of the historic centre, in this case at the buffer zone, for social housing and development (88 housing units, 6 training workshops, commercial and administrative spaces). Technical specifications were included for the project and no impact is foreseen on the World Heritage property.

iii. Plaza de Acho project

The project focuses on the restoration and improvement of the infrastructure of the plaza, the museum, and the restaurant in order to make the place a touristic destination. Only the outline of the project has been submitted for consideration by the Ministry of Culture so it has not been granted approval for implementation.

iv. Station at Jirón de la Unión and High Capacity Segregated Corridor

The State Party reports that technical criteria have been established to minimize the visual impact of the built station for the High Capacity Segregated Corridor on the heritage buildings located nearby. The observations made have been taken into account and actions were implemented so that the station now allows for maximum transparency and a minimum degree of intervention. In addition, the State Party informs that the Metropolitan Municipality

of Lima has not developed alternative plans or additional studies for transport systems for the High Capacity Segregated Corridor.

v. Electric Train of Lima

The State Party reports that the initial project presented in October 2011 by the Autonomous Authority of the Electric Train was rejected by the Ministry of Culture since it entailed impacts to heritage buildings, the proposed infrastructure was not coherent with the surrounding urban environment and the monumental zone, and did not comply with existing Municipal Ordinances and regulatory measures. A revised project consisting in a complete proposal for an electric mass-transit system for Lima and Callao sector was submitted in 2012 and included the conservation of historic buildings as well as revised designs for the proposed infrastructure. The revised projects were approved by the Ministry of Culture in December 2012 and governed by Law 28253. Its implementation and operation are carried out by the Autonomous Authority of the Electric Train (AATE).

vi. Cable Car project

The State Party reports that a new project proposal "Teléférico de Lima" for the cable car was presented in May 2012. The initial route has been revised and the Ministry of Culture made technical observations to the project proposal in November 2012. These related to the proposed constructions at the hill, which need to take into account the existing topography to integrate with the natural landscape and the modifications that needed to be made to Tower 2 which could create strong visual impacts given its height and design. In January 2013 a revised project was submitted which addressed the previously made technical observations; the project was approved by the Ministry of Culture on February 2013. The requested information should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made by the State Party in the implementation of the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee and the 2010 reactive monitoring mission to the property. Legal tools and regulatory frameworks have been enhanced so decision-making processes in regard to conservation and management of the property is expected to improve. The finalisation and implementation of the updated Master Plan, along with the continued coordination among different institutions, will be an important step in ensuring the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

As requested by the Committee, the State Party submitted the legal, technical and graphic information on the different projects currently being implemented within the property and its buffer zone. They note that given the extent of the interventions foreseen, sufficient time should be allocated for the review of large-scale projects, to anticipate potential impacts and identify adequate solutions in consideration to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that some of the concerns previously raised have been partially addressed by the State Party. Special attention is required concerning the final implementation of the adjustment of the Jirón de la Unión project and the Cable Car project and the other urban projects which their final layout is not yet evaluated by the Advisory Bodies. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will continue working with the municipal and national authorities in the monitoring of activities related to the updating process of the Master Plan.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.102

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,
2. Recalling Decision **35 COM 7B.134**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),
3. Acknowledges the efforts made by the State Party in the implementation of the recommendations made by the 2010 reactive monitoring mission and encourages it to continue with these efforts, in particular regarding the establishment of a fully functional and resourced management system for the property;
4. Takes note of large scale projects being implemented and requests the State Party to:
 - a) Consider the development of alternative plans for the High Capacity Segregated Corridor, responsive to studies of transportation systems, and develop the adequate heritage impact assessments in the sections that could potentially impact the World Heritage property,
 - b) Submit to the World Heritage Centre the final design, technical specifications and precise location of the route, in relation to the inscribed property, for the Cable Car Project, including relevant heritage and visual impact assessments, for review by the Advisory Bodies prior to making any commitment to its implementation by **30 October 2014**;
5. Also requests the State Party to submit three printed and electronic copies of the finalised Master Plan for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
6. 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 abovementioned requests, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015.

III. OMNIBUS DECISION

As part of its functions and within the reactive monitoring process, each year the World Heritage Committee examines the state of conservation of a number of selected properties, inscribed on the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and those that are under threats (see Paragraph 169 of the *Operational Guidelines*). To this effect, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies prepare detailed reports on the state of conservation (“SOC reports”) of those properties which are presented for examination to the Committee (see Documents WHC-13/37.COM/7A, 7A.Add, 7B and 7B.Add).

On the basis of these reports, the World Heritage Committee decides, in consultation with the State Party concerned and as per Paragraph 24 of the *Operational Guidelines*, whether additional measures are required to conserve the property, including by adding it to the List of World Heritage in Danger, or whether to delete the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger if the property is no longer under threat.

At its 27th session (UNESCO, 2003), considering time constraints during its sessions, the ever-increasing number of properties placed under the reactive monitoring process, as well as its impact on the workload of all parties involved, the World Heritage Committee adopted Decision **27 COM 7B.106**, which requested that the SOC reports be grouped in two categories 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, unless a request is made by a Committee member to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee in advance of the discussion of this agenda item.

Furthermore, at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011), recognizing the need to improve the processes for monitoring the state of conservation of properties as a means of further reducing workload, the World Heritage Committee decided to “default to a minimum two-year cycle for the examination of state of conservation reports for individual properties on the World Heritage List, and for the discussion of those inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, except for cases of utmost urgency” (Decision **35 COM 12B**). This measure was implemented at the 36th session of the Committee in 2012.

However, considering the significant number of SOC reports which remain to be prepared for the 37th session of the Committee in 2013 (160 reports) and after a careful review of the state of conservation reports submitted by the States Parties concerned, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that in a number of cases, the requests made by the World Heritage Committee to the State Party have been responded to in a satisfactory manner by the authorities concerned and/or adequate measures have been taken (for example, a comprehensive Management Plan for the property has been finalized or a development project potentially affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been cancelled) and that therefore the property can no longer be considered under threat.

In this sense, and in the context of the ever-growing workload of the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that it is not necessary to present yet another detailed SOC report for examination by the World Heritage Committee but rather a brief summary of the progress achieved for the conservation of such properties, which can therefore be removed from the reactive monitoring process.

With *Draft Decision 37 COM 7B.103* proposed below, the World Heritage Committee is therefore invited to note with satisfaction that its requests have been addressed by the States Parties concerned and that in the judgment of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory

Bodies, the Outstanding Universal Value of the properties listed below is no longer under threat. As a result, no further report on the state of conservation of these properties is required in the future, unless in the event of a new threat or development at the property.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Monte San Giorgio (Italy / Switzerland) (N 1090bis)

Further to Decision **34 COM 8B.6**, Italy and Switzerland submitted, on 6 February 2013, a detailed joint report providing information on the establishment of a Transnational Board which will hold officially the coordinating role in the strategic management of the property, as well as information concerning the management structures of each of the two components of the property. For the Italian part of the property, the “Convention of Monte San Giorgio”, established by the stakeholders for the first two years of the transboundary property, has been renewed in 2012. It is managed by the “Commission for planning and management of the Monte San Giorgio UNESCO site”. For the Swiss part, the “Foundation Monte San Giorgio” continues to operate.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the collaboration between the States Parties of Italy and Switzerland to ensure effective management of the transboundary property, and recommend to them to urgently ensure that the Transnational Board become operational as soon as possible for the effective conservation and management of this property. Following Decision **34 COM 8B.6**, the State Party of Switzerland could also bring forward a boundary modification proposal.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26)

On 28 January 2013, in accordance with Decision **35 COM 7B.42**, adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011), the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the Island of Gorée. The State Party has confirmed the appointment of the site manager and the establishment of a Management Office. The State Party continues the implementation of the recommendations of the joint mission of the World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM in 2011, and indicates that the rehabilitation and development of the former port authority, and rehabilitation work for the municipal market is completed, and its functional reorganization is in progress. Moreover, a fissure in the vicinity of the mosque, caused by sea action has occurred and requires appropriate technical intervention.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that a report to the Committee is not necessary at this stage, in order to provide more time to the State Party to pursue the necessary conservation and management actions. Recognizing the difficulties of the State

Party to raise the necessary funds for the conservation and physical safeguarding of the property, they recall the recommendation made to the State Party to submit a request for international assistance for the implementation of the recommendations of the 2011 joint mission, as well as to finance the necessary technical studies.

ASIA – PACIFIC

Old Town of Lijiang (China) (C 811 bis)

On 25 January 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report of the property that addresses the progress made in the implementation of Decision **35 COM 7B.63** adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011). The State Party submitted the minor boundary modification of the property in 2012, which was approved by the 36th session of Committee (Decision **36 COM 8B.48**). The retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property was adopted by the Committee at its 36th session (Decision **36 COM 8E**). The Conservation Master Plan (CMP), reported to be in the final phase of approval, is guiding the protection, conservation and management of the property. It contains specific assessments of the natural and built environment, taking into account the current conservation issues and sets out detailed regulations to ensure the conservation of the authenticity and integrity of the property, along with clear management, monitoring and protection procedures.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that no further reporting to the World Heritage Committee is currently required. The completed Conservation Master Plan, with a synthesis in English, should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, as soon as possible.

Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C 707ter)

On 25 January 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report that addresses the progress made in the implementation of Decision **35 COM 7B.65** made by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011). The State Party reports on the progress made with the definition of the buffer zones of the ensembles of the Potala Palace, Jokhang Temple Monastery and Norbulingka, defining the protection and management requirements, and stating that the existing area and buffer zones as stated in the nomination documents will be maintained. With regard to the conservation master plans for the three areas of the property, the State Party informs that these will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies before final approval.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that no further reporting to the World Heritage Committee is currently required on management; however they request that proposals for minor boundary modifications to the buffer zones of the property be submitted in due course for approval by the Committee. The conservation master plans, with syntheses in English, for the three areas of the property should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, before their final approval.

Taj Mahal (India) (C 252); Agra Fort (India) (C 251); Fatehpur Sikri (India) (C 255)

On 1 February 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report that addresses the progress made in the implementation of Decision **35 COM 7B.67** made by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session. The State Party reports that the development of an Integrated Management Plan for World Heritage properties of Taj Mahal and Agra Fort is in progress and that consultation process was initiated with the State Government, Department of Tourism and Advisory Committee for World Heritage Matters (Ministry of Culture), in order to assess the complex management issues. It further reports that a Management Plan for Fatehpur Sikri is under preparation by Archaeological Survey of India (ASI).

Moreover, the State Party has explained that the Door Frame Metal Detectors and barricaded queue arrangements at the Eastern and Western gates of the Taj Mahal are temporary and will be replaced in due course. The State Party confirms that the new bridge across the river Yamuna mentioned at the 34th session of the Committee (2010) has been constructed at 2 KM distance from the Taj Mahal property. The State Party has submitted a Visual Impact Assessment of the new Bridge, which clarifies that the bridge is not visible from the property and has hardly any visual impact on the property. The State Party also provides clarifications that the bridge's impact on traffic and visitor movement is being prepared through an Environmental Impact Assessment commissioned by ASI. Finally, the State Party reports that a museum is being proposed in the Mughal period heritage building at Fatehpur Sikri and, a Heritage Impact Assessment will be carried out and submitted for review.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the main concerns of the World Heritage Committee for these three properties are being addressed by the State Party and that no further reporting to the World Heritage Committee is currently required. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies however recommend that the Committee encourages the State Party to closely monitor the activities at the properties, to provide information concerning boundaries and buffer zones, and to submit to the World Heritage Centre, for review by the Advisory Bodies, copies of the integrated Management Plan for the three properties, including an overall visitor management strategy which considers traffic management at Taj Mahal and Agra Fort, and the specific Management Plan for Fatehpur Sikri, along with the Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed new museum.

Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India) (C 1101)

On 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report which provides information on progress made in the implementation of Decision **35 COM 7B.68** made by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011). The State Party reports on conservation activities carried out at the property and its immediate surroundings from December 2011 to January 2013, as well as on the process of developing an Integrated Management Plan for the property. The State Party has also submitted the completed and adopted Management Plan containing an overall diagnosis of the conservation issues and details of a comprehensive management system, as well as the related legal and institutional tools for its implementation. The Management Plan has been transmitted to ICOMOS for review.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the concerns of the World Heritage Committee in relation to management have been addressed by the State Party. They therefore consider that no further reporting to the World Heritage Committee is currently required. However, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend

that the State Party monitor periodically the state of conservation of the property, by assessing the implementation of the new legal and institutional tools, as well as the implementation of the Management Plan.

Prambanan Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C 642)

In response to the decisions made by the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee (**35 COM 7B.69**) the State Party provided a report outlining the implementation of the action plans and recovery efforts following the eruption of Mount Merapi in 2010. In the framework of the Safeguarding of Prambanan Temple Compounds, extensive restoration and conservation efforts have been carried out, supported by a number of capacity building and training activities, including technical studies and monitoring efforts.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that no further reporting to the World Heritage Committee is currently required on these issues.

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

Melaka and George Town, Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca (Malaysia) (C1223bis) On 17 January 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report which provides information on progress made in the implementation of Decision **35 COM7B.73** adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011).

The State Party reports that it has further developed the detailed Conservation Guidelines for the two cities; has amended the draft Special Area Plans (SAPs) that now stress the importance of new development not detracting from the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, and require Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) for all new development. The SAPs will be formally adopted by summer 2013 when they will provide the statutory measures in the Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for both cities and their buffer zones. The State Party confirms that no development project higher than 18m in either the city or its buffer zone will be approved before the adoption of the SAPs. With regard to a specific timetable for achieving a reinforced system of management for the property, the State Party informs that the proposed World Heritage Office has now been set up to oversee management of the property, while details of the implementation of the management system are provided in the CMP and SAPs. The State Party has also submitted a completed HIA of the Swiftlet industry (June 2012). This thorough report finds that the industry is impacting severely upon the fabric of historic buildings. In accordance with this, Melaka and George Town have agreed to comply with the draft Special Area Plans which define the industry as a non-permitted activity within the property and buffer zones, and Action Plans for eradication (2011-2012) and enforcement (January to December 2013) have been adopted. Consequently, all Swiftlet farming within the property and buffer zones should be removed by December 2013.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the recent concerns of the World Heritage Committee in relation to the protection and management of the property are being addressed by the State Party. They therefore are of the view that no further reporting to the World Heritage Committee is currently required. However, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the State Party monitor periodically the state of conservation of the property, in particular to ensure that the Special Areas Plans emphasise

the requirement for Heritage Impact Assessments on all infill and replacement development so that the character of the townscape will not be adversely affected, before any existing buildings are replaced or open spaces developed and effectively monitor the timetable for reinforcing the management system to ensure its effective implementation at the property.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Historic Centre of Český Krumlov (Czech Republic) (C 617)

On 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted a detailed state of conservation report that addresses the progress made in the implementation of the World Heritage Committee Decision adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011), including preparation of the Management Plan, the new zoning plan, the design documentation of the bus station and the actions taken regarding the revolving theatre. The State Party informed that the preparatory work for building a vehicular tunnel and a bridge to this tunnel, both works in the buffer zone, have been halted. As previously announced by the national authorities, according to the time schedule for measures aimed at solving the revolving theatre issue, it cannot be expected that a final solution could be implemented before 2015. The State Party also provided information on current conservation issues affecting the historic fabric, on protection of landscape and river banks, as well as on new developments and constructions planned until 2018.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the state of conservation of the property is being adequately addressed by the State Party. The State Party is encouraged to continue with the implementation of all relevant measures in order to prevent any threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape (Hungary) (C 1063)

On 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted a detailed state of conservation report that addresses the progress made in the implementation of the Committee Decision (**35 COM 7B.94**) adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011), including information on recent administrative reforms in Hungary as well as on the progress made reviewing the impact of the different traditional and commercial quarries. The "Wine-Region Tokaj National Programme 2012-2020" has been included in the Government's prioritized National Programmes; the project for a large-capacity straw-burning power plant in the outskirts of the city of Szerencs has been abandoned; and the authorities have initiated new proceedings regarding the proposed andesite mine near the settlement of Szegi. The preliminary steps for the Interdisciplinary Review related to the mines of the Tokaj region have been completed. The authorities have also started a reflection on the precise delineation of the buffer zone. The report also informs that negotiations on a bypass to replace the high-traffic road presently crossing the World Heritage property, and on the construction of the Tisza River bridge connected to this bypass, are currently under way.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the state of conservation of the property is being adequately addressed by the State Party. The State Party is encouraged to implement all relevant measures in order to prevent any threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Vilnius Historic centre (Lithuania) (C 541bis)

Pursuant to the Committee's Decision **35 COM 7B.98** (UNESCO, 2011), the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 30 January 2013. The new "Commission for protection of the Vilnius Historic Centre" was established in 2011 with the continued aim to identify threats to the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property and address them through conservation and management measures. An Activity Plan for 2013-2015 was developed and approved by the two relevant ministries. The State Party also reports that a Special Plan to regulate the construction of high-rise buildings is under preparation and expected to be completed in 2013. This will address concerns regarding the potential impact on the OUV of the property from future constructions beyond the buffer zone.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the requests of the Committee for the property are being adequately addressed and that no further reporting to the World Heritage Committee is required at this stage. However, they will continue working closely with the State Party in monitoring the state of conservation of the property. The State Party is encouraged to submit a copy of the above-mentioned Activity Plan, as well as the regulations concerning the construction of high-rise buildings to the World Heritage Centre for evaluation by the Advisory Bodies. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will also maintain collaboration with the State Party for the final architectural design of the "Park of Architecture" project, in order to ensure the achievement of appropriate results in the large scale project and to avoid any adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Churches of Moldavia (Romania) (C 598bis)

On 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted a detailed state of conservation report that addresses the progress made in the implementation of the Committee Decision adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011), including information on the progress in the implementation of the conservation programme, on the measures taken to address the threats to the wall paintings, on the architectural projects and consolidation works, and on the management of tourists and visitors. A Protection and Management Programme for historical monuments has been approved and an Organizing Committee has been created for each church. General Town Plans and Urban Plans for protected areas have been developed and implemented in order to enhance the control of all works within the property and its buffer zone.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the state of conservation of the property is being adequately addressed by the State Party. The State Party is encouraged to implement all relevant measures in order to prevent any threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Ensemble of the Ferrapontov Monastery (Russian Federation) (C 982)

On 27 February 2013, the State Party submitted a detailed state of conservation report that addresses the progress made in the implementation of the Committee Decision (**35 COM 7B.106**) adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011). It includes information on the progress on development of the Management Plan and on the restoration project on the

Church of Saint Martinian, as well as on the complex monitoring of the atmospheric conditions within monuments and the inspection of buildings constructed in the buffer zone. As requested by the Committee, the State Party provides information on the establishment by the site manager of a joint Conciliation Commission with the Vologda Eparchy (Russian Orthodox Church) in order to improve the involvement of the religious community in the protection and use of the property. The State Party also provides information on the elaboration of the General Plan of the settlement of Ferrapontov, which includes a strategy for its development, land use and construction regulations, including tourism infrastructure. The State Party mentions in the report the urgent need to construct a visitor centre within the property or its surroundings.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the state of conservation of the property is being adequately addressed by the State Party. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take this opportunity to recall that all tourism-related infrastructures should be developed only in ways that do not negatively impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and that no construction should be authorized within the property or its surroundings but only in an appropriate location with no visual impact on the property. In conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, States Parties should inform the Committee, through World Heritage Centre, of their intention to undertake or to authorize any major restorations or new constructions which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property; notice should be given before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse.

The State Party is encouraged to continue with the implementation of all relevant measures to prevent any threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Works of Antoni Gaudi (Spain) (C 320bis)

On 1 February 2013, Spain submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property providing information concerning the tunnel and possible vibrations caused by high speed trains near the Casa Milà and the Sagrada Família. The Spanish Railway Infrastructure Administration (ADIF) has confirmed that the Sant Sagrera Tunnel has been put in service in January 2013. The report points out that there has been no soil compaction or other events affecting the property and that the property is in stable condition. The report informs also about the implementation of a Vibrational Monitoring Programme with the purpose of surveying and preventing any negative impact on the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the state of conservation of the property is being adequately addressed by the State Party. The State Party is encouraged to continue to monitor closely the state of conservation of the property and implement all relevant measures in order to prevent any threats to its Outstanding Universal Value.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

San Augustin Archaeological Park (Colombia) (C 744)

In response to the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (**35 COM 7B.121**), the State Party provided a report detailing the implementation of

outreach programs with local communities, both the indigenous groups and local inhabitants, to promote awareness to the protection of the World Heritage property. With regard to the closure of the illegal road, a proposal has been submitted by the Mayor of San Agustín to include a footpath instead of the road in the framework of the new territorial planning to be approved during 2013. Furthermore, in 2012 the Administrative Litigation Tribunal of Huila requested the immediate closure of the road following the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee. At the same time, national institutions and local Authorities have designed a participatory plan to establish guidelines to work with the communities in order to find a common approach for the preservation of the site. Finally, the State Party has submitted in 2013, within the framework of the Retrospective Inventory, a proposal for a delimitation of the components of the site and its buffer zone, presently under consideration by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the state of conservation of the property is being adequately addressed and that no further reporting to the World Heritage Committee is required. However, it is important to make sure that a buffer zone is established and submitted for approval in order to ensure an adequate protection to the property.

Historic centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412)

In response to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (Decision **35 COM 7B.127**), the State Party has submitted a state of conservation report that adequately addresses the information requested. The State Party has continued with the implementation of the Management Plan for the Historic Centre of Mexico City, as foreseen since 2010, taking into particular consideration the citizens' participation in the preservation of the property, as well as the dynamism of the urban space and the premise of sustainability. The State Party has also put the Management Unit in place in Xochimilco, which started working in December 2012.

More particularly, the State Party continues dealing with the main urban project issues, such as the public transportation matters, including Metrobus Line 4 and Metro Line 12. The State Party has also implemented social housing policies, which has resulted in the increase of the number of residential use properties for the first time since the end of the 1980s. As for the monumental buildings at risk of collapse, the State Party and the local authorities are implementing public policies that respect the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee and the 2009 reactive monitoring mission. The State Party has put in place a comprehensive system for risk management, including provisions for timely assessment and prevention. Moreover, pedestrian areas have been enlarged and an important awareness campaign for the wider public on the World Heritage property has been conducted. In general, the collaboration between public and private sectors has been successful and has led to the successful implementation of several projects foreseen in the Management Plan, including conservation actions and the continuation of the archaeological project at Templo Mayor. Finally, the future course of action is clearly indicated by the State Party.

For those reasons, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the conservation of the property is being properly addressed. Nevertheless, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will continue reviewing the interventions at the property, particularly at the area of Regina 97 and the ongoing archaeological research and works in the Templo Mayor, as well as follow up on the efficacy of the management system.

Camino real de Tierra Adentro (Mexico) (C 1351)

In response to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (Decision **35 COM 7B.128**), the State Party has submitted a comprehensive Management Plan, which encompasses 55 sites and 5 existing World Heritage properties. The management plan provides specific guidelines for the coordinated management and preservation of the property as a whole. The State Party takes into particular consideration the living and dynamic nature of the property and places emphasis on public use aspects.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party made a coordinated effort with the different states where the component parts are located in order to ensure a collective and coherent response in the protection of this serial property. No further reporting to the World Heritage Committee is required at this stage although information will be periodically requested on the operation of the management system.

Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru) (C 700)

In response to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (Decision **35 COM 7B.131**), the State Party has submitted the Management Plan containing a complete diagnosis of the current conservation issues and a comprehensive management system, as well as the related financial, legal and institutional instruments for its implementation. The State Party has also submitted new designs and technical specifications of an alternative project for a touristic lookout tower, which was revised according to the evaluation made by ICOMOS. The new proposal will be assessed as per Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* and the technical review submitted to the State Party to further assist the final decision to improve visitor facilities. The State Party has further submitted information on the progress of the removal of illegal settlements and mining quarries at the property, according to the Administrative Sanction Processes carried out in 2012, and the new 2012 Legislative Decrees, establishing the supplementary provisions to implement the formalization process of informal mining activities of small-scale and artisanal mining exercised in zones where not prohibited.

For those reasons, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the state of conservation of the property is being adequately addressed and that no further reporting to the World Heritage Committee is required. However, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will continue working closely with the State Party in monitoring the state of conservation of the property, by periodically requesting information on the effective control of the agricultural expansion, the ongoing results of the implementation of the new legal instruments, as well as the indicators of the level and efficacy of implementation of the Management Plan.

City of Cuzco (Peru) (C 273)

In response to Decision **35 COM 7B.133**, the State Party submitted, on 31 January 2013, a detailed report on the implementation of recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee. Regarding the setting up and resourcing of the Coordinating Board and Technical Secretariat for the management of the property, an interagency cooperation agreement has been formalized in March 2011 and staff has been accredited for the new arrangements. The period for implementation of the Master Plan has been extended;

notwithstanding, several actions have been undertaken in preparation for the updating process, including the assessment of rate of implementation and success of the current Master Plan. With respect to the regularization of property titles, capacity building on the legislative and regulatory frameworks was carried out and guidance continues to be provided to property owners in order to address current deficiencies. In addition, the State Party reports that actions were carried out for the enforcement and improvement of measures and control of new developments and changes in land use, for the conservation and recovery of historic buildings, for coordination meetings with civil society to enhance the protection of the property through the development of a policy for social housing and improvement of living conditions, and for awareness raising and outreach.

Finally, detailed information was provided on the supervision of the rehabilitation projects at the Monasterio and Marriot Hotels, including actions taken to ensure the conservation of the properties. With respect to the Ima Sumaq Commercial Centre, legal procedures are currently underway to allow the Provincial Municipality of Cusco to undertake actions to reverse the negative impacts of this construction.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party is appropriately and consistently addressing the conservation and management issues of the property and that no further reporting to the World Heritage Committee is required at this stage. They will continue working with the State Party in ensuring that the management system is operational and that the Management Plan is updated to respond to conditions of the property, particularly with respect to the control of new construction and the implementation of a policy for social housing through the recovery of historic buildings.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7B.103

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions 34 COM 8B.6, 35 COM 7B.42, 35 COM 7B.63, 35 COM 7B.67, 35 COM 7B.68, 35 COM 7B.69, 35 COM 7B.73, 35 COM 7B.88, 35 COM 7B.94, 35 COM 7B.98, 35 COM 7B.102, 35 COM 7B.106, 35 COM 7B.109, 35 COM 7B.122, 35 COM 7B.127, 35 COM 7B.128, 35 COM 7B.131 and 35 COM 7B.133, adopted at its 34th (Brasilia, 2010) and 35th (UNESCO, 2011) sessions respectively,*
3. *Takes note with satisfaction of the measures taken by the States Parties concerned to address its previous requests to mitigate the threats on the Outstanding Universal Value of the following World Heritage properties :*
 - ***Old Town of Lijiang (China)***
 - ***Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China)***
 - ***San Augustin Archaeological Park (Colombia)***
 - ***Historic Centre of Český Krumlov (Czech Republic)***
 - ***Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape (Hungary)***
 - ***Taj Mahal (India)***
 - ***Agra Fort (India)***
 - ***Fatehpur Sikri (India)***
 - ***Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India)***

- ***Prambanan Temple Compounds (Indonesia)***
 - ***Monte San Giorgio (Italy / Switzerland)***
 - ***Vilnius Historic centre (Lithuania)***
 - ***Melaka and George Town, Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca (Malaysia)***
 - ***Historic centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico)***
 - ***Camino real de Tierra Adentro (Mexico)***
 - ***Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru)***
 - ***City of Cuzco (Peru)***
 - ***Churches of Moldavia (Romania)***
 - ***Ensemble of the Ferrapontov Monastery (Russian Federation)***
 - ***Island of Gorée (Senegal)***
 - ***Works of Antoni Gaudi (Spain)***
4. Encourages the States Parties concerned to pursue their efforts to ensure the conservation of World Heritage properties;
5. Reminds the States Parties concerned to inform the World Heritage Centre in due course about any major development project that may negatively impact the Outstanding Universal Value of a property, before any irreversible commitments are made, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines.