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Examine the state of conservation of World Heritage properties through processes of Reactive monitoring and Periodic Reporting.
State of conservation reports
(+/- 2,700)
SOC reports

► Exceptional documentation on various conservation issues

► One of the most comprehensive monitoring system of all international conventions

► Global network of nearly 500 properties
but......
SOC reports

- Scattered data; difficult to retrieve and use
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Flemish Government support
SOC Information System
Project objective

- To establish a comprehensive online information system
- Available for all (different access levels)
- Advanced search facility (statutory data)
- Available in 2 official languages (English / français)
Project objective

► It helps in:

• Monitoring properties
• Improving transparency
• Improving institutional memory
• Well-informed and consistent decision-making
Link to PR process

Narrative threats (SOC reports)

“Theft of stone from ruins for use as building material”

Factors (PR – Section II)

“Illegal activities”

→ 83 standardized factors
Link to other WH databases

→ Nominations
→ List of World Heritage in Danger
→ International Assistance
→ Statutory documents
→ Decisions
→ Maps and galleries
→ etc.
Access to SOC Information System
State of Conservation (SOC)

The very significant number of reports prepared by the UNESCO Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee represents an exceptional and extensive documentation on various conservation issues. It is one of the most comprehensive monitoring systems of any international conventions, through a global network of sites.
Results

Statistics

Different views

Clickable charts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>State Party</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Threats</th>
<th>Document Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uja Faunal Reserve</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Livestock farming/grazing of domesticated animals, Commercial hunting,</td>
<td>WHC-10/34 COM/7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mining, Illegal activities, Management systems/ management plan,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djoudj National Bird</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Livestock farming/grazing of domesticated animals, Subsistence hunting,</td>
<td>WHC-11/35 COM/7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invasive/invader terrestrial species, Management systems/ management plan,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial resources, Human resources,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djoudj National Bird</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Water infrastructure, Livestock farming/grazing of domesticated animals,</td>
<td>WHC-09/33 COM/7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsistence hunting, Water, Invasive/invader terrestrial species,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management systems/ management plan, Financial resources, Human resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doñana National Park</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Pollution of marine waters, Crop production, Water, Management systems/</td>
<td>WHC-11/35 COM/7B.Add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management plan,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doñana National Park</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Pollution of marine waters, Crop production, Management systems/</td>
<td>WHC-10/34 COM/7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management plan,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong Phayayen-Khao</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Water infrastructure, Ground transport infrastructure, Land conversion,</td>
<td>WHC-12/36 COM/7B.Add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yai Forest Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Livestock farming/grazing of domesticated animals, Forestry /wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>production, Impacts of tourism/visitor/recreation, Management systems/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management plan,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong Phayayen-Khao</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Ground transport infrastructure, Land conversion, Forestry /wood</td>
<td>WHC-11/35 COM/7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yai Forest Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>production,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresden Elbe Valley</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ground transport infrastructure,</td>
<td>WHC-09/33 COM/7A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rennell</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Fishing/collection aquatic resources, Mining, Illegal activities, Invasive/invader terrestrial species</td>
<td>WHC-12/36 COM/7B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>Regions</td>
<td>Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>APA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sites with SOC</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sites inscribed (year-1)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sites with SOC</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sites inscribed (year-1)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sites with SOC</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sites inscribed (year-1)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sites with SOC</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sites inscribed (year-1)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State of Conservation (SOC)
Kahuzi-Biega National Park (2012)

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

A draft has been developed during the 2003 reactive monitoring mission (http://whc.unesco.org/en/list137/documents), but the indicators still need to be quantified based on the results of a census of large mammals.

UNESCO Extra-Budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: Conservation Programme for the DRC World Heritage properties (DRC Programme) financed by the United Nations Foundation (UNF), Italy and Belgium (2001-2005): approximately USD 300,000; (2005-2006): USD 300,000; (2010-2012): USD 350,000. Financial support (USD 30,000) in 2008 granted by the Rapid Response Facility (RRF) for the rehabilitation of a control post at Nebéro.

International Assistance granted to the property

Requests Approved: 7 (from 1980-2009)
Total Amount Approved: 119,370 USD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Emergency assistance to World Natural Heritage of the ... (Approved)</td>
<td>5,400 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Support to Resident Staff of Geramba, Virunga, Kahuzi ... (Approved)</td>
<td>20,000 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Purchase of a vehicle for Kahuzi Biega National Park (Approved)</td>
<td>30,000 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Financial contribution for the protection of ... (Approved)</td>
<td>25,000 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Review of the state of conservation of World Heritage ... (Approved)</td>
<td>3,750 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Purchase of a 4x4 Jeep for Kahuzi Biega National Park (Approved)</td>
<td>20,000 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Equipment for Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Approved)</td>
<td>15,120 USD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kahuzi-Biega National Park

State Party:
Democratic Republic of the Congo
Date of Inscription: 1980
Nomination records (Year): 1979
Category: Natural
Criteria: (vi)
Danger List: Yes
View Inscribed site web page

Documents

Original Documents
WHC-12/38.COM7A

Other Documents
View Inscribed site documents, nomination file, reports, decisions, ...

Exports
Word File
Missions


2009 Mission de monitoring de l'Etat de Conservation du Parc National de Kahuzi-Biega...
2008 Rapport de mission, mission de monitoring de l'Etat de Conservation du Parc National...
2009 Rapport de suivi renforcé sur les biens du Patrimoine mondial en République...
2009 Reinforced monitoring report on World Heritage properties in the Democratic Republic...
2005 Mission de suivi réactif
2002 UNESCO/UNFPRC Project (243ZA70), Sept 2002

Factors* affecting the property identified in previous reports

- Presence of armed groups, lack of security and political instability rendering a large part of the property inaccessible to the guards;
- Attraction of mining permits inside the property;
- Poaching by armed military groups;
- Villages in the ecological corridor between the highland and lowland sectors of the park;
- Illegal mining and deforestation;

Corrective Measures

Adopted, see page http://whc.unesco.org/fan/documents/4081

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property on 2 February 2012, with information concerning the efforts employed in the implementation of the corrective measures:

- Evacuate the armed groups from the property and extend the area of surveillance to the whole property

The State Party recalls the military operation of the MONUSCO (United Nations Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)), Ameni Leo, Kinshi I and Kinshi II, to neutralize the armed groups active in the Kivu region, and confirms that these operations have had a positive impact on the occupation of the property by the armed groups. These operations have enabled an increase in the area of surveillance of the property and all the sectors except a few pockets in the inaccessible and obstructed zones. The report provides a detailed description of the surveillance operations and the protection of the Park and informs that in 2011, 37.22% of the extent of the property was effectively monitored.

Inscription on the Danger List

Year: 1997
Threats to the Site:

Grave concern that portions of the Kahuzi-Biega National Park had been deforested and that hunting had been reported there, as well as war and civil strife ravaging the country, led the World Heritage Committee to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The property has been much affected by the influx of refugees. Park facilities had been looted and destroyed, and most of the park staff have fled the area. The park may also be serving as a hideout for large militia groups, as well as for illegal settlers. This has led to...
Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the important progress reported by the State Party in the implementation of the corrective measures, notably the evacuation of the armed groups from the property and the extension of the area of surveillance, the closing down of a large number of artisanal mining operations in the property and the resolution of illegal occupation in Bitale.

However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee expresses its concern with regard to the lack of progress concerning the completion by the Government of the land rights granted illegally in the property by the Mining Service of Land Titles and Cadastre, as well as the mining concessions encroaching on the property attributed by the Mining Cadastre. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the opinion that the World Heritage Committee should request the State Party to initiate a dialogue at the political level with the State services that are indispensable for the successful implementation of these corrective measures.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the importance of ensuring that the identified zoning options guarantee the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and deem it important to submit those options for consideration to the World Heritage Committee before any decision is taken.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that the progress achieved by the managers of the property is very encouraging but share the conclusion of the State Party report that the work still to be achieved remains important. They underline once again the need to carry out without delay an inventory of the lowland sector. Only with the availability of reliable data on the main populations of wildlife will an assessment of the true state for the Outstanding Universal Value and the establishment of a timetable for the rehabilitation of the property be possible. They consider that the property should be maintained on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the reinforced monitoring mechanism be applied.

Decision

36COM7A.36
Link to the decision

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM7A.Add,


3. Expresses its concern that signature of the January 2011 Kinshasa Declaration has not yet resulted in a concerted action between the different Ministries, the army and different technical agencies which is necessary to resolve some urgent conservation issues in the sites and create the conditions for their rehabilitation;

4. Notes with concern the consistent reports from different properties about continued involvement of elements of the Congolese Army in illegal exploitation of the natural resources;

5. Considers that the recent permit which has been granted to the international oil and gas company SOCO to start oil exploration activities in Virunga National Park is not in conformity with commitments made by the State Party in the Kinshasa Declaration;

6. Urges the State Party to ensure a full implementation of the commitments made in the Kinshasa Declaration and ensure the
ONE entry-point
to 40 years
of conservation