

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

• Belarus

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

1196

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005


1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh	53.223 / 26.691	0	0	0	2005
Total (ha)			0		

Comment

Property zone territory - 120 ha, Buffer zone territory - 292 ha (Accordingly to the nomination file). Total 412 ha

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh - map of inscribed property	01/01/2005	

Comment

The map requires the updating. This work is executing by the Nesvizh Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve "Niasvizh". All changes will be submitted by UNESCO according the procedure indicated in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

Comment

State Institution "National Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve "Niasvizh" Nesvizh District Administration (Niasvizhski Rayonny Vykanauchy Kamitet) Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Belarus

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

• Siarhei Yehareichanka
National State historical-and-culture museum-reserve "Nesvizh"
Head of the Scientific and Education Department

Comment

National State "National Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve "Niasvizh" Liubov Ivahnina Scientific Secretary 19, Leninskaya str. 222603 Nesvizh Belarus Telephone: +375 17 705 42 81 Email: edu@niasvizh.by

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)

Comment

www.niasvizh.by - web address of the National Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve "Niasvizh"

1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)

Comment

Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict with Regulations for the Execution of the Convention (1954) Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (1970) Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972) Second Protocol to the Hague Convention of 1954 for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1999)

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Comment

Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value/ Statement of Significance was directed by the Republic of Belarus to the World Heritage Centre in 2013.

2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed

(ii)(iv)(vi)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Criterion ii: The architectural, residential and cultural complex of the Radziwill family at Nesvizh was the cradle for inoculation of new concepts based on the synthesis of the Western traditions, leading to the establishment of a new architectural school in Central Europe. Criterion iv: The Radziwill complex represents an important stage in the development of building typology in the history of architecture of the Central Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries. This concerned particularly the Corpus Christi Church with its typology related to cross-cupola basilica. Criterion vi: The Radziwill family was particularly significant for being associated with the interpretation of the influences from Southern and Western Europe and the transmission of the ideas in the Central and Eastern Europe.

2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised

2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

No comments

3. Factors Affecting the Property


















































3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

Not available

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact	Origin			
3.1	Buildings and Development					
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities	  				
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	   				
3.3	Services Infrastructures					
3.3.1	Water infrastructure	   				
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses	    				
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	    				
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	  				
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	   				
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	     				
3.13	Management and institutional factors					
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities	    				
3.13.3	Management activities	   				
Legend	 Current	 Potential	 Negative	 Positive	 Inside	 Outside

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	extensive	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	extensive	frequent	minor	medium capacity	increasing

3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

3.17.1 - Comments

It is necessary to provide the visitor survey and elaborate the special visitor policy concerning the use of the property.

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are **known** by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

Concept of buffer zones not defined in the legislation system of the Republic of Belarus. It is necessary to implement the 1972 Convention provisions in the national law on the protection of historical and cultural heritage.

4.2. Protective Measures

4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional)

The architectural-cultural residential complex of the Radziwills in Nesvizh is a property of National Significance. In 1996, by a decree of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Belarus, the castle and the Corpus Christi church were included in the National Historical and Cultural Reserve- Museum ("Nacyyanalny historika-kulturny musey zapavednik "Nesvizh"), and this institution has direct control over and supervises the conservation of both complexes as well as managing the

castle. The church is managed by the Ecclesiastical Council. The causeway linking the castle and church is under the management of the Nesvizh Region Executive Committee ("Nesvizhski rayonny vykanauchy kamitet"). A group of experts and representatives of NGO has been set up recently for the coordination of activities for the restoration and maintenance of the building of the church.

The protection of the castle and church as historical monuments is ensured by the Law of the Republic of Belarus through the act "On the Protection of Historical and Cultural Heritage" which is administered by the Ministry of Culture. The National Historical and Cultural Reserve-Museum "Nesvizh" acts in its name. The castle and the Corpus Christi church and the causeway with the road which links them are in state ownership.

4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides an **adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides an **adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides an **adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?

There is **acceptable** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures

It is necessary to implement the Convention provision concerning the Buffer zones into the national legislative system.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

The management plan with the law of the Republic of Belarus on the Protection of Historical and Cultural Heritage passed on

24 July 2006 as legal basis allows for an adequate management system for the property.


The following agencies exercise management authority over the Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh:

- Department for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Heritage and Restoration of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Belarus;
- State Historical and Cultural Reserve-Museum "Nesvizh";
- Nesvizh Region Executive Committee ("Nesvizhski rayonny vykanauchy kamitet").

Comment

At present a new management plan (2010) is in action. It was created and adopted in 2010. The following agencies exercise management authority over the WH site at Nesvizh: · National Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve "Niasvizh"; · Nesvizh District Administration · Department for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Heritage and Restoration of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Belarus. An annual working plan is also in action now

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Management Plan of the Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh	In Force	Available	01/01/2005	

Comment

At present a new management plan (2010) is in action. It was created and adopted in 2010.

4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?

There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies / levels involved in the management of the property **but it could be improved**

4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?

The management system/plan is only **partially adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system is **only partially** being implemented

4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?

An annual work / action plan exists and **many activities** are being implemented

4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following

Local communities / residents	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Good
Landowners	Poor
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good

Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Poor

4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Local communities have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management

4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

Indigenous peoples have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role

4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?

There is contact but only **some cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

The future management plan of the property requires significant improvement. This work is carried out and will be completed in 2015.

4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report

No significant changes

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	98%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	1%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	1%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	0%

4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)

Comment

2012 - 20 331,51 \$ international assistance for conducting of the International capacity-building workshop "World Heritage

Properties: Conservation and Use for the Sustainable Development"

4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?

The existing sources of funding **are secure** in the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?

There is **some flow** of economic benefits to local communities

4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained?

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure

No comments.

4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Full-time	93%
Part-time	7%

4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	0%

4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?

Human resources are **adequate** for management needs

4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	Fair
Promotion	Fair
Community outreach	Poor
Interpretation	Poor
Education	Poor
Visitor management	Fair

Conservation	Fair
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Poor
Tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Fair

4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines

Research and monitoring	High
Promotion	High
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	Medium
Education	Medium
Visitor management	High
Conservation	High
Administration	High
Risk preparedness	Medium
Tourism	High
Enforcement (custodians, police)	High

4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?

A capacity development plan or programme is **in place and fully implemented**; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, who are assuming leadership in management

4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training

No comments

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is **considerable** research but it is **not directed** towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared with local participants and some national agencies**

4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report

K. Shyshygina-Patockaya, "Niasvizh and Radziwills", 2007 A. Miatselski, "Owners of the old Nesvizh", 2011 "World Heritage Properties: Conservation and Use for the Sustainable Development", international capacity-building workshop an Nesvizh (23-26, May, 2012), 2012 D. Rodwell "An Anchor in an Age of Crisis" (2012) ("Context", the journal of the UK's Institute of Historic Building Conservation)

4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects

No comments

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?

In **many locations and easily visible** to visitors

4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities / residents	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Excellent
Local landowners	Poor
Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Poor

4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?

There is a planned education and awareness programme but it only **partly meets the needs** and could be improved

4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, **but it could be improved**

4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

Visitor centre	Excellent
Site museum	Excellent
Information booths	Excellent
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Adequate

Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Poor
Other	Adequate

4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building

No comments

4.7. Visitor Management

4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years

Last year	Major Increase (100%+)
Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Minor Increase

4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries
Tourism industry

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

In the museum-reserve there is the Ticket-net system which accumulates all statistics data about visitors. This information can be submitted to UNESCO upon request.

4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is managed **but improvements could be made**

4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?

There is **limited co-operation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

The fee is collected and makes a **substantial contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property

No comments

4.8. Monitoring

4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or

improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **small amount** of monitoring, but it is not planned

4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient and key indicators have been defined but **monitoring the status of indicators could be improved**

4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Average
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Poor
Industry	Poor
Local indigenous peoples	Average

4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?

Implementation is **underway**

4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee

Now the implementation of the WHC recommendations is in force in the Republic of Belarus

4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring

No comments

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	It does not have a significant impact	It is planned develop and carry out some educational activities for young people and other groups of citizens to review the valorization of objects included in UNESCO World Heritage List.	It is planned to provide the special survey concerned this problem	2015 -- 2016	National Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve "Niasvizh", local administration, Ministry of Culture of Belarus	No comments
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	It does not have a significant impact	It is planned to create a series of special educational programmes for local community.	Monitoring will be implemented through a survey of local residents.	2015-2016	National Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve "Niasvizh", local administration, Ministry of Culture of Belarus	No comments
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	It does not have a significant impact	It is planned to elaborate and implement the programme of visitor survey.	It is planned to provide the additional survey of visitors.	2015-2016	National Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve "Niasvizh", local administration, Ministry of Culture of Belarus	No comments

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.8 Monitoring							
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.8.1	Some monitoring, but it is not planned	Such monitoring is planned in 2015	2015	National Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve "Niasvizh", Ministry of Culture of Belarus	No comments		

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **preserved**

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **maintained**.

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.4.1 - Comments

No comments

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas

Conservation	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	No impact
Recognition	Positive
Education	No impact
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Very positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Very positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	Positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status

No comments

6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
Staff from other World Heritage properties

6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?

yes

6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

It is quite sufficient.

6.6 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire from the following entities

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Good
Advisory Body	Good

6.7 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?

Most of the required information was accessible

6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following

The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
Monitoring and reporting

6.9 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Satisfactory

6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

- **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**

Reason for update: Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value/ Statement of Significance was directed by the Republic of Belarus to the World Heritage Centre in 2013.

- **Geographic Information Table**

Reason for update: Property zone territory - 120 ha, Buffer zone territory - 292 ha (Accordingly to the nomination file). Total 412 ha

- **Map(s)**

Reason for update: The map requires the updating. This work is executing by the Nesvizh Historical and Cultural Museum-Reserve "Niasvizh". All changes will be submitted by UNESCO according the procedure indicated in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise

No comments