

## 1. World Heritage Property Data

### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Fortress of Suomenlinna

### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

#### State(s) Party(ies)

- Finland

#### Type of Property

cultural

#### Identification Number

583

#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1991

### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Fortress of Suomenlinna	60.147 / 24.987	210	2641	2851	1991
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>210</b>	<b>2641</b>	<b>2851</b>	

### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Fortress of Suomenlinna - Map of the inscribed property	25/11/2011	

### 1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Margaretha Ehrström  
National Board of Antiquities  
Senior Advisor

#### Comment

National Board of Antiquities Stefan Wessman Senior Researcher P.O.Box 913 FIN-00101 FIN 00101 Helsinki Finland Telephone: +358-400-1286256 Email: stefan.wessman@nba.fi

### 1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Maire Mattinen  
Governing Body of Suomenlinna  
Director

#### Comment

Governing Body of Suomenlinna Mr. Petteri Takkula Development Manager Suomenlinna C 40 FIN-00190 HELSINKI Finland Telephone: +358 29 533 8387 Email: petteri.takkula@suomenlinna.fi

### 1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- [Fortress of Suomenlinna, \(Virtual Finland\)](#)
- [National Board of Antiquities](#)
- [Suomenlinna](#)

#### Comment

Remove from webpage list link: Fortress of Suomenlinna, (Virtual Finland)

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

#### Comment

On a decision by the Council of State (1919) the islands of Susisaari and Kustaanmiekka were protected as historical monuments; The Finnish Antiquities Act (1963); The Council of State gave a decree on the principles of restoration and future use of Suomenlinna (1975); The Law on the Governing Body of Suomenlinna (1988); The Act of the Governing Body of Suomenlinna (1989); The master plan of Helsinki (2002) in which Suomenlinna is defined as an area of significance.

## 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

### 2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

#### Comment

OUV has been submitted, but not yet adopted by the WHC.

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

(iv)

### 2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

### 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

## 3. Factors Affecting the Property

### 3.14. Other factor(s)

#### 3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact	Origin			
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>					
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities	  				
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	  				
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>					
3.3.1	Water infrastructure	  				
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>					
3.4.5	Solid waste	  				
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>					
3.7.1	Wind	  				
3.7.2	Relative humidity	  				
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)	  				
3.7.8	Micro-organisms	  				
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>					
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	    				
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Other human activities</b>					
3.9.1	Illegal activities	  				
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage	    				
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>					
3.10.1	Storms	  				
3.10.2	Flooding	  				
3.10.3	Drought	  				
3.10.6	Temperature change	  				
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>					
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition	  				
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)	  				
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>					
3.12.1	Translocated species	   				
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	  				
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>					
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities	  				
3.13.3	Management activities	  				
<b>Legend</b>	 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	
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>					
<b>3.4.5</b>	<b>Solid waste</b>	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	high capacity	static
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>					
<b>3.7.1</b>	<b>Wind</b>	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
<b>3.7.2</b>	<b>Relative humidity</b>	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	significant	high capacity	static
<b>3.7.8</b>	<b>Micro-organisms</b>	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>					

		Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	extensive	intermittent or sporadic	minor	high capacity	static
3.9	Other human activities					
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage	localised	one off or rare	minor	high capacity	static

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

## 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

The boundaries of the buffer zone are known but certain questions remain about restrictions for the development inside the buffer zone.

## 4.2. Protective Measures

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

**Note WHC (July 2012): Please carefully review, complete and update the information provided below.**

#### Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Saturday, October 29, 2005

- **Question 6.02**

On a decision by the Council of State in 1919 the islands of Susisaari and Kustaanmiekka are protected as historical monuments.

In 1975 the Council of State gave a decree on the principles of restoration and future use of Suomenlinna.

According to the decree Suomenlinna is to be preserved as a reminder of the cultural history and as a historic monument of fortifications. It is to be restored combining architectural and antiquarian aspects.

According to the Act of the Governing Body of Suomenlinna (1989) the area is classified as a monument of cultural history where the restoration work is being supervised by the Board of Antiquities.

In the 2002 master plan of Helsinki Suomenlinna is defined as an area of significance in the sense of cultural history, architecture and landscape.

#### Comment

All of the above protective designations are valid. Please add to the list The Finnish Antiquities Act 295/1963; Land Use and Building Act 132/1999; Act on the Protection of Built Heritage 498/2010 (pending official translation of the act).

#### 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?

An adequate legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are **some deficiencies in implementation**

#### 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

Protective mechanism remains to be enforced by the town plan and protective legislation.

## 4.3. Management System / Management Plan

### 4.3.1 - Management System

**WHC Note (July 2012):**

**In the First Cycle of the PR it was mentioned that a Management Plan is being implemented. However, the**

only information available at the World Heritage Centre is dating from the time of inscription of the property. If the above mentioned Management Plan is currently in force, please provide its 2 paper and electronic version to the WHC. If a more recent Management Plan is in force, please submit 2 paper and electronic version to WHC. In either of the above cases, the submission should be accompanied by a cover letter to DIR/WHC. Thank you for your cooperation.

**Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2**

Source: [Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 \(2001-2006\)](#)

Submitted on Saturday, October 29, 2005

• **Question 5.02**

Sterling group or similar management committee has been set up to guide the management of the site

• **Question 5.03**

**Function:** Administration, maintenance and restoration of the area and buildings go Suomenlinna as well as coordination of the works.

**Mandate:** The governing body of Suomenlinna shall operate on the site as a representative of the owner, the state of Finland.

**Constituted:** formal

• **Question 5.05**

Overall management system of the site

- Management by the State Party
- Management under protective legislation
- Management under contractual agreement between the State Party and a third party

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

**Comment**

Suomenlinna World Heritage Site Management Plan will be submitted to the National Advisory Body in 2013.

**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 **excellent coordination** between all bodies / levels involved in the management of the property

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

The management system / plan is **fully 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	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Good
Visitors	Fair

Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Not applicable

**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 **directly contribute** to some decisions relating to 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?**

**No indigenous peoples** are resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone

**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**

**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**

**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)	90%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	10%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0%
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)**

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

The available budget is **sufficient** but further funding would enable more effective management to international best practice standard

## Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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

Existing sources of funding are **not secure**

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

**Potential** economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed

### 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

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

Full-time	100%
Part-time	0%

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

Permanent	90%
Seasonal	10%

### 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	Good
Promotion	Good
Community outreach	Good
Interpretation	Good
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Good
Conservation	Good
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Not applicable

### 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

## Section II-Fortress of Suomenlinna

Community outreach	High
Interpretation	High
Education	High
Visitor management	High
Conservation	High
Administration	High
Risk preparedness	High
Tourism	High
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Not applicable

### 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

## 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**

### 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 widely** with the local, national and international audiences

### 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

Conservation and Reuse of Suomenlinna, edited by the Head of the Planning unit of the Governing Body of Suomenlinna Heikki Lahdenmäki and architect Reetta Amper 2010, publisher the Governing Body of Suomenlinna Viaporista Suomenlinnaksi, Liisa Eerikäinen et al 2006, publisher National Board of Antiquities

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

**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	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Excellent
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Average
Local businesses and industries	Average

**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 **limited and ad hoc** education and awareness programme

**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 **not adequately** presented and interpreted

**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	Adequate
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Excellent
Transportation facilities	Poor
Other	Not needed

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

**4.7. Visitor Management**

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

Last year	Static
-----------	--------

Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Static

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

Entry tickets and registries
Transportation services
Visitor surveys

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**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?**

**No fees are collected**

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

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

**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	Average
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Average
Industry	Non-existent
Local indigenous peoples	Non-existent

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

**No relevant** Committee recommendations to implement

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

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

#### **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
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>					
<b>3.4.5</b>	<b>Solid waste</b>	Cultural landscape is affected by the litter thrown away by the visitors.	Awareness building actions, Increased waste collecting	Monitoring the amount of waste and litter	Continuous	The Governing Body of Suomenlinna Impact on the attributes is fairly low
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>					
<b>3.7.1</b>	<b>Wind</b>	Authenticity and integrity might be affected by heavy storms. The structures, roofs and trees of the fortress are threatened by increasingly extreme weather events.	Methods of repairing erosion damage will be developed constantly. A long-term goal is to get away from a cycle of erosion repair.	Monitoring of erosion and tree surveys.	Continuous.	The Governing Body of Suomenlinna The erosion problem is a combination of visitor use and changing weather conditions.
<b>3.7.2</b>	<b>Relative humidity</b>	Authenticity and integrity might be affected by deteriorated materials. Increased occurrence of humid and warm winters induced by climate change may cause damage from mould and wood-decay fungi in building structures.	Improvement of restoration methods and materials.	Material surveys.	Continuous	The Governing Body of Suomenlinna Education for the employees on dealing with the humidity problems.
<b>3.7.8</b>	<b>Micro-organisms</b>					
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>					
<b>3.8.6</b>	<b>Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation</b>	Authenticity and integrity is affected by vandalism and erosion caused by visitors. Regarding to visitor surveys the interpretation of the site should be improved. Un-authorized tourist guides deliver false information about the history and facts.	Improving interpretation by new welcoming centre and exhibition. Making the presence of the host more visible one can prevent hooliganism and deliver information about the OUV. Strengthening the role of authorised guides and guide training.	Regular visitor and resident surveys, erosion monitoring	Monitoring timeframe: Visitor surveys every 4 years, Residential surveys every 4 years, otherwise continuous actions on daily basis	The Governing Body of Suomenlinna, The Ehrensvärd Society Presentation of the site with new technology will be developed.
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Other human activities</b>					
<b>3.9.2</b>	<b>Deliberate destruction of heritage</b>	Authenticity and integrity is affected by vandalism of the visitors and inhabitants.	Visitor behaviour can be directed by investing in presentation. The more visible presence of the host and cooperation with the local elementary school allows the site manager to prevent vandalism and deliver information about the OUV of the site.	Monitoring is an important part of the fieldwork on daily basis.	Continuous	The Governing Body of Suomenlinna World Heritage education for the local elementary schools is being developed.

### 5.2. Summary - Management Needs

#### 5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.4 Financial and Human Resources						
	Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
<b>4.4.4</b>	<b>Existing sources of funding are not secure</b>	Lobbying, PR-actions	Continuous	The Governing Body of Suomenlinna The resources allocated by the Ministry of Education and Culture have been adequate and steady. The potential austerity measures decided on the political level need to be monitored by the Governing Body of Suomenlinna		
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building						

4.6.3	<b>There is a limited education and awareness programme</b>	National World Heritage Strategy is being prepared. Education, information and awareness building -programme in Nordic level is planned.	Strategy 2013.	Ministry of Culture and Education.Nordic World Heritage Sites.	No further comments.
4.6.5	<b>The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is not adequately presented and interpreted</b>	New welcoming centre and basic exhibitions are being built in two different locations within the site.	2013	The Governing Body of Suomenlinna	The presentation of the site includes the interpretation of the OUV.

**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**

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

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

6.1.4 Quality of life for local communities refers to the whole Helsinki metropolitan area

**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**

**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?**

All required information was accessible

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

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	Not Applicable
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: OUV has been submitted, but not yet adopted by the WHC.

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