

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Historical Monuments of Mtskheta

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Georgia

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

708

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994




1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
Sveti Tskhoveli Church , City of Mtskheta , Province of Mtskheta-Mtianeti	0 / 0	2.33	?	2.33	
Samtavro Church and Monastery , Province of Mtskheta-Mtianeti	0 / 0	0.49	8.73	9.22	
Mtskhedis Jvari (The Church of the Holy Cross - Mtskheta) , City of Mtskheta , Province of Mtskheta Mtianeti	0 / 0	1.03	?	1.03	
Total (ha)		3.85	8.73	12.58	

Comment

Samtavro church and monastery are also located in the city of Mtskheta.

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Historic Monuments of Mtskheta - Map of Svetitskhoveli Church	28/11/2011	
Historic Monuments of Mtskheta - Samtavro Church and Monastery	28/11/2011	
Historic Monuments of Mtskheta - Mtskhedis Jvari	28/11/2011	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Nicholas Vacheishvili
National Agency for Cultural heritage preservation of Georgia
Director General

Comment

National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia
Nikoloz Antidze Director General 5, Tabukashvili Street
0105, Tbilisi Georgia Telephone (+995 32) 932411 Email: antidzenikoloz@gmail.com

Section II-Historical Monuments of Mtskheta

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Nukri Maisurashvili
The National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia
Head of the the Great Mtskheta Archaeological Museum-Reserve

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
2. [Monuments of Ancient Georgia, \(Parliament of Georgia\)](#)

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

Comment

There are no other conventions/designations under which the property is protected.

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Comment

The Retrospective Statement of OUV was adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2014.

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

(iii)(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Criterion (iii) The Holy Cross Monastery of Jvari, Svetitskhoveli Cathedral and Samtavro Monasteries, archaeology, landscape. Criterion (iv) The Holy Cross Monastery of Jvari, Svetitskhoveli Cathedral and Samtavro Monasteries, archaeology, landscape.

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)

Privatization of state owned lands in landscape and archaeologically sensitive zones and their consequent conversion into urban land has/may have an impact on the landscape/skyline.

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact						Origin
3.1	Buildings and Development							
3.1.1	Housing							
3.1.2	Commercial development							
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure							
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities							
3.5	Biological resource use/modification							
3.5.3	Land conversion							
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric							
3.7.1	Wind							
3.7.2	Relative humidity							
3.7.8	Micro-organisms							
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage							
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses							
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage							
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation							
3.9	Other human activities							
3.9.1	Illegal activities							
3.9.4	War							
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events							
3.11.2	Earthquake							
3.13	Management and institutional factors							
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	
3.1	Buildings and Development					
3.1.1	Housing	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.1.2	Commercial development	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.5	Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.3	Land conversion	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.1	Wind	restricted	frequent	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.7.2	Relative humidity	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.7.8	Micro-organisms	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses	extensive	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.9	Other human activities					
3.9.1	Illegal activities	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	medium 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 **do not limit** the ability to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value but they could be improved

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 **do not limit** the ability to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value **but they could be improved**

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

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by the management authority but **are not known by 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 the management authority but **are not known by local residents / communities/landowners.**

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

The proposal for minor modification of the Buffer Zone boundaries was elaborated withing the Mtskheta historical landscape survey and Mtskheta's World Heritage Management Plan draft.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

At the time of inscription, the property was protected by the 1947 Law for the protection of the Monuments of GSSR. Five years after the inscription, the protection of the monuments was based on the 1999 Georgian Law *on Cultural Heritage Protection* (with amendments in 2002 and 2004). The national protection zones of Mtskheta approved, by the joint Order of Minister of Culture and the Minister of Economic Development, "On the definition of the Cultural Heritage Protection Zones in Mtskheta" on 27 October 2006. The new

"Law of Georgia on Cultural Heritage Protection" was adopted in 2007. Two types of protection zones were defined by this legal instrument:

- **Individual protected areas** are composed of a zone of physical protection and a zone of visual protection (1000 m for the World Heritage properties). This area is applied automatically with the attribution of the status of monument and could be extended by Ministerial Decree. The zone of physical protection is defined around the monuments (no less than 50 m) in order to protect against any threats. All construction is forbidden which is not beneficial for the monument's protection or its landscape.

- **General protected areas** comprise a protection zone for immovable monuments, a construction regulation zone, an historic landscape protection zone and an archaeological protection zone.

The historic landscape protection zone is meant to be free of any constructions and objects which do not have any historical value. In this area, the following activities may be carried out:

- research;
- rehabilitation works of historically valuable buildings
- new authorized constructions which respond to the public interest;
- horizontal constructions which do not modify the sense of the historic fabric and space, and do not disturb the visual appreciation of the historic monuments.

In accordance with the Cultural Heritage Law and the Urban Planning Law, protected area Plans and Historic-Cultural Plans constitute the base for all urban planning documentation, including Land Use Plans and the General Plans.

According to the Concordat concluded by the State and the Georgian Orthodox Church, all the buildings for public worship within the State, including Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery have been transferred to the Church.

Comment

The proposal for modification of Visual Protection Area boundaries to make them adequate to the property's needs was elaborated in 2012-2014.

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?

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**

4.2.3 - 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?

An **adequate** legal framework exists for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, but **there are some deficiencies in its implementation** which undermine

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the property

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

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

- Site manager on full-time basis
 - Levels of public authority who are primarily involved with the management of the site: national
- A clear institutional coordination mechanism, ensuring that the conservation of the Historical Monuments of Mtskheta receives priority consideration within relevant governmental decision-making processes, has been established.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Monday, September 5, 2005

- **Question 5.04** Plans in place to set up a "steering group: By the end of 2005 Ministry of Culture, Monuments Protection and Sport of Georgia plans to set up the steering groups for some of Mtskheta's Monuments, namely for Jvari Church and Svetitskhoveli Cathedral.

- **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
- Management under traditional protective measures or customary law

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Plan directeur de Mtskheta (Géorgie) Rapport préliminaire	N/A	Available	01/11/1997	
Plan directeur de Mtskheta - Géorgie - pour un projet pilote de politique patrimoniale et touristique Rapport préliminaire	N/A	Available	01/12/1997	
Projet pilote de Mtskheta (Géorgie): politique patrimoniale et touristique: Termes de Références pour 9 actions. Eléments provisoires	N/A	Available	01/06/1999	
Pilot Project of Mtskheta (Georgia): Heritage and Tourism Policy: Terms of Reference for 9 Actions	N/A	Available	01/06/1999	
Heritage and Tourism Master Plan for Mtskheta, Georgia (Draft)	N/A	Available	01/09/2001	
A Heritage & Tourism Master Plan for Mtskheta, Georgia - Final Report	N/A	Available	01/08/2002	
Plan directeur de Mtskheta (Géorgie) Rapport préliminaire	N/A	Available	01/01/1997	
Plan directeur de Mtskheta (Géorgie) Rapport préliminaire	N/A	Available	01/01/1997	
Plan directeur de Mtskheta - Géorgie - pour un projet pilote de politique patrimoniale et touristique Rapport préliminaire. In Georgian	N/A	Available	01/01/1997	

Section II-Historical Monuments of Mtskheta

UNDP-SPPD Project: A Heritage & Tourism Master Plan for Mtskheta, Georgia, Mission Report	N/A	Available	01/01/2001	
A Heritage & Tourism Master Plan for Mtskheta, Georgia - Final Report	N/A	Available	01/01/2002	
UNESCO World Heritage Centre. Pilot Project of Mtskheta (Georgia). Heritage and Tourism Policy. Terms of Reference for 9 Actions. Bernard Bizet, Paris 6/6/1999	N/A	Available	01/01/1999	
UNESCO Centre du Patrimoine Mondial. Projet pilote de Mtskheta (Georgie). Politique patrimoniale et touristique. Termes de références pour 9 actions. Bernard Bizet, Paris 6/6/1999	N/A	Available	01/01/1999	

Comment

Draft Management Plan (2012) Mtskheta Cultural Landscape Survey and Heritage Impact assessment (2014)

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 ?

No management system / plan is currently in place 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	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Poor
Researchers	Fair
Tourism industry	Poor
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 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

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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 little or no contact 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 upgrade of the capacity and skills of local professionals is necessary. The training and awareness raising of local monastic communities is also recommended.

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



In 2006 the cultural heritage protection zones were established by the joint decree of the minister of Economy and the Minister of Culture. Some of these boundaries were altered in 2012 following the Government decree.

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)	34%
Governmental (National / Federal)	62%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	5%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	3%
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)

Title	Year	Amount	Link to source
Launching of a rehabilitation programme for Mtskheta	1996	16500.00	
Implementation of the Masterplan for Mtskheta, Georgia	1999	19000.00	
Total		35500	

Comment

Elaboration of the Management Plan for Mtskheta World Heritage Site 2012, 34 361 USD.

Section II-Historical Monuments of Mtskheta

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 **some** equipment and facilities but overall these are **inadequate**

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

There is some **ad hoc** maintenance of equipment and facilities

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	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?

A range of human resources exist, but these are **below optimum** to manage the World Heritage Property.

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	Good
Visitor management	Poor
Conservation	Fair
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Poor

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

Tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Poor

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	Low
Promotion	Low
Community outreach	Low
Interpretation	Low
Education	Low
Visitor management	Low
Conservation	Low
Administration	Low
Risk preparedness	Low
Tourism	Low
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Low

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

No capacity development plan or programme is in place; management is implemented by external staff and skills are not transferred

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 World Heritage property is **not 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 with local participants and some national agencies**

Section II-Historical Monuments of Mtskheta

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

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 **one location 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	Not applicable
Local landowners	Poor
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Average
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	Poor
Site museum	Not provided but needed
Information booths	Not provided but needed
Guided tours	Poor
Trails / routes	Poor
Information materials	Poor
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Poor

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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	Major Increase (100%+)
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?

Visitor surveys

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

No visitor management documents exist

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 **not being actively managed** despite an identified need

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, but it makes **no 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

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 to define key indicators, **but this has not been done**

Section II-Historical Monuments of Mtskheta

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	Poor
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Poor
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

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

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
3.1	Buildings and Development					
3.1.1	Housing Criteria iii, iv, landscape, archaeology	Preparation of the Urban Master Plan in course to regulate housing and other types of development		1 year	Local Municipal Government in cooperation with the National Heritage Agency	
3.1.2	Commercial development Criteria iii, iv, landscape, archaeology	Preparation of the Urban Master Plan in course to regulate housing and other types of development		1 year	Local Municipal Government in cooperation with the National Heritage Agency	
3.5	Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.3	Land conversion Criteria iii, iv, landscape, archaeology	Preparation of the Urban Master Plan in course to regulate housing and other types of development		1 year	Local Municipal Government in cooperation with the National Heritage Agency	
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.1	Wind criteria iii, iv architectural ensembles	Permanent maintenance, preventive conservation		To be implemented on regular basis	The National Heritage Agency and its local Museum Reserve	
3.7.8	Micro-organisms criteria iii, iv architectural ensembles	Permanent maintenance, preventive conservation		To be implemented on regular basis	The National Heritage Agency and its local Museum Reserve	
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses criteria iii, iv architectural ensembles	Awareness raising of local religious communities and training in basic preventive conservation				

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones						
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
4.1.2	Boundaries could be improved	The boundary modification document to be adopted and submitted to WHC	1 year	The National Heritage Agency		
4.1.5	The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are not known by local residents / communities/landowners	To organize public meetings and information days	1-3 years	The National Heritage agency and its local Museum Reserve		
4.3 Management System / Management Plan						
4.3.4	No management system / plan is currently in place	To revise the draft management plan according to WHC comments and adopt it	1-2 years	The National Heritage Agency	The development of the national law on World Heritage and the State Program for World Heritage are under way that shall create necessary condition for legal status of the Management Plan.	
4.4 Financial and Human Resources						
4.4.6	Inadequate equipment and facilities	The new museum of Mtskheta shall be installed in the former cinema building at the archaeological site "The Gate"	1-5 years	The National Heritage Agency	Preparation of the adaptation project design under way to be submitted to the WHC for approval.	
4.4.15	No capacity development plan or programme is in place	To elaborate the capacity development program	1-3 years	The National Heritage Agency		
4.8 Monitoring						

4.8.2	Key indicators have not been defined	To elaborate the Monitoring action plan	1-3 years	The National Heritage Agency	
-------	--------------------------------------	---	-----------	------------------------------	--

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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 are being **partially degraded** but the state of conservation of the World Heritage property has not been significantly impacted

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

5.4.1 - Comments

With an aim to improve the Mtskheta's waterfront areas, degraded during the recent years through inappropriate developments, The National Heritage Agency advocates to the preparation and implementation of the project design for recreational area through the World Bank loan for regional development.

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	Very positive
Management effectiveness	No impact
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	No impact
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Very positive
Political support for conservation	No impact
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	No impact
Other (please specify)	

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

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

Governmental institution responsible for the property

Section II-Historical Monuments of Mtskheta

Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
Staff from other World Heritage properties
Non Governmental Organization
External experts

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	Very good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Very 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

Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

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

UNESCO	
State Party	
Site Managers	
Advisory Bodies	

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: The Retrospective Statement of OUV was adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2014.

• Geographic Information Table

Reason for update: Samtavro church and monastery are also located in the city of Mtskheta.

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