

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Upper Svaneti

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Georgia

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

709


Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Upper Svaneti	42.916 / 43.011	1.06	19.16	20.22	1996
Total (ha)		1.06	19.16	20.22	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Upper Svaneti World Heritage Site	15/07/2010	

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:
n.antidze@heritagesites.ge

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Rusudan Mirzikashvili
National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia
Head of UNESCO and International Relations Unit

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

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

Comment

Added to <http://heritagesites.ge/?lang=geo&page=328>

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

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Comment

Brief Synthesis Preserved by its long geographical isolation, the mountain landscape of Upper Svaneti region of the Caucasus is an exceptional example of mountain scenery with medieval villages and tower houses. The property occupies the upper reaches of the Inguri river basin between the Caucasus and Svaneti ranges. It consists of several small villages forming a community that are dominated by the towers and situated on the mountain slopes, with a natural environment of gorges and alpine valleys and a backdrop of snow-covered mountains. The most notable feature of the settlements is the abundance of towers. The village of Chazhashi in Ushguli community, situated at the confluence of Inguri and Black rivers, has preserved more than 200 medieval tower houses, churches and castles. The land use and settlement structure reveal the continued dwelling and building traditions of local Svan people living in harmony with the surrounding natural environment. Svaneti tower house origins go back to prehistory. Its features reflect the traditional economic mode and social organization of Svan communities. These towers usually have from three to five floors and the thickness of the walls decreases, giving the towers a slender, tapering profile. The houses themselves are usually two-storeyed; the ground floor is a single hall with an open hearth and accommodation for both people and domestic animals, the latter being separated by a wooden partition, which is often lavishly decorated. A corridor annex helped the thermal insulation of the building. The upper floor was used by the human occupants in the summer, and also served as a store for fodder and tools. A door at this level provided access to the tower, which was also connected with the corridor that protected the entrance. The houses were used both as dwellings and as defense posts against the invaders who plagued the region. The property is also notable for the monumental and minor arts. The mural paintings are the outstanding examples of Renaissance painting in Georgia.

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

(iv)(v)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Criterion (IV): The region of Upper Svanety is an outstanding example of an exceptional mountain landscape composed of highly preserved villages with unique defensive tower houses and complexes, examples of ecclesiastical architecture and arts of medieval origin. Criterion (v): The region of Upper Svaneti is an outstanding landscape that has preserved to a remarkable degree its original medieval appearance notable for its fragile traditional human settlements and land-use patterns. Integrity The elements conveying the Outstanding Universal Value of Upper Svaneti are included within the boundaries of the nominated area and the buffer zone. The exceptional medieval landscape, with its traditional settlement patterns, architecture and land use forms, ensures the representation of the property's significance and has retained its original appearance and substance to a great extent. The architectural elements of the property have maintained the

medieval material and most of the have retained original use and function as well as the relationship with the surrounding environment. Authenticity All elements credibly express the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as they retain their authentic medieval form and distribution of traditional settlement and land use patterns, landscape setting, design of architectural typology and preserve to a high degree original material as well as function of dwelling and ecclesiastical structures. The interaction between man and nature in the landscape is completely authentic and of high importance. The geographical location and setting of this exceptional medieval landscape highly contribute to preservation of the forms of local intangible heritage, like: traditions, customs, beliefs, rituals of everyday life, language and folklore of Svan living community. The harsh environmental conditions, lack of access during long winter periods and inappropriate repair techniques applied to maintain the traditional structures often challenge the authenticity of material and the state of conservation of the components of the property.

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			
3.1	Buildings and Development					
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities	    				
3.3	Services Infrastructures					
3.3.4	Localised utilities	   				
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.2	Ground water pollution	   				
3.4.5	Solid waste	    				
3.5	Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.3	Land conversion	   				
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals	   				
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.3	Temperature	  				
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
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	    				
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.2	Earthquake	  				
3.13	Management and institutional factors					
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring 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	
3.3	Services Infrastructures					
3.3.4	Localised utilities	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	static
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.2	Ground water pollution	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	static
3.4.5	Solid waste	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	static
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.3	Temperature	widespread	on-going	minor	low capacity	static
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	widespread	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	static
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	widespread	on-going	minor	low capacity	static
3.9	Other human activities					
3.9.1	Illegal activities	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	low capacity	increasing

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 not known** by the management authority or 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 local community and local governmental body have a general knowledge about Ushguli being the World Heritage Site. They have no information regarding the boundaries of Chazhashi buffer zone.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

The property has been protected as Ushguli Chazhashi Museum Reserve since 1971. Due to the change of legislation is last 20 years, currently only individual architectural elements are being listed under the National Law on Cultural Heritage that prohibits any interventions without a prior permit from relevant state authorities and the same time provides the highest level of protection zoning for these structures as to the elements of the World Heritage site. Other national laws in specific circumstances also apply.

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.

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 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 are **major deficiencies** in capacity/resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property

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

According to Georgian legislation, apart from the Ministry and the National Agency, the regional and local authorities are responsible also for monument protection, however there is no proper institution. The National Museum has 2 towers and 5 residential houses on its balance. Project on Development of Upper Svaneti Protected Areas, which would have had a positive effect on the preservation and maintenance of the monument, had stopped the legislative stage (2010-2011)

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

The National Agency for cultural Heritage Preservation is responsible for the national monuments and the complexes on the world heritage list, that allowing for a well targeted site management and the fulfillment of the envisaged works. The Agency manages the projects regarding the national monuments and those on the UNESCO cultural heritage list. There is no management plan in place. The overall management and monitoring is implemented by the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia. The distance and difficult climatic conditions that isolates the region in winter often prevents site visits. In this context the traditional system of community management contributes to the management of the property.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Wednesday, September 7, 2005

• **Question 5.04** Plans in place to set up a "steering group":
The possibility of the establishment of the "steering group" is under examination in the Ministry of Culture, Monuments Protection and Sport of Georgia. This group may be formed involving already existing "coordinators", NGOs, representatives of Church and national/local authorities as well as the community.

• **Question 5.05**

Overall management system of the site

- Management by the State Party
- Management under traditional protective measures or customary law

Comment

The property has been designated as Ushguli-Chazhashi Museum Reserve since 1971. In the Soviet period the boundaries of the Strict Protection and Protection Zones were also defined. Due to several changes of cultural heritage legislation in the last 20 years, the boundaries of the protected landscape have changed. Currently the landscape is protected within 1 km radius around the World Heritage Site of Chazhashi as well as within 500 m around national monuments. This zone represent legally protected buffer zone of the property with strict limitations for development activities. The individual architectural elements as well as entire villages of the villages of Ushguli community : Chazhashi, Jibiani, Chvibiani and Murk'meli remain listed as national monuments under the National Law on Cultural Heritage. The law prohibits any interventions on monuments without a prior permit from relevant state authorities and the same time provides the highest level of protection zoning for these structures as to the elements of the World Heritage Site. Other national laws in specific circumstances also apply. The overall management and monitoring is implemented by the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia and its division - Parmen Zakaraia Nokalakevi Architectural-Archaeological

Museum-Reserve. Due to the severe weather conditions that isolates the region in winter and the lack of financial resources it is difficult to implement regular monitoring missions at the site. The severe climatic conditions as well as insufficient conservation and management capacities remain among the risks to the property. There is no management plan enforced. The local population and their traditional system of community management remain the key factor in the property management. ICOMOS Georgia has been actively working on the different issues of Upper Svaneti cultural heritage and particularly on the World Heritage site of Chazhashi. In 2000-2001 the multidisciplinary research was implemented to study the different features of the site, including the community and social issues. Based on this research the Conservation Plan and a Site Development strategy were prepared. These were followed by the rehabilitation-restoration projects for the historical buildings of the Chazhashi village.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

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 a range of administrative bodies / levels involved in management but there is **little or no coordination** between them for managing different aspects of the property

**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?
No management system is currently in place**

**4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?
No annual work / action plan exists despite an identified need**

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	Poor
Indigenous peoples	Poor
Landowners	Non-existent
Visitors	Non-existent
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

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 **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

Chazhashi village management system and plan do not exist, therefore there is no coordination between the administrative authorities or the tourism industry.

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)	20%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	20%
Governmental (National / Federal)	10%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	20%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	20%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	10%
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?

There is **no budget** for effective management of the World Heritage property despite an identified need

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 **little or no** equipment or facilities despite an identified need

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	90%
Seasonal	10%

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

Paid	90%
Volunteer	10%

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

Human resources are **inadequate** 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	Poor
Community outreach	Poor
Interpretation	Poor
Education	Poor
Visitor management	Poor
Conservation	Fair
Administration	Poor
Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

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	High
Interpretation	High
Education	High
Visitor management	High
Conservation	High
Administration	High
Risk preparedness	High
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 drafted or in place, but is **not being implemented**

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

Some members of the professional staff have experience and certain skills in working with cultural heritage protection. However, in order for the region to be able to fully patronage the monument, they require trainings and increase of qualifications.

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 a **small amount** of research, but it is not planned

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results **are shared with local partners** but there is no active outreach to national or international 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

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

A multidisciplinary study conducted in 2001-2002 by ICOMOS - is still valid. In 2010, a study called "Assessment of the Svaneti Tower Conditions" has been carried out, which was prepared by the Caucasus Environmental NGO Network (CENN)"s. However, this study was not focused specifically on Ushguli.

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	Average
-------------------------------	---------

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

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 **partially influenced** education, information and awareness building activities

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	Excellent
Information booths	Not provided but needed
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Poor
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Not provided but needed

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

Educational activities directed to inform and raise consciousness of local communities and other stakeholders regarding the monument - are not taking place.

4.7. Visitor Management

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

Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Static
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

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

Visitor management document does not 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?

Although the tourism industry is active in the property, there is **little or no contact** between tourism operators and those responsible for the World Heritage property

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

Monitoring system over the visitors and generally tourism is absent; LEPL The National Museum of Chazhashi, a branch of Mestia Museum of History and Ethnography of the National Museum of Georgia is recording the visitors; certain observations are ran by the local NGO "Svaneti Tourism Centre".

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	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities	Poor
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Poor
NGOs	Poor
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Poor

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

There is no local office for supervision, preservation and popularization of Ushguli (village Chazhashi) as the World Haritage Site. According to the World Heritage Convention it is desirable to create preconditions for recognition of Upper Svaneti as a cultural landscape.

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

General management and monitoring is carried out by the National Agency of Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia.

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
3.3	Services Infrastructures						
3.3.4	Localised utilities	Magti receiving tower located near the village Chazhashi is violating criteria V of the World Heritage Monument. It cuts into the "original, delicate expressiveness of the middle ages".	No specific actions are being implemented.	Random.	Not determined	National Agency of Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia, Local government, Local NGOs	In recent years, local governmental body and the NGO have raised the issue of relocating the tower several times in front of the owner of the company.
3.4	Pollution						
3.4.5	Solid waste	According to the current situation there is no a direct threat, but there is a risk of landscape pollution (iv, v).	Local NGOs are lobbying the project of modern standards-based landfill arrangement on local governmental and regional level.	Local NGOs monitor this issue.	An issue of constructing a new regional sanitary landfill in Samegrelo-Upper Svaneti regions by 2014-2021 is being discussed.	NGO "Svaneti Tourism Centre".	Tourism development has resulted in need for disposal of solid waste. In light of even that Mestia Municipality has no landfill environment pollution has become a problematic issue for the Municipality.
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
3.7.3	Temperature	Difficult climatic conditions, isolation of the region in winter inhibits possibilities for ongoing monitoring of the monument, which has an adverse impact on all attributes and criteria of it.	This factor must be considered while developing the management plan and other protective measures.	Random. Special observations are not being implemented.	It is cold 6-8 months a year	The population, the surveillance bodies, organizations; construction, restoration, research and etc.	Harsh weather conditions, long period of the winter season (8 months), the bad weather during autumn and spring, frequent breakdown of the Mestia - Ushguli road inhibits the implementation of works at place and strictly defines the dates of any works
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	The traditions – mass culture, modern technologies and the transition to a market economy leads to changes in values of the population, namely aesthetic and attitude towards monuments and private property tend to change.	At this stage, no educational or informational activities are being carried out with the civil society groups related with the cultural heritage monument.	Random. Special observations are not being implemented.	Not determined.	National Agency of Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia	Svan people in Georgia are unique with their social authenticity which is due to their specific mentality, traditions and way of life. The local community is represented by exceptional non-materialistic values and self-administrative traditions.
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	Increase of the visitors may disturb (is disturbing) isolation of Ushguli. Development of family tourism changes economy and agriculture of the community step-by-step.	Currently not being implemented	Random	Not determined	LEPL National Administration of Georgian Tourism, NGO "Svaneti Tourism Centre" (His partner organization - biological farming association "Elkana").	Local NGOs have implemented several projects aimed at purchase of touristic product and increase of its quality. A few beneficiaries from Ushguli also participated in the projects.
3.9	Other human activities						
3.9.1	Illegal activities	Attribute of the V criteria – a medieval housing	The action takes place in response to the incoming the appeal. Till 2012 local governmental bodies have not adopted any normative act regarding this issue.	Monitoring is not scheduled	Not determined	Supervision services of Zugdidi and Mestia, inspection of National Agency of Cultural Heritage Preservation.	The only actual point here is "illegal constructions", which implies use of the monument-non-matching materials and details by the population during maintenance works and also a few facts of an unauthorized construction.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.3 Management System / Management Plan					
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
4.3.4	No management system / plan is currently in place	The National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia starts the update and implementation of rehabilitation project of the village Chazhashi, but Upper Svaneti's architectural and cultural heritage protection plan is not developed.	From 2014 to 2016	The Ministry of Culture and Monument Protection of Georgia; National Agency of Cultural Heritage Protection; Regional administration of Samegrelo-Upper Svaneti; Local government of Mestia municipality; Svaneti Museum. ICOMOS-Georgia.	Basis: 2000-2001 years ICOMOS - of Georgias multidisciplinary research, conservation plan, site development strategy and restorative rehabilitation project.
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building					
4.6.3	There is a limited education and awareness programme	General guidelines are established cultural heritage, including books for the schools. Georgia Museum also has an educational resource program.	Not determined	National Agency of Cultural Heritage Protection; the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia; National Museum of Georgia; ICMOS-Georgia;	Guidelines regarding cultural heritage are developed, including school books that discusses v.Chazhashi as a world heritage site. Georgia Museum also has an educational resource program. There is no special information or education programs.
4.8 Monitoring					
4.8.1	Some monitoring, but it is not planned	Svaneti History and Ethnography Museum periodically supervises condition of its property in the vil. Chazhashi. Within implementation of Ushguli conservation project the National Agency of Cultural Heritage Protection will supervise the works.	Not determined	LEPL National Agency of Cultural Heritage Protection of Georgia; LEPL Svaneti History and Ethnography Museum	Monitoring held until now was not regular, mostly was based on visual assessment and was carried out only in cases of receiving a specific statement regarding condition of the monument.

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

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

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

Although there is no management and development plan for the area, the World Heritage status has some indirect impact on the listed fields. For example, prominence of the area leads to increase of number of visitors resulting a positive impact on income of the local population and regulation of the migration processes, which is crucial for Ushguli viability.

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
Non Governmental Organization
Indigenous peoples
Local community

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

Number of characters in comment fields can be increased.

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

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Very 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

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	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: Brief Synthesis Preserved by its long geographical isolation, the mountain landscape of Upper Svaneti region of the Caucasus is an exceptional example of mountain scenery with medieval villages and tower houses. The property occupies the upper reaches of the Inguri river basin between the Caucasus and Svaneti ranges. It consists of several small villages forming a community that are dominated by the towers and situated on the mountain slopes, with a natural environment of gorges and alpine valleys and a backdrop of snow-covered mountains. The most notable feature of the settlements is the abundance of towers. The village of Chazhashi in Ushguli community, situated at the confluence of Inguri and Black rivers, has preserved more than 200 medieval tower houses, churches and castles. The land use and settlement structure reveal the continued dwelling and building traditions of local Svan people living in harmony with the surrounding natural environment. Svaneti tower house origins go back to prehistory. Its features reflect the traditional economic mode and social organization of Svan communities. These towers usually have from

three to five floors and the thickness of the walls decreases, giving the towers a slender, tapering profile. The houses themselves are usually two-storeyed; the ground floor is a single hall with an open hearth and accommodation for both people and domestic animals, the latter being separated by a wooden partition, which is often lavishly decorated. A corridor annex helped the thermal insulation of the building. The upper floor was used by the human occupants in the summer, and also served as a store for fodder and tools. A door at this level provided access to the tower, which was also connected with the corridor that protected the entrance. The houses were used both as dwellings and as defense posts against the invaders who plagued the region. The property is also notable for the monumental and minor arts. The mural paintings are the outstanding examples of Renaissance painting in Georgia.

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

Information was collected specially for questionnaire.