

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Georgia

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

710

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	?	?	?	
Bagrati Cathedral	0 / 0	3.77	11.26	15.03	1994
Gelati Monastery	0 / 0	4.1	?	4.1	1994
Total (ha)		7.87	11.26	19.13	

Comment

Following the request by the World Heritage Committee the State Party submitted in 2014 the Major Boundary Modification document to the WHC. According to the document Gelati Monastery is proposed to remain in World Heritage Site, while Bagrati Cathedral shall be withdrawn. The co-ordinates for Gelati Monastery are as follows: E42° 17' 40.58, N 42° 46' 05.62, 600m altitude. The core area - 4,20 ha, the Buffer zone area - 12,46 km2.

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Bagrati Cathedral - inscribed property	01/12/2009	
Gelati Monastery - Inscribed property	01/12/2009	

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 Addresss: 5 Tabukashvili str. 0105, Tbilisi, Georgia tel: (+995 32) 93 13 49 email: antidzenikoloz@gmail.com

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Roland Isakadze
The National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia
Head of the the Kutaisi Historical Architectural Museum-Reserve

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [Ancient Monuments of Georgia, \(Georgian Parliament\)](#)
2. [Gelati's frescos, \(Georgian Parliament\)](#)

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

Comment

For the time being the territory is not designated under any other Convention.

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Comment

The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was submitted to the world Heritage Centre in scopes of the retrospective inventory process. An updated version was submitted together with the Major Boundary Modification document in 2014.

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

(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Gelati is distinguished for its harmony with its natural setting, a well thought-out overall planning concept and highly elaborated architecture. The excavated archaeological remains form important attribute of the site. The main church has well-preserved mosaic decoration, comparable with the best Byzantine mosaics, as well as the largest ensemble of wall paintings of the middle Byzantine, late Byzantine, and post-Byzantine periods in Georgia.

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							
3.1.1	Housing							
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure							
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities							
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure							
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure							
3.4	Pollution							
3.4.5	Solid waste							
3.5	Biological resource use/modification							
3.5.3	Land conversion							
3.6	Physical resource extraction							
3.6.2	Quarrying							
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric							
3.7.1	Wind							
3.7.2	Relative humidity							
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)							
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							
3.9.4	War							
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							
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					
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	restricted	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	restricted	frequent	insignificant	low capacity	static
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.5	Solid waste	restricted	frequent	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.5	Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.3	Land conversion	localised	one off or rare	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.6	Physical resource extraction					
3.6.2	Quarrying	restricted	on-going	insignificant	low capacity	static
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.1	Wind	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	high capacity	static

		Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.7.2	Relative humidity	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	high capacity	static
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	high capacity	static
3.7.8	Micro-organisms	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses	extensive	on-going	minor	high capacity	static
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	extensive	on-going	insignificant	medium 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 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 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 property had no Buffer Zone at the time of inscription. The Buffer zone was defined following the comprehensive studies undertaken in 2012-2013 and was adopted by the decree of the Ministry of Culture and Monuments Protection on 09.01.2014. The information was submitted to local authorities, and the Patriarchate of Georgia. Additional communication with local community is needed.

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 of 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 new Georgian Law on Cultural Heritage was adopted in June 2007. Two protection zones were defined by this legal instrument:

- Individual protected area composed of the zone of physical protection and the 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 the 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 constructions are forbidden which are not beneficial for the monuments protection or its landscape.

- General protected area composed by the immovable monuments protection zone, the construction regulation zone, the historic landscape protection zone and archaeological protection zone.

The historic landscape protection zone has to be free of any constructions and objects which do not have any historical value. In this area, the following activities could 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 relief 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, the Protected areas Plans and the Historic-Cultural Plans constitute the base for all urban planning documentation, including the 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 automatically defined visual protection area (1000m) was refined following the studies undertaken in 2012-2013 following which the new appropriately outlined boundary was established and formally adopted. This perimeter is an equivalent to the Buffer Zone requirements. For the time being there are no other type of protection zones established as defined by the Law. There are no town planning documents established for the area that makes difficult decision making on development.

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?

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone is **inadequate** to ensure 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

The main deficiencies in capacity remain at the local level: municipal, site manager and monastic community. The legislation entitles the National Heritage Agency, and its advisory councils, where the significant professional resources are gathered, to control the developments in the Buffer and Core Zones, as well as conservation and maintenance issues.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

A clear institutional coordination mechanism, ensuring that the conservation of the property receives priority consideration within relevant governmental decision-making processes, has been established.

In accordance with the 2007 Law on Cultural Heritage and with this Constitutional Agreement, the management of the religious cultural heritage properties still lies under the State Party's authority but is carried out in agreement with the Church. No management plan exists for the property.

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":
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 protective legislation
- Management under contractual agreement between the State Party and a third party
- Management under traditional protective measures or customary law

The property is managed jointly by the Georgian Orthodox Church and the State (Ministry of Culture, Monuments Protection and Sport of Georgia and the Kutaisi-Gelati Museum-Reserve)

Comment

The preparation of the Management Plan has started in 2013 by the state party and is envisaged to be finalized by the end of 2014. Overall co-ordination mechanism and communication between the stakeholders is being defined in scopes of the ongoing work on the World Heritage law of Georgia. The memorandum between the Patriarchate of Georgia and the Ministry of Culture and Monuments Protection, signed on

17.07.2014) is also to play a role in improving management system of the property.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

The preparation of the Management Plan has started in 2013 by the state party and is envisaged to be finalized by the end of 2014. Overall co-ordination mechanism and communication between the stakeholders is being defined in scopes of the ongoing work on the World Heritage law of Georgia. The memorandum between the Patriarchate of Georgia and the Ministry of Culture and Monuments Protection, signed on 17.07.2014) is also to play a role in improving management system of the property.

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

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

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

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

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

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

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

An annual work / action plan exists and **most or all activities** are being implemented and monitored

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	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Non-existent
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Non-existent
Industry	Poor

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

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

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

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 **little or no 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

Upgrade of the capacity and skills of local professional resources is necessary. The training and awareness raising of local monastic community and village residents is also recommended to avoid any undesirable impacts on the property's OUV.

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

The new extended Buffer Zone was established in 01. 2014. The memorandum of co-operation was signed between the Patriarchate of Georgia and the Ministry of Culture and Monuments Protection in 07.2014.

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)	60%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO´s, foundations, etc)	6%
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)

Comment

There has not been any assistance from the World Heritage Fund to the property.

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

The available budget is **inadequate** for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage

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

The construction of the Gelati visitor center is being funded by the Government through the World Bank loan. The visitor center will greatly improve the site infrastructure. The funding is regularly provided by the national budget for conservation, management, monitoring and maintenance works (maintain the staff in local museum-reserve, major conservation works, etc.)

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	

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

Paid	3%
Volunteer	

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	Fair
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Non-existent
Conservation	Fair
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Poor
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	Not available
Tourism	Low
Enforcement (custodians, police)	

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

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

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

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

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

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

Lanchava O. Isakadze R. (2010) Excavation in Kutaisi and Gelati, "Dziebani" #19, Tbilisi; Lanchava O., Isakadze R. (2010) Excavations in Gelati and Motsameta, "Ancient Art Today" #1, Tbilisi; Lanchava O., Isakadze R. Buadze Sh.,(2011) Results of archaeological excavation of the gate of the David the Builder, "Ancient Art Today", #2, Tbilisi.; Gelati Manuskrips (2011); Gelati 900 (2007).

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, but **not 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	Poor
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 **no education and awareness programme**, despite an identified need

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	Not provided but needed
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	

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

The visitor center is planned to be put in place in 2015-2016 in scopes of the Imereti Regional Development program. It is expected to improve delivery of information to visitors through on site exhibition, permanent staff available on site, information materials and other tools.

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	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	N/A
Five years ago	N/A

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

Visitor surveys

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

the visitor management issue forms part of the Gelati management plan that is being elaborated in 2013-2014.

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?

While there is the **authority to collect fees they are not collected**

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

There is a growing need for qualified guides on site.

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

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

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Average
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Non-existent
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

Recommendations on the conservation are being regularly implemented. The recommendation on the major boundary modification was also implemented - the State Party submitted the major boundary modification document in 2013 and in 2014.

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						
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	criterion iv; no direct impact on attributes, but potential impact on landscape setting.	land use master plan and building regulation plan of the buffer zone territory should be elaborated and adopted to provide detailed regulations for developments.		1-3 years	local municipality government, in co-ordination with the National Heritage Agency	if appropriately managed, the visitor accommodation and infrastructure has positive income on local economy.
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	criterion iv,	Relocation of the heavy vehicle circulation to alternative road to the quarry nearby Gelati Monastery.		1-3 years	Local municipal government, the State Department of Roads of Georgia	Proposal for the relocation of the road is included in conservation master plan of Gelati monastery elaborated in 2008.
3.6	Physical resource extraction						
3.6.2	Quarrying	Criterion iv, no direct impact on attributes	The impact appears from the heavy vehicle circulation to and from the quarry on the road adjacent to Gelati monastery. The redirection of the heavy vehicles to alternative road is proposed within Conservation Master Plan of the monastery.		1-3 years	Local municipal government, the State Department of Roads of Georgia	
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)	criterion iv, insignificant impact on the buildings of Gelati Monastery.	Regular maintenance works, preventive conservation actions		To be implemented on regular basis	The National Heritage Agency and its Kutaisi local Museum-Reserve, local religious community	The regular monitoring is implemented by the Museum-Reserve staff, based on which the implementation of works are scheduled by the National Heritage Agency.
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses	criterion iv, buildings of the Gelati Monastery.	Regular awareness raising on the OUV attributes and protection measures for local religious community.		1-5 years	The National Heritage Agency and its Kutaisi Museum Reserve	
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	criterion iv, indirect impact on the attributes	Clear visitor management strategy should be implemented.		1-5 years	The National Heritage Agency and its Kutaisi Museum reserve.	The construction of the visitor centre and facilities, scheduled in 2015-2016 will significantly improve the visitor circulation and potential impact on the site attributes.

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	
4.1.5	The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are not known by local residents / communities/landowners	Organize the public meetings and information days.	1 year	Local Municipal Government, The National Heritage Agency		
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building						

4.6.3	There is no education and awareness programme	To elaborate the education and awareness program for Gelati monastery.	1-2 years	The National Heritage Agency	
4.7 Visitor Management					
4.7.4	Visitor use of the property is not being actively managed	Elaboration of visitor management plan is under way in scopes of the Gelati monastery Management Plan.	1-2 years	The National Heritage Agency	The Management Plan is being elaborated by the G. Chubinashvili National Research Centre for Georgian Art History and Heritage Preservation since 2013.
4.8 Monitoring					
4.8.2	Key indicators have not been defined	To define the monitoring action plan of the property.	1-2 years	The National Heritage Agency.	

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

The Conservation Master Plan elaborated in 2008 has been in the process of step by step implementation. The major conservation works have been completed/ are under way with the participation of international experts and Restoration Faculty of the State Academy of Fine Arts. The construction of visitor centre, improving access, parking, circulation of visitors on site is also in under way.

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

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

Conservation	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Positive
Management effectiveness	No impact
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	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	Positive
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	Positive
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

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 Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was submitted to the world Heritage Centre in scopes of the retrospective inventory process. An updated version was submitted together with the Major Boundary Modification document in 2014.

• **Geographic Information Table**

Reason for update: Following the request by the World Heritage Committee the State Party submitted in 2014 the Major Boundary Modification document to the WHC. According to the document Gelati Monastery is proposed to remain in World Heritage Site, while Bagrati Cathedral shall be withdrawn. The co-ordinates for Gelati Monastery are as follows: E42° 17' 40.58, N 42° 46' 05.62, 600m altitude. The core area - 4,20 ha, the Buffer zone area - 12,46 km2.

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