

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Muskauer Park / Park Mużakowski

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Germany
- Poland

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

1127

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004



1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Muskauer Park / Park Mużakowski	51.579 / 14.726	348	1204.65	1552.65	2004
Total (ha)		348	1204.65	1552.65	

Comment

Coordinates- longitude: from 51.3200 to 51.3442 latitude:from 14.4210 to 14.4545

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Muskauer Park / Park Mużakowski - inscribed property	07/07/2004	
Park Mużakowski / Muskauer Park	01/01/2002	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Birgitta Ringbeck
Auswärtiges Amt
National World Heritage Focal Point
Referat 603-9
Multilaterale Kultur- und Medienpolitik
- The Centre for the Preservation of Historic Landscape, A National Institution for Culture
- The Centre for the Preservation of Historic Landscape, A National Institution for Culture
- Ministry of Finance of the State of Saxony
Assistant Programme Specialist
CLT/WHC/P/LAC
3.18
- Bogdan Zdrojewski
Ministry of Culture and National Heritage
Minister of Culture and National Heritage

Comment

polish side: Narodowy Instytut Dziedzictwa (National Heritage Board of Poland) ul. Kopernika 36/40 00-924 Warszawa
Email: info@nid.pl

Section II-Muskauer Park / Park Mużakowski

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Renata Stachańczyk
National Heritage Board of Poland
Project Manager

Comment

Property Manager- Poland: prof. nadzw. dr hab. inż. arch. Małgorzata Rozbicka, Director of National Heritage Board of Poland; +48 22 826 02 39, info@nid.pl dr inż. Renata Stachańczyk, Narodowy Instytut Dziedzictwa (National Heritage Board of Poland); ul. Kopernika 36/40, 00-924 Warszawa; +48 22 826 02 39 ext.143; Germany: Dipl.-Ing. Cord Panning, Director of "Fuerst-Pueckler-Park Bad Muskau" Foundation, Orangerie, 02953 Bad Muskau, +49 35571 63110, fax: +49 35571 63110, direktion@muskauer-park.de

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

Comment

www.muskauer-park.de www.park-muzakowski.pl;
www.zabytek.pl

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

RSOUV has been adopted by the World Heritage Committee at the 38th session in June 2014.

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

(i)(iv)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

In connection with the adoption of RSOUV at the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee, work on determining attributes will be started.

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						
3.1.2	Commercial development						
3.1.3	Industrial areas						
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure						
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities						
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure						
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure						
3.3	Services Infrastructures						
3.3.1	Water infrastructure						
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities						
3.3.4	Localised utilities						
3.4	Pollution						
3.4.4	Air pollution						
3.5	Biological resource use/modification						
3.5.1	Fishing/collecting aquatic resources						
3.5.5	Crop production						
3.5.7	Subsistence wild plant collection						
3.5.9	Subsistence hunting						
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production						
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
3.7.1	Wind						
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)						
3.7.7	Pests						
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses						
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage						
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system						
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community						
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation						
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events						
3.10.1	Storms						
3.10.2	Flooding						
3.10.3	Drought						
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events						
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition						
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)						
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species						
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species						
3.12.5	Hyper-abundant species						
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					
3.1.1 Housing	restricted	on-going	significant	low capacity	static
3.1.2 Commercial development	restricted	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.1.3 Industrial areas	restricted	on-going	significant	low capacity	static
3.1.4 Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	localised	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.2 Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure	localised	on-going	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.2.4 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	localised	on-going	minor	no capacity and / or resources	static
3.3 Services Infrastructures					
3.3.4 Localised utilities	localised	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.4 Pollution					
3.4.4 Air pollution	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	no capacity and / or resources	static
3.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.6 Water (rain/water table)	localised	one off or rare	insignificant	low capacity	static
3.7.7 Pests	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	static
3.11 Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.5 Erosion and siltation/ deposition	restricted	on-going	significant	low capacity	static
3.12 Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.5 Hyper-abundant species	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static

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

3.17.1 - Comments

The answer in point 3.1.3 refers to the German side only.

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 **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 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

On the Polish side, the buffer zone covers mainly the area of the historical composition (on the eastern and southern side). The boundary of the zone overlaps the historical boundary of the park. So, there is no zone which would protect the value of the composition in a wider context. It is advisable to revise the boundary of the zone and to expand it on the basis of the existing Landscape Park.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

Polish Side

Legal protection of the cultural values of the area of the property:

- Entry in the Historical Monuments Registry of the Lubuskie County under the 1962 Historical Monuments Protection Act.

- The Local Master Town Development Plan for the Town of Łęknica of 27th May 1994 as amended. The Local Town Development Plan of Łęknica, a local law act, imposes conservator's restrictions on the park area and on its buffer zone.

Legal protection of the natural and cultural values related to the property:

- The Landscape Park "Łuk Mużakowa" (Muskauer Arc), under the Nature Conservation Act

- The Protected Landscape Area (ordinance of the Voivod of the Zielonogórskie County under the Nature Conservation Act).

German Side

- Monument of Cultural Heritage (object integrity)

Furthermore, within the limits of the park there are individual monuments that are singled out. These include all the significant buildings and furnishing elements, e.g. such as the bridges over the Hermann's Neisse watercourse, two entrance gates to the park, and the weir on the Hermann's Neisse. This list of monuments contains also a number of historical buildings within the Old Town of Bad Muskau and in the neighbouring villages that are historically linked to the park. Also the core area of the town of Bad Muskau, together with the surrounding parts of the locality is marked as areas under Historical Monuments" Protection.

- Law on the Protection of Monuments

Furthermore, since 1968, the German part of the park in its entire territorial expanse is a component part of the landscape protection area of "Neißeau", a protected category subject to the Law on the Protection of Nature.

- Land Use Plan of the Town of Bad Muskau

In Poland part of the park has been designated a Cultural Reserve by the Centre for the Preservation of Historic Landscape, under the Local Town and Country Development Plan for the town of Leknica. The whole park is designated under the Protected Landscape Area. The park is also entered in the Historical Monuments Registry – for both tangible and intangible assets. The area of the park alongside the Neisse and Skroda valleys is protected under the Nature Conservation Act for both natural and cultural values, while specific ancient English Oaks and European beech trees are protected as Nature Monuments.

The entire German part of the park was granted protected in 1955 as a Historical Monument of Landscape and Garden Composition. In 1984 this protection was confirmed under the Law on Protection of Monuments of the Free State of Saxony. Under the Municipal Land Use Zoning Plan for Bad Muskau, the park is protected as a Monument of Historical Heritage. All the significant buildings and built elements in the park and significant buildings in Bad Muskau are protected individually. The park is also a protected category subject to the Law on Protection of nature.

Comment

Polish side: on 28.07.2005, the new Local Spatial Development Plan of the town of Łęknica was adopted.

German side: October 2013: Flächennutzungsplan der Verwaltungsgemeinschaft Bad Muskau, The name of the landscape protection area is „Muskauer Parklandschaft und Neißeau“ The Local Spatial Development Plan of the Town Bad Muskau was confirmed in 1984 and assured today under the Law on Protection of Monuments of the Free State of Saxony.

4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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

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

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

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

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

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 is **excellent** 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

On the Polish side: the legal framework in the buffer zone is sufficient, but the provisions of Local Spatial Development Plan of the town of Łęknica are insufficiently precise, thus the setting is subject to continuous degradation.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

A Management Plan for the property is in place. As a cross border site, the key management element is the arrangement for joint collaboration for strategy and management. This is currently conducted at five different levels: National, Trustees, Working Group, Park Maintenance Group and Coordination Group. The Trustees are those of the Prince Puckler-Park Bad Muskau Foundation set up jointly by both countries in 2003 as the Centre for Historic Monuments Studies and documentation (see below). This joint collaboration has overseen the production of a thorough and detailed management plan. This is underpinned by a restoration concept and the goals are clearly articulated. The plan lists clearly the restoration projects achieved to date. It is less detailed with timescales for short and medium term future objectives.

Resources: - Polish side: Maintenance funds are provided by the Centre for the preservation of Historic Landscape. Funds for project work have so far been provided through the Polish-German Cooperation Foundation and from the PHARE European Fund. No funding has been put forward for future projects. - German side: The Federal Republic of Germany has designated the Muskau Park as 'kulturreller Leuchtturm', which means that there can be financial support for any



Section II-Muskauer Park / Park Mużakowski

necessary restoration projects. The German Environmental Protection Foundation (Deutsche Bundesstiftung Umwelt), Osnabruck has announced recently that its future projects will focus mainly on WH sites in Germany. The Management Plan states that: 'the personnel and financial resources of the Foundation are assured both for the present time and for the longer-term future by the engagement of the Free State of Saxony and the Federal Authorities, [funding] does not present any problems that the restoration programme will be implemented step by step over the forthcoming years'.

Comment

The name of the Centre for Historic Monuments Studies and documentation is since 01.01.2011 Narodowy Instytut Dziedzictwa (National Heritage Board of Poland). The management of the park and all important decisions are evaluated and approved since 2005 by the International Conservation Board of Muskauer/Mużakowski Park (since 2010 International Conservation Board of Muskauer/Mużakowski Park and Park Branitz).

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Management Plan for Muskauer Park / Park Mużakowski	N/A	Available	01/01/2003	
Parc Mużakowski / Muskauer Park Management Plan	In Force	Available	01/02/2003	

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

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

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

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

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system is being **fully** implemented and monitored

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	Good
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Fair
Researchers	Good
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

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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

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

In the recent years, Poland has made all efforts to improve the state of maintenance of the property. However, in relation to the provisions of the 2003 management plan, a few changes have taken place: change of the name of the institution and its internal structure, dissolution of the independent unit responsible for the substantive preparation of the project, increase in the number of permanent field staff; in the management structure, indirect levels were introduced.

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

4.4. Financial and Human Resources

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

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	25%
Governmental (National / Federal)	41%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	28%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	1%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	5%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	
Other grants	

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

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

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

Section II-Muskauer Park / Park Mużakowski

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

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

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

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

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

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

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

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

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

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

Full-time	97%
Part-time	3%

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	97%
Volunteer	3%

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

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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

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

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

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

Polish side: human resources at the management level have been reduced since 2003 as a result of the reorganisation of the institution. In the longer term, this will result in deficits in various areas of management. The employment level in the executive unit has been maintained, although its structure has changed a little. Due to an increasing range of tasks, these resources are still insufficient and should be increased in the nearest future.

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 widely** with the local, national and international audiences

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

Englandsouvenirs. Fürst Pücklers Reise 1826–1829. Zittau 2005 Fürst Pückler. Parkomanie in Muskau und Branitz. Ein

Section II-Muskauer Park / Park Mużakowski

Führer durch seine Anlagen in Sachsen, Brandenburg und Thüringen. Hamburg 2006 Stachańczyk Renata, Park Mużakowski / Muskauer Park, Łęknica/Bad Muskau. Przewodnik, Warszawa 2009

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

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

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

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

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

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	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 been an **important influence** on 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	Adequate
Site museum	Excellent
Information booths	Adequate
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Excellent
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Not needed

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

The activities in this area require further organisation, first of all, the creation of a permanent programme.

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

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

Entry tickets and registries
Accommodation establishments
Visitor surveys
Other

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

Polish side: the source of knowledge on point 4.7.2. are own observations and data from tourist guides providing services in the area of the property.

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

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

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

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

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

The fee is collected, and makes **some 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

According to the Marketing Study, we should expect a rise in the number of visitors, which the property is able to accept. In the summer, a limitation is the insufficient number of accommodation, parking lots and public transport connections. The presented decrease in the number of visitors was related to the floods, which have taken place in the region and within the property. On the Polish side, it is necessary to establish a reception centre and tourists should be served by an external entity.

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 **comprehensive, integrated programme** of monitoring, which is relevant to 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** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

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

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

In point 4.8.1., monitoring on the Polish side means constant substantive supervision by the coordinator. In point 4.8.3. - subjective evaluation only, no research.

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 management 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						
3.1.2	Commercial development	I, IV	Cooperation with the local authorities (town of Łęknica, commune of Trzebiel and Bad Muskau). Supporting the local government through specialist studies for the urban planning purposes. Giving opinions on investments in the buffer zone.	on-going evaluation of the state of land use, periodic monitoring	continuous activity	local authorities; site managers; monuments protection services	The problems relate to the buildings in the buffer zone and on the Polish side – in particular, the marketplace and urban development of the town of Łęknica.
3.1.3	Industrial areas	I, IV	Cooperation with regional spatial planning offices. Cooperation with representatives of the Executive Boards of the opencast mines.	Examination of the regional spatial plans /every 10 years/. Monitoring UNESCO Deutschland.	continuous activity	Regionale Planung Verband, Deutsche ICOMOS	This factor is of outside origin and concerns the wider setting of the property, namely the opencast mines operating on the German side.
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	I, IV,	Cooperation with the local authorities (the town of Łęknica, commune of Trzebiel and Bad Muskau) - supporting them through specialist studies for the urban planning, giving opinions on investments in the buffer zone, cooperation with investors.	on-going evaluation of the state of land use, periodic monitoring	continuous activity	local authorities, site managers, monuments protection services	The problem relates to the new tourist infrastructure in the buffer zone, in particular hotels, spa facilities, both in Poland and in Germany.
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	I, IV	The existing bypass in the town of Łęknica (Poland) interferes with the visual values of the landscape from some spots within the property – it is necessary to seek the removal of noise barriers and introduction of masking plantings.	does not concern	long-term activity	Site managers, monuments protection services, local authorities, General Directorate for National Roads and Motorways.	-
3.3	Services Infrastructures						
3.3.4	Localised utilities	I, IV	Cooperation with the local authorities both within the buffer zone and in its surroundings – cooperation with managers and owners of the infrastructure, giving opinions on investments.	periodic monitoring of the buffer zone and its surroundings	continuous activity	Site managers, monument's protection services, local authorities, managers and owners of the infrastructure	The problem relates to mobile phone masts and radio-television towers.
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events						
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition	I, IV	Cooperation at the government level with the waterways administration and other agencies responsible for water management.	on-going observations of changes taking place	long-term activity	Ministry of the Environment, waterways administrators and other agencies responsible for water management, private owner of a hydro power plant	The problem relates to the damage to the river bank and silting of the Nysa River riverbed, as a result of improper water management.

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	Cooperation with the local authorities.	long-term activity	local governments	In Poland the zone is included into the local spatial development plans of the towns of Łęknica and Bad Muskau, but not in plan of the commune of Trzebiel. The German side has no legal obligation to respect specific regulations in the buffer zone.

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 and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

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

5.4.1 - Comments

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

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

Conservation	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Very positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Very positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Very positive
International cooperation	Very positive
Political support for conservation	Very positive
Legal / Policy framework	Very positive
Lobbying	Very positive
Institutional coordination	Very positive
Security	Positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

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
External experts

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

no

Section II-Muskauer Park / Park Mużakowski

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

The questionnaire is not suitable for serial and transboundary properties as there are difficulties to average answers.

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 poor

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

Most of the required information was accessible

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

The World Heritage Convention
The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
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	Not Applicable
State Party	Not Applicable
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

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: RSOUV has been adopted by the World Heritage Committee at the 38th session in June 2014.

• Geographic Information Table

Reason for update: Coordinates- longitude: from 51.3200 to 51.3442 latitude:from 14.4210 to 14.4545

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