

**1. World Heritage Property Data**

**1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property**

Biblical Tels - Megiddo, Hazor, Beer Sheba

**1.2 - World Heritage Property Details**

**State(s) Party(ies)**

- Israel

**Type of Property**

cultural

**Identification Number**

1108





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

2005

**1.3 - Geographic Information Table**

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Tel Megiddo , Jezreel Valley , Israel	32.585 / 35.182	16.05	290.85	306.9	2005
Tel Hazor , Upper Galilee , Israel	33.017 / 35.567	76.9	204.6	281.5	2005
Tel Beer Sheba , Southern district , Israel	31.245 / 34.841	3.09	108.53	111.62	2005
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>96.04</b>	<b>603.98</b>	<b>700.02</b>	

**1.4 - Map(s)**

Title	Date	Link to source
Biblical Tels - Megiddo, Hazor, Beer Sheba - maps of inscribed properties	15/07/2005	
Tel Megiddo National Park	01/01/2004	
Tel Beer Sheba National Park	01/01/2004	
Tel Hazor National Park	01/01/2004	

**1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property**

- Guy Kav-Venaki  
Israel Chair Monitoring, Follow-Up and Periodic Reporting Team  
Chairman

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

- Revital Weiss  
Israel Nature and Parks Authority

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

**Comment**

Tel Beer Sheba  
<http://www.parks.org.il/parksandreserves/telbeersheva/Pages/default.aspx> Tel Megiddo  
<http://www.parks.org.il/parksandreserves/megiddo/Pages/default.aspx> Tel Hazor  
<http://www.parks.org.il/ParksAndReserves/telHazor/Pages/default.aspx>

**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**

**Statement of Outstanding Universal Value**

**Brief synthesis**

Historic settlement mounds, known as tels, are characteristic of the flatter lands of the eastern Mediterranean, particularly in Lebanon, Syria, Israel and eastern Turkey. Of more than 200 such mounds in Israel, the three sites of Megiddo, Hazor and Beer Sheba are representative of those that contain substantial remains of cities with biblical connections, and are strongly associated with events portrayed in the bible.

The three tels extend across the State of Israel; Tel Hazor in the north, near the Sea of Galilee; Tel Megiddo 50 kilometres to the south west; and Tel Beer Sheba near the Negev Desert in the south.

The three sites reflect the wealth and power of Bronze and Iron Age cities in the fertile biblical lands. This was based on, and achieved through, a centralized authority that had control of trade routes to the north east and south; connecting Egypt to Syria and Anatolia to Mesopotamia, and the creation and management of sophisticated and technologically advanced water collection systems. Together, these tels reflect the key stages of urban development in the region.

They are also representative of the large, multi-layered occupation of single sites that persisted for several millennia until the 6th century BCE, and particularly reflect in their final flowering the formative stages of biblical history from the 12th to 6th century BCE. With their impressive remains of palaces, fortifications and urban planning, they offer key material manifestations of the biblical epoch.

The early Bronze Age temple compound at Megiddo is unparalleled for its number of temples, the continuity of cult activity and the record of ritual activity. At Hazor, the ramparts are said to be the best example in the area from southern Turkey to the north of the Negev in Israel. The late Bronze Age palace is the most elaborate in Israel, and one of the best in the Levant. For the Iron Age remains, the elaborate town plan of Beer Sheba and the orthogonal plan of Megiddo have few parallels in the Levant.

All three tels have impressive remains of their underground water catchments systems, which demonstrate sophisticated and geographically responsive engineering solutions to water storage.

**Criterion (ii):** The three tels represent an interchange of human values throughout the ancient near-east, forged through extensive trade routes and alliances with other states and manifest in building styles which merged Egyptian, Syrian and Aegean influences to create a distinctive local style.

**Criterion (iii):** The three tels are a testimony to a civilization that has disappeared - that of the Cananean cities of the Bronze Age and the biblical cities of the Iron Age - manifests in their expressions of creativity: town planning, fortifications, palaces, and water collection technologies.

**Criterion (iv):** The Biblical cities reflect the key stages of urban development in the Levant, which exerted a powerful influence on later history of the region.

**Criterion (vi):** The three tels, through their mentions in the Bible, constitute a religious and spiritual testimony of Outstanding Universal Value.

**Integrity**

All components of the tels are included in the property. The three tels have preserved substantial remains of cities from the Bronze and Iron Age with biblical connection. Each tel relates to the overall property through its temples, fortifications and gate system, palaces, water systems, town planning and prominence in the Bible. None of the attributes are under threat.

**Authenticity**

All three tels have been generally left untouched and intact since their decline, and subsequent abandonment, between the 10th and 4th centuries BCE. Over time they have retained their authenticity, and acquired the characteristic appearance of a conical shape, with a flattish top, protruding above the surrounding countryside. From the beginning of the 20th century Tel Hazor and Tel Megiddo have been the subject of archaeological investigation, with Tel Beer Sheba being first excavated during the 1960's.

In the interests of safety and interpretation, some interventions have been made to the water systems at all three sites, but these do not seriously affect the authenticity of the overall system.

At Tel Hazor an unconventional approach was taken to dismantle and rebuild a storehouse and residential building elsewhere on site. These two Iron Age buildings had been excavated in the 1950's and had remained exposed to deterioration on an "island" as excavation work proceeded into earlier archaeological levels. This action was considered justified as it also permitted the completion of the site excavation, and the consolidation of earlier evidence around and beneath the two structures.

**Protection and management requirements**

The State of Israel owns the three tels. They are designated National Parks administered by the Israel Nature and Parks Authority (INPA), and protected under the 1998 National Parks, Nature Reserves, National Sites and Memorial Sites Law. Tel Megiddo and Tel Hazor are located in the Northern District, and Tel Beer Sheba in the Southern District, of the INPA.

The Planning and Development Forum of the Director General of INPA approves all significant plans regarding activities in the National Parks. In addition, there is an internal World Heritage Site Forum under the chairmanship of the Authority's Director of Archaeology and Heritage. This body coordinates and monitors activities at all the inscribed sites. It is also concerned with their management, and that of those on the Israel Tentative List.

In order to achieve a comparable conservation standard across the three sites that comprise the property a comprehensive conservation plan and monitoring programme is desirable.

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

(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

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

**2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised**

**2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value**

**3. Factors Affecting the Property**

**3.14. Other factor(s)**

**3.14.1 - Other factor(s)**

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact						Origin	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>								
3.1.2	Commercial development								
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure								
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities								
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>								
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure								
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure								
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>								
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses								
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage								
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>								
3.13.3	Management activities								
<b>Legend</b>	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside			

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

No factor is both current and negative.

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

A new interchange between routes 65 and 66 is planned. Some development is proposed within the buffer zone of Tel Megiddo. UNESCO Israel's representatives are involved in order to minimize the visual impact on Tel Megiddo.

## 4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

### 4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

#### 4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

#### 4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

#### 4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

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

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

#### 4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are **known** by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

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

## 4.2. Protective Measures

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

All three sites have been designated as National Parks. This status provides protection under the Heritage and National Sites Law, 1998.

As these are antiquities sites, they are protected by the Antiquities Law, 1978.

Megiddo Antiquities National Park was declared a national park on January 27, 1966 in Regulations Book 1830. The 18.6-hectare national park is subject to national and local master plans.

Tel Hazor National Park was declared a national park on November 9, 1967 in Regulations Book 21 31. The 76.1

hectare Hazor National Park is subject to national and local master plans.

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

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

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

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

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

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides an **adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

#### 4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?

There is **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

## 4.3. Management System / Management Plan

### 4.3.1 - Management System

The three tels that make up this serial site are owned by the State of Israel and are designated National Parks, administered by the Israel Nature and Parks Authority (INPA). Tel Megiddo and Tel Hazor come within the Northern District of INPA and Tel Beer Sheba in the Southern District. The Planning and Development Forum of the Director General of INPA approves all significant plans regarding activities in the National Parks. Additionally, there is an internal forum under the chairmanship of the Authority's Director of Archaeology and Heritage, which is concerned, with the management of actual and potential World Heritage sites.

Tel Beer Sheba National Park was declared a national park on December 18, 1986 in Regulations Booklet 4989. The site was opened to the public in 1992. The 18-hectare Beer Sheba National Park is subject to national and local master plans.

### 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 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 **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	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Good
Landowners	Not applicable
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Non-existent

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

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

**4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World**

**Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report**

**4.4. Financial and Human Resources**

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

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	0%
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Governmental (National / Federal)	95%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	0%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	5%
Other grants	0%

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

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

The available budget is **acceptable** but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs

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

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

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

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

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

There are **some** adequate equipment and facilities, but deficiencies in at least one key area **constrain** management at the World Heritage property

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

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

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

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

Full-time	100%
Part-time	0%

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

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	0%

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

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

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

Human resources are **adequate** for management needs

**4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines**

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

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

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

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

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

**4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects**

**4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?**

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient**

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

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

**4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?**

Research results are **shared widely** with the local, national and international audiences

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

**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	Excellent
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Average

**4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?**

There is a **planned and effective** education and awareness programme that contributes to the protection of the World Heritage property

**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	Adequate
----------------	----------

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

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

**4.7. Visitor Management**

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

Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Static
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
Tourism industry

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

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

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

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

There is **excellent 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 a **substantial contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

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

**4.8. Monitoring**

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

There is a **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	Not applicable
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Non-existent
Industry	Non-existent
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

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

Implementation is **complete**

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

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

**4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs**

**4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)**

Please refer to question 5.2

## **5. Summary and Conclusions**

### **5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property**

#### **5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property**

No factor is both current and negative.

### **5.2. Summary - Management Needs**

#### **5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs**

Answers provided have not outlined any serious management need.



**5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property**

**5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity**

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **preserved**

**5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity**

The integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

**5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value**

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **maintained**.

**5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values**

Other important cultural and / or natural values and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

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

**5.4.1 - Comments**

**6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise**

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

Conservation	Positive
Research and monitoring	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	No impact
International cooperation	No impact
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**

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

Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
Others

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

no

**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	Fair
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**

Monitoring and reporting
--------------------------

**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**

Automatically generated in online version

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

The monitoring team of the Israel National Commission for UNESCO was involved in the preparation of the report.