

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Montenegro

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

125

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor	42.483 / 18.7	14600	0	14600	1979
Total (ha)		14600	0	14600	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor - Map of the inscribed property	12/09/1979	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Branislav Mićunović
Ministry of Culture
Minister of Culture

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Ruzica Ivanovic
Organization Directorate for Conservation of Cultural Properties
Director of Territorial Unit in Kotor

Comment

Directorate for Conservation of Cultural Properties Anastazija Miranovic Palata Drago, Stari grad 85330 Kotor Montenegro
Telephone: 00382 32 325 833 Fax: 00382 32 302 572

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
2. [Historical Archives Kotor](#)
3. [Official web site of the City of Kotor](#)
4. [Virtual Tour of Kotor](#)
5. [Photographs of Kotor \(Historical Archives Kotor\)](#)
6. [Region of Kotor, Yugoslavia \(History Channel\)](#)

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

SOU is adopted on the last UNESCO General Assembly, Doha 2014.

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

(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

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	
3.1	Buildings and Development								
3.1.1	Housing								
3.1.2	Commercial development								
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure								
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure								
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure								
3.2.3	Marine transport infrastructure								
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure								
3.3	Services Infrastructures								
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities								
3.3.4	Localised utilities								
3.4	Pollution								
3.4.1	Pollution of marine waters								
3.4.2	Ground water pollution								
3.4.3	Surface water pollution								
3.4.4	Air pollution								
3.4.5	Solid waste								
3.5	Biological resource use/modification								
3.5.2	Aquaculture								
3.5.3	Land conversion								
3.6	Physical resource extraction								
3.6.2	Quarrying								
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric								
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)								
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								
3.9	Other human activities								
3.9.1	Illegal activities								
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage								
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events								
3.11.2	Earthquake								
3.11.4	Avalanche/ landslide								
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)								
3.13	Management and institutional factors								
3.13.3	Management activities								
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside			

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.1 Buildings and Development					
3.1.4 Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.2 Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.3 Marine transport infrastructure	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	static
3.2.4 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.3 Services Infrastructures					
3.3.4 Localised utilities	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.4 Pollution					
3.4.1 Pollution of marine waters	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.4.2 Ground water pollution	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.4.3 Surface water pollution	restricted	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	static
3.4.5 Solid waste	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.5 Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.3 Land conversion	extensive	frequent	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.6 Physical resource extraction					
3.6.2 Quarrying	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.6 Water (rain/water table)	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.8 Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.2 Society's valuing of heritage	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.8.4 Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	extensive	frequent	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.8.6 Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	extensive	frequent	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.9 Other human activities					
3.9.1 Illegal activities	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	decreasing

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 the management authority but are **not known by local residents / communities / landowners**.

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

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

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

4.2. Protective Measures

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

The 1991 Montenegro Act for the Protection of Cultural Monuments was followed up by the 1992 amendments to the Decree on Registering of Cultural Monuments, to the Decree on Regulating Conditions of Archaeological Surveys and to the Ordinance on conditions for performing, professional works and mode of professional examinations in the field of protection of cultural monuments. Instruments of protection include the 1979 Decision of the Municipality of Kotor, which declared the World Heritage site (which comprises a number of surrounding settlements) as being of special natural, cultural and historical significance, and the 1981 Decision on General Conditions for Construction in the Protected Area. In 1991, a special Law on the Renewal of the Protected Kotor Area was prepared, but its provisions have never been properly applied and in 1997 a Ruling on the Organization of

Development of Towns and Settlements in the Region of Kotor was adopted.

A few legal instruments have been applied to the site over the past few years, notably the Government of the Republic of Montenegro Act (2005), the Spatial Planning and Organisation Law (2005), the Kotor Municipal Assembly Decision (2006) and the Law on Coastal Zone (2008). Under the 1991 law, the site is administered as an "urban cultural monument", "first class", World Heritage. The law also defines the site's boundaries, which correspond to those drawn up when the cultural property was inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Monday, November 21, 2005

• Question 6.02

There is a special law for the protection of Natural and culturo-historical Region of Kotor, but not specific spatial planning and zoning.

Comment

The new Law on the protection of cultural heritage from 2010
The new Law on the protection of WHS Kotor from 2013

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

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

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

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

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

An **adequate** legal framework exists for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone, but **there are some deficiencies in its implementation** which undermine the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the property

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

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

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

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

Different institutions are responsible for Kotor World Heritage site, including the Ministry for Tourism and Environment, Ministry for Culture, and its two specialized institutes, the Republic Institute for Cultural Heritage and the Regional Institute for Cultural Heritage of Kotor and Ministry for Economic Development and at the local and regional level. The area covered by the site is governed by the following plans: the "Southern Adriatic" Plan (1969), which covers the whole area as the basis for lower-level spatial planning; the Spatial Plan of Montenegro, which was submitted to the parliament in 2008 with a view to its adoption as law; the Project for the Special Use of Maritime Property (2007), which comprises a 6m to 1km wide strip of land running the length of the coast; Spatial Plan of the Municipality of Kotor (1987); General Urban Plan covering part of the Kotor Bay area (Kotor, Skaljari, Muo, Dobrota); detailed elaboration plans for almost all of the urban areas around the bay. In fact, various different levels of plans cover almost the whole of the site. The Regional Institute is putting forward preliminary studies, defining the conservation criteria regarding old buildings, to form part of these plans.

A draft management plan was developed in 2007.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Monday, November 21, 2005

• **Question 5.04** Plans in place to set up a "steering group: should be defined in Management plan

• **Question 5.05**

Overall management system of the site

- Management by the State Party
- Management under protective legislation

Comment

Management Plan is updated and adopted in 2011.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Plan d'action pour la campagne internationale pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel du Montenegro ravage par un seisme, 1979	N/A	Available	01/00/1979	
Plan d'Action pour la Campaign internationale pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel du Montenegro ravagé par us seisme	N/A	Available	01/01/1979	
ARELATE. Colonia Julia Paterna Arelate Sextanorum. Déclaration d'intention	N/A	Available	01/01/1993	
Management Plan Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor	N/A	Available	01/01/2007	
Plan de gestion du site du patrimoine mondial de la contrée naturelle et culturo-historique de Kotor	In Force	Available	01/12/2011	

Comment

Management Plan Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor, 2011

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?

No annual work / action plan exists **despite an identified need**

4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following

Local communities / residents	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Poor
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Poor
Visitors	Fair
Researchers	Fair
Tourism industry	Fair
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 **little or no contact** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

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

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)	
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	
Governmental (National / Federal)	65%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	25%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	10%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	
Other grants	

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

Title	Year	Amount	Link to source
Emergency assistance for the natural and culturo-historical region of Kotor after the earthquake	1979	20000.00	
Equipment for the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments in Kotor for pursuit of conservation activities in Kotor	1982	50000.00	
Consultation on excavations at Dubrovnik Cathedral	1988	2000.00	
Total		72000	

Comment

Consultation on excavations at Dubrovnik Cathedral-mistake, Dubrovnik is the WHS in Croatia Participation Programme 2002/2003- 20.000 Participation Programme 2004/.2005- 20.000 Participation Programme 2010/2011- 25.000

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?

Existing sources of funding are **not secure**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Full-time	100%
Part-time	

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

Permanent	50%
Seasonal	50%

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

Paid	100%
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	Poor
Promotion	Fair
Community outreach	Fair
Interpretation	Fair
Education	Poor
Visitor management	Fair
Conservation	Poor
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Poor
Tourism	Fair
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	Medium
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	Low
Education	Low
Visitor management	Medium
Conservation	Low
Administration	Medium
Risk preparedness	Medium
Tourism	Medium
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Medium

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

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

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

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

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

Knowledge about the World Heritage property is **not sufficient**

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

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

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

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

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

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

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	Non-existent
Local landowners	Average
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 **limited and ad hoc** education and awareness programme

4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has **partially influenced** education, information and awareness building activities

4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?

The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is **not adequately** presented and interpreted

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	Adequate
Information booths	Poor
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Poor
Transportation facilities	Poor
Other	

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	Minor Increase
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
Transportation services
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 **not being actively managed** despite an identified need

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

There is contact between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry but this is largely **confined to administrative or regulatory matters**

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

4.8. Monitoring

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

There is a **small amount** of monitoring, but it is not planned

4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient to define key indicators, **but this has not been done**

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

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

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

Implementation is **underway**

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

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

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

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

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

	World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.1	Buildings and Development					
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure					
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure					
3.5	Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.3	Land conversion					
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage					
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system					
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation					

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.2 Protective Measures						
	Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.2.5	Major deficiencies in capacity / resources to enforce legislation					
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building						
4.6.3	There is a limited education and awareness programme					
4.8 Monitoring						
4.8.1	Some monitoring, but it is not planned					

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 **compromised** by factors described in this report

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property has been **compromised** by factors described in this report

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

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **impacted** by factors described in this report, but this situation is being **addressed through effective management actions**.

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values are being **partially degraded** but the state of conservation of the World Heritage property has not been significantly impacted

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

5.4.1 - Comments

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

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

Conservation	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	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

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	Good
State Party Representative	Good
Advisory Body	Fair

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

Not all of the required information was accessible

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

The World Heritage Convention
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
Monitoring and reporting

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

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Unsatisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Satisfactory

6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

- **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**

Reason for update: SOU is adopted on the last UNESCO General Assembly, Doha 2014.

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