

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Defence Line of Amsterdam

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Netherlands

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

759

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
Fort Near Edam, Edam-Volendam (NH) , Netherlands	52.518 / 5.068	0	0	0	1996
Fort Near Kwadijk (never completed), Zeevang (NH) , Netherlands	52.528 / 5	0	0	0	1996
Fort north of Purmerend, Beemster (NH) , Netherlands	52.536 / 4.958	0	0	0	1996
Fort along Nekkerweg, Beemster (NH) , Netherlands	52.528 / 4.928	0	0	0	1996
Fort along Middenweg, Beemster (NH) , Netherlands	52.519 / 4.892	0	0	0	1996
Fort along Jisperweg, Beemster (NH) , Netherlands	52.524 / 4.866	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Spijkerboor, Beemster (NH) , Netherlands	52.541 / 4.841	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Marken-Binnen, Uitgeest (NH) , Netherlands	52.534 / 4.781	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Krommeniedijk, Uitgeest (NH) , Netherlands	52.517 / 4.743	0	0	0	1996
Fort along de Ham, Zaanstad (NH) , Netherlands	52.502 / 4.736	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Veldhuis, Heemskerk (NH) , Netherlands	52.498 / 4.705	0	0	0	1996
Fort along the St. Aagtendijk, Beverwijk (NH) , Netherlands	52.478 / 4.684	0	0	0	1996
Fort Zuidwijkermeer, Beverwijk (NH) , Netherlands	52.455 / 4.683	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Velsen, Beverwijk (NH) , Netherlands	52.464 / 4.666	0	0	0	1996
Coastal Fort near Ijmuiden, Velsen (NH) , Netherlands	52.465 / 4.576	0	0	0	1996

Fort north of Spaardam, Velsen (NH) , Netherlands	52.423 / 4.679	0	0	0	1996
Fort south of Spaardam, Haarlem (NH) , Netherlands	52.412 / 4.672	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Penningsveer, Haarlemmerliede (NH) , Netherlands	52.391 / 4.678	0	0	0	1996
Fort near the Liebrug, Haarlemmerliede (NH) , Netherlands	52.385 / 4.688	0	0	0	1996
Fort de Liede, Haarlemmerliede (NH) , Netherlands	52.38 / 4.69	0	0	0	1996
Fort Bij Heemstede, Haarlemmermeer (NH) , Netherlands	52.337 / 4.632	0	0	0	1996
Advanced defense at Vijfhuizen, Haarlemmermeer (NH) , Netherlands	52.341 / 4.655	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Vijfhuizen, Haarlemmermeer (NH) , Netherlands	52.348 / 4.67	0	0	0	1996
Battery along Ijweg, Haarlemmermeer (NH) , Netherlands	52.324 / 4.677	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Hoofddorp, Haarlemmermeer (NH) , Netherlands	52.302 / 4.685	0	0	0	1996
Battery along Sloteweg, Haarlemmermeer (NH) , Netherlands	52.286 / 4.704	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Aalsmeer, Haarlemmermeer (NH) , Netherlands	52.268 / 4.735	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Kudelstaart, Aalsmeer (NH) , Netherlands	52.248 / 4.757	0	0	0	1996
Fort near de Kwakel, Uithoorn (NH) , Netherlands	52.237 / 4.79	0	0	0	1996
Fort along the Drecht, Uithoorn (NH) , Netherlands	52.229 / 4.814	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Uithoorn, De Ronde Venen (UT) , Netherlands	52.228 / 4.838	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Wavel-Amstel, De Ronde Venen (UT) , Netherlands	52.249 / 4.87	0	0	0	1996
Fort in the Waver-Botshol (never completed), Abcoude (UT) , Netherlands	52.251 / 4.911	0	0	0	1996
Fort along De Winkel (never completed), Abcoude (UT) , Netherlands	52.256 / 4.958	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Abcoude, Abcoude (UT) , Netherlands	52.27 / 4.981	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Nigtevecht, Abcoude (UT) , Netherlands	52.275 / 5.017	0	0	0	1996
Fort near Hinderdam, Weesp (NH) , Netherlands	52.284 / 5.059	0	0	0	1996
Fort Uitermeer, Weesp (NH) , Netherlands	52.293 / 5.082	0	0	0	1996

## Periodic Report - Second Cycle














## Section II-Defence Line of Amsterdam

Weesp Fortress - Defensive tower on the Ossensmarket, Weesp (NH) , Netherlands	52.305 / 5.043	0	0	0	1996
Muiden Fortress, Muiden (NH) , Netherlands	52.33 / 5.069	0	0	0	1996
Muiden west battery, Muiden (NH) , Netherlands	52.336 / 5.067	0	0	0	1996
Fort Kijkuit, 's-Graveland (NH) , Netherlands	52.236 / 5.059	0	0	0	1996
Battery near the IJ before Diemerdam, Diemen (NH) , Netherlands	52.343 / 5.014	0	0	0	1996
Fort along the Pampus, Muiden (NH) , Netherlands	52.365 / 5.069	0	0	0	1996
Battery near the IJ before Durgerdam, Amsterdam (NH) , Netherlands	52.372 / 5.013	0	0	0	1996
<b>Total (ha)</b>			<b>0</b>		

### Comment

In the second half of the year 2013 a boundary clarification of the Defence Line of Amsterdam will be supplied. In this document we will give more geographical information about the extend of the Defence Line of Amsterdam. As has been reported before in a clarification of boundaries that was part of the Retrospective Inventory Project , Fort Kijkuit in 's-Graveland is NOT a fort of the Defence Line of Amsterdam, but belongs to the Nieuwe Hollandse Waterlinie, which is on the Tentative List!

### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Defence Line of Amsterdam - Map of the inscribed property showing Fort #01	29/09/1995	
Defence Line of Amsterdam - Map of the inscribed property showing Forts # 02, 03, 04, 05	29/09/1995	
Defence Line of Amsterdam - Map of the inscribed property showing Forts # 06, 07, 08, 09, 10	29/09/1995	
Defence Line of Amsterdam - Map of the inscribed property showing Fort # 11	29/09/1995	
Defence Line of Amsterdam - Map of the inscribed property showing Forts # 12, 14, 13, 16	29/09/1995	
Defence Line of Amsterdam - Map of the inscribed property showing Forts # 16, 17, 18, 19, 20	29/09/1995	
Defence Line of Amsterdam - Map of the inscribed property showing Forts #23, 24	29/09/1995	
Defence Line of Amsterdam - Map of the inscribed property showing Forts #24, 25, 26	29/09/1995	
Defence Line of Amsterdam - Map of the inscribed property showing Fort #27	29/09/1995	
Defence Line of Amsterdam - Map of the inscribed property showing Forts # 28, 29, 30, 31, 32	29/09/1995	
Defence Line of Amsterdam - Map of the inscribed property showing Forts # 33, 34	29/09/1995	
Defence Line of Amsterdam - Map of the inscribed property showing Forts #35, 36	29/09/1995	
Defence Line of Amsterdam - Map of the inscribed property showing Forts # 37, 38, 39, 40, 41	29/09/1995	

### Comment

In the second half of the year 2013 a boundary clarification of the Defence Line of Amsterdam will be supplied. In this document we will give more geographical information about the extend of the Defence Line of Amsterdam.

### 1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Rene Wokke  
Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands  
National Focal Point for Periodic Reporting

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

- Nanette Van Goor  
Province of Noord-Holland Defence Line of Amsterdam  
Ms  
Programme Bureau

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

- [Patrimonium-mundi.org](http://Patrimonium-mundi.org) : visit this site in [panophotographies - immersive and interactive spherical images](#)
- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- ["Herstelling" Foundation \(dutch only\)](#)
- [The City of Amsterdam \(dutch only\)](#)
- [Stichting Platform Werelderfgoed Nederland](#)
- [Defence Line of Amsterdam. A citywall of water](#)
- [De Stelling van Amsterdam \(Provincie Noord-Holland\) \(dutch only\)](#)

### Comment

The website of the property itself is "www.stellingvanamsterdam.nl". Please use only this website. The other websites named above (3, 4, 6) are of partner-organisations, but not the official website. This website is in Dutch, German and English. And from 2013 on also in French.

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

#### Comment

The fortresses of Velsen, Kudelstaart, Uithoorn, Waver-Amstel, Winkel, Botshol, Abcoude, Nigtevecht, Hinderdam, Uitermeer, the fortresses of Weesp and Muiden, the Westbattery and fort Pampus, are protected as a state monument by the national Monuments and Historic Buildings Act. All the other forts, sluices etc. (parts of the Defence Line) are protected by the provincial ordinance. The site as a whole (landscape) is protected by national spatial policy.

## 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

### 2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

#### Comment

In 2012 the '(Retrospective) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of The Defence Line of Amsterdam' was sent to the World Heritage Centre. The rSoOUV has not been determined yet. The text of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is too long for this box, so we refer to the Statement that is already in your possession.

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

(ii)(iv)(v)

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

Criterion ii: man-made and for the most part still open landscape nearby the city of Amsterdam. Criterion iv: outstanding example of ring of forts. Hydraulic works for military purposes. A surviving example of a permanent defensive structure. Use of concrete as building material (new use). Criterion v: the use of already existing dikes, sluices and the low lying landscape is typical for this site.

**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>								
3.1.1	Housing								
3.1.3	Industrial areas								
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								
3.2.3	Marine transport infrastructure								
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>								
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities								
3.3.5	Major linear utilities								
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>								
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals								
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Other human activities</b>								
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage								
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>								
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities								
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

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
<b>3.1 Buildings and Development</b>					
<b>3.1.1 Housing</b>	localised	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
<b>3.1.3 Industrial areas</b>	localised	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	static
<b>3.1.4 Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure</b>	extensive	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	increasing
<b>3.3 Services Infrastructures</b>					
<b>3.3.5 Major linear utilities</b>	localised	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	increasing
<b>3.9 Other human activities</b>					
<b>3.9.2 Deliberate destruction of heritage</b>	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	no capacity and / or resources	static

### 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 **no buffer zone**, and it is not needed

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

The boundaries of the World Heritage property **do not limit** the ability to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value but they could be improved

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

The property had **no buffer zone** at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

#### 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 property had **no buffer zone** at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

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

The management authority works with slightly different boundaries than those that were inscribed in 1996. This is one of the reasons why we have agreed upon presenting a boundary clarification and directly after a minor boundary modification later this year.

## 4.2. Protective Measures

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

**Note WHC (July 2012): Please carefully review and update the information provided below.**

#### Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Tuesday, November 22, 2005

- **Question 6.02**

- The Stelling van Amsterdam counts 125 buildings and structures that are protected by the Province of Noord-Holland by virtue of its Provincial Monuments Bye-Law

(Provinciale Monumentenverordening) and more than 25 protected components protected by virtue of the 1988 Monuments Act (Monumentenwet 1988)

- The following cityscapes and townscapes protected by virtue of the 1988 Monuments Act are situated entirely or partly within the area of the Stelling: Edam, Middenbeemster, Spaarndam, Abcoude, Weesp and Muiden

- The Province of Noord-Holland has officially stated that it sees no reason to designate the Stelling van Amsterdam as a protected scape on the basis of the 1988 Monuments Act (under Art. 35)

- The Space/Space for Development Document (Nota Ruimte. Ruimte voor ontwikkeling) published in 2004 by the Ministry for Housing, Regional Development and the Environment (VROM), the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature And Food Quality (LNV), the Ministry of Transport and Public Works (V&W), and the Ministry of Economic Affairs (EZ), specifies the Stelling van Amsterdam as one of 20 National Landscapes in the Netherlands.

The Stelling van Amsterdam is of international significance and as such designated a National Landscape.

'National Landscapes' are described in the Space Document as 'areas with landscape qualities that are rare or unique from an international perspective, characteristic from a national perspective and special from a natural and recreational perspective. Qualities that are important to the landscape, cultural history and nature of national landscapes must be preserved, managed sustainably and strengthened where possible...' (also see 01.03, 03.02, 05.01).

The part of the Stelling that lies within World Heritage 'Beemster Polder' (the part between Fort Benoorden Purmerend-Fort and the Fort at Spijkerboor) is also part of National Landscape 'Laag-Holland' ('Noord-Hollands-Midden').

The southern part of the Stelling is also part of National Landscape 'Groene Hart' as stated in the Space Document.

The eastern side of the Stelling coincides with National Landscape 'Nieuw Hollandse Waterlinie' (New Inundation Defence Line and included on the Tentative List of the Netherlands).

The Space Document describes the 'key qualities' of National Landscape Stelling van Amsterdam as follows: —a coherent system of forts, dikes, canals and inundation basins;

- a green and relatively 'quiet' ring around Amsterdam;
- a relatively expansive open area, and those of Laag-Holland (Noord-Hollands Midden) as follows:

- an expansive open area.

The document emphasizes that part of the Stelling is located within this National Landscape (in De Beemster). The Space Document mentions the 'vast open expanse' as one of the 'key qualities' of National Landscape 'Groene Hart'.

The document also states that 'the northern and eastern parts of the 'Groene Hart' ('Green Heart of Holland') include important cultural historical values of the Stelling van Amsterdam (which has been inscribed on UNESCO's World Heritage List) and the Hollandse Waterlinie'.

The national government acts as one of the 'area partners' in specifying the National Landscapes.

-Regional Plan for Southern Noord-Holland (Streekplan Noord-Holland Zuid) (Province of Noord-Holland, 2003). Based on the Spatial Planning Act (Wet op de Ruimtelijke Ordening) Provinces may draw up regional plans outlining the 'future development of the area as included in the plan' (Art. 4a, sub 1).

The Regional Plan for Southern Noord-Holland, which was drawn up in 2003, applies to the area in which most of the Stelling is situated.

The Province of Noord-Holland commissioned H+N+S Landschapsarchitecten to submit a 'translation' for a spatial plan that would be carried out for the future development and conservation of the Stelling area. The ensuing organizational paper entitled 'A slow moving outer ring in the fast moving metropole' ('Een langzame buitenring in de snelle metropool') (2001) was used to draw up the regional plan for the Stelling van Amsterdam. A precondition for the study was that the area was not to undergo any extensive reorganization but that its subtle relationship with the cultural landscape was to be taken into account, the latter needing to be made more distinctive.

The objectives for the future of the Stelling as contained in the Regional Plan (up to the year 2030) are:  
 - to conserve the spatial relationship between the various (partially protected) components of the Stelling of Amsterdam;  
 - to enhance the monument's identity and practical use

By 2020 the Province of Noord-Holland wishes to have achieved that:  
 - Both Dutch and foreign visitors perceive the Stelling van Amsterdam as a recognisable, coherent area with some specific features and that the area has been enhanced by adding new land and water functions. The Regional Plan specifies the scale and nature of these functions  
 - Most of the fort buildings are easily accessible to the public  
 - More efficient use is made of the Stelling and that new commercial activities have been implemented that, together with improved accessibility to the public, form a demonstrable financial impetus for the Stelling area  
 - There is at least one location in each of the three subareas of the Stelling (Northern Edge ('Noordrand'); West side ('Westflank'); River Vecht and Lake District ('Vecht- en Plassengebied')) where the history and the operation of the Stelling as well as its present-day values can be shown (virtually and/or physically). One location is to be the national/international visitors centre  
 - Most of the characteristic parts of the Stelling – main defence line, fort sites, 'kringenwet' farms (the 'Kringenwet' (Circle Act) permitted the construction of wooden farmhouses within the circle of the fort's field of fire), inundation works and (parts of) the inundation areas – are easy to get to and connected by various recreational routes  
 - The Stelling as a World Heritage is of true significance to the spatial planning around the capital city (Amsterdam) and the characteristic parts of the Stelling are permanently safeguarded through the use of their space and are specified from a planning perspective  
 - The characteristic parts of the Stelling are managed and run sustainably.

The Area Programme for the Stelling van Amsterdam, 2005-2008 (Gebiedsprogramma Stelling van Amsterdam, 2005-2008), was drawn up by the Province of Noord-Holland in 2005. It details the spatial policy for this historic defence line as outlined in the Regional Plan for the Stelling for 2005 to 2008 (also see 05.05, 05.13, 07.02, 08.02, 08.10).

- National Ecological Network (Ecologische Hoofdstructuur – EHS)

Parts of the Stelling situated in the Province of Noord-Holland are also part of the Provincial Ecological Network (PEHS) (1992, updated in 2003), particularly the northern part.  
 In the year 2000, 'nature reserve plans' were drawn up for some parts of the Stelling within the scope of a state regulation called 'Programme Management' ('Programma Beheer'). The relevant parts are that of Eastern Central Holland ('Holland-Midden-Oost'); Western Central Holland ('Holland-Midden-West'); North Sea Canal South ('Noordzeekanaal-Zuid'); Vecht and Gooi districts ('Vechtstreek en Gooi')

-Regional Plan for Utrecht, 2005 – 2015 (Streekplan Utrecht 2005-2015) (Province of Utrecht, 2004)

In 2003, the Province of Utrecht established its 'Cultural-Historical Network' ('Cultuurhistorische Hoofdstructuur - CHS') comprising related, historically valuable structures whose importance exceeds local boundaries.

The regional plan contains areas marked with: 'safeguard: cultural history important for its development'. The Province wishes to 'prevent large-scale transformations from a cultural history perspective. Changes to appearance and characteristic are unwelcome, unless it can be proven that the strength of the cultural-historical coherence is not at issue.' The following condition has been set: 'cultural history gives direction to the possibilities for new developments'. According to the regional plan this condition applies to the part of the Stelling van Amsterdam that lies in the Province of Utrecht.

The Province has drawn up the Multiannual Regional Plan Programme 2005-2007 (Meerjarenprogramma Streekplan 2005-2007) for this regional plan:

Municipal zoning plans

Approximately 110 zoning plans apply within the Stelling area. These have been drawn up by the municipalities on the basis of the Spatial Planning Act (Wet op de Ruimtelijke Ordening). 80 zoning plans apply within the Province of Noord-Holland, more than 30 plans apply within the Province of Utrecht

**Comment**

The text above is partly outdated. But the goals for 2020 we want to achieve are the same. The site management has a new plan for the period 2014-2016 for the Defence Line and also the spatial rules have changed. By the end of 2013 a new management plan for the Defence Line of Amsterdam will be in place and sent to UNESCO WHC. In the management plan the new rules and plans will be updated. So is the case in the rSoOUV.



**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 property had **no buffer zone at the time of inscription** on the World Heritage List

**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**

**Note WHC (July 2012):** If a more recent management plan is in force, we will very much appreciate it if you could provide its 2 paper and electronic copies to the WHC. The submission should be accompanied by a cover letter to DIR/WHC. Thank you for your cooperation.

**Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2**

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

Submitted on Tuesday, November 22, 2005

- **Question 5.04** Plans in place to set up a "steering group: No plans are being made. The Provincial Government of Noord-Holland is considering organizing governmental joint ventures
- **Question 5.05**  
Overall management system of the site
  - Other effective management system  
Project Centre for the Stelling van Amsterdam manages the Stelling on behalf of the Province of Noord-Holland (also see 04.07). The Centre is run by the member of the Provincial Executive who is in charge of the Culture portfolio and responsible for the Stelling van Amsterdam. Its detailing is based on the Area Programme 2005-2008 (Gebiedsprogramma 2005-2008) which was approved by the Provincial States in 2005 (also see 05.13, 06.02, 07.02, 08.02, 08.10)

**Comment**

Concerning question 5.05: In 2009 a new Area Programme for The Defence Line of Amsterdam has been approved for the period 2009-2013. At the moment, the management authority is working on a new Area Programme for the period 2014-2016. And in 2013 a management plan for the property will be drawn up.

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

**Comment**

In 2013 a management plan for the property will be drawn up and approved by the siteholder.

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

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

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

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

**4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?**

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

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

An annual work / action plan exists and **many activities** are being implemented

**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	Not applicable
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Fair
Researchers	Not applicable
Tourism industry	Fair
Industry	Not applicable

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

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

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

**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)	10%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	50%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	10%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	
Other grants	30%

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

**Comment**

Till now we have never received international assistance from the World Heritage Fund.

**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?**

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 **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**

Regarding question 4.4.1: Costs related to conservation are (in the case of the Defence Line of Amsterdam) also paid by private investments. For instance: when a fort is restored, there is often also a private investor who pays a part (and starts a business in the fort). Approximately 30% of the costs of conservation and restoration is paid by private investments. Relating question 4.4.4.1: sources of funding are not secure, because of economy measures and changing rules.

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

Full-time	50%
Part-time	50%

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

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	

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

Paid	100%
Volunteer	

**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	Poor
Promotion	Fair
Community outreach	Non-existent
Interpretation	Fair
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Non-existent
Conservation	Fair
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Poor

**4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines**

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



## Periodic Report - Second Cycle

### 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 **partially implemented**; some technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally **but most of the technical work is carried out by external staff**

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

Questions 4.4.9, 4.4.10 and 4.4.11 have been answered from the point of view of the programme bureau, at which there are 8 people working (4,2 fulltime employment). All the volunteer work at the Defence Line of Amsterdam is not considered in the answering of this question, neither the effort of people working for owners of property or working for other governmental authorities (like the local governments).

## 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 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 participants and some national agencies**

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

Evaluation of the management of the site Defence Line of Amsterdam - Provincie of North-Holland, 2012; Constructional report of the minor parts of the Defence Line of Amsterdam - Bouwadvies Groot Holland, 2012. Constructional report of the 15 forts of the Defence Line of Amsterdam - Bouwadvies Groot Holland, 2013.

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

The conclusion of the evaluation was that the management of the site was well equipped and need to be continued; The recommendation in the constructional report is that some parts of the defence line need consolidation. The costs fore the work needed are estimated.

## 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

## Section II-Defence Line of Amsterdam

### 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	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 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	Excellent
Site museum	Not needed
Information booths	Not needed
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	Static
Two years ago	Static
Three years ago	Static
Four years ago	Static
Five years ago	Static

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

Entry tickets and registries
Accommodation establishments
Visitor surveys

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**Comment**

There is no separate visitor management document. The goal to receive more visitors has been described in the programme for the years 2009-2013.

**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?**

There is **some management** of the visitor use of the World Heritage property

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

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

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

The fee is collected, but it makes **no 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**

question 4.7.2.1: some forts of the Defence Line sell entry tickets, but these figures provide limited information on the total amount of the visitors of the Defence Line as a whole. question 4.7.2.2: in several forts there are restaurants, congress-facilities and in one fort is a hotel. These forts can provide data about the use of the accommodations. question 4.7.6: some forts collect fees, but the money goes to exploitation of that particular fort.

**4.8. Monitoring**

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

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

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

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient and key indicators have been defined but **monitoring the status of indicators could be improved**

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

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Average
Local / Municipal authorities	Average
Local communities	Not applicable
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Not applicable
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**

**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	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>						
<b>3.1.4</b>	<b>Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure</b>	Criterion iv could be affected (damage to a fort because it gets a new function)	For the development of major visitor accommodation at the site itself there are licences needed. Local government and siteholder look after that.	No info	No info	Local government and regional government (also siteholder)	The development of major visitor accommodation, such as hotels/restaurants, in or nearby the site can have a positive (more tourists, more knowledge of the site) and negative (more use, probably more damage of the site and his constructions?) impact
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Other human activities</b>						
<b>3.9.2</b>	<b>Deliberate destruction of heritage</b>	Criterion iv (the buildings/objects) could be affected by graffiti.	No info	No direct monitoring. Reporting by owner.	No info	Owners of the different parts of the Defence Line could detect this and report for instance graffiti.	No info

### 5.2. Summary - Management Needs

#### 5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

<b>4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones</b>						
	Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
<b>4.1.2</b>	<b>Boundaries could be improved</b>	At the end of 2013 the State Party and the siteholder will sent a plan to UNESCO WHC for improvement of the boundaries of this site.	Plan will be send to UNESCO at the end of 2013. Implementation in 2014?	State Party and siteholder	No comments.	
<b>4.1.4</b>	<b>The boundaries of the World Heritage property are not known by local residents / communities / landowners</b>	By providing detailed information we want the residents/communities/landowners to be known with the boundaries.	Goal for program 2014-2016	siteholder (province of North-Holland)	no comments	
<b>4.4 Financial and Human Resources</b>						
<b>4.4.13</b>	<b>Promotion</b>	Try to make financial and human resources solid	2014-2016 (time of new plan)	State Party, siteholder, regional and local governments, owners	In this economical period it is difficult to make financial and human resources longlasting and solid. The best we could do is, with al the parties involved, to try to make financial and human resources solid.	
<b>4.7 Visitor Management</b>						
<b>4.7.4</b>	<b>Some management of visitor use of the property but this could be improved</b>	At one hand we try to attract more people to this site by iproviding nformation/communication. At the other hand we will have to manage the visitors at parts of the site that are the most busiest.	2014-2016 (time of new plan)	siteholder (province of North-Holland) together with the owners and local governments.	No comments	
<b>4.7.5</b>	<b>There is little or no contact with the tourism industry</b>	We will strengthen our contacts with the tourism industry.	2014-2016 (time of plan)	siteholder (province of North-Holland) together with owners and other parties involved (like Werelderfgoed.nl)	No comments.	

### 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	No impact
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	Very positive
Legal / Policy framework	Very positive
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
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

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff

#### 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

Some questions need more explanation. The multiple choice questions are not always adequate. Categories are limited. Could be broader and more consequent. Sometimes too less space in boxes for an adequate answer. Sometimes some strange connections between answer and conclusions.

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

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	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 property's Outstanding Universal Value
Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

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

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
Advisory Bodies	Satisfactory

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

- Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**  
 Reason for update: In 2012 the '(Retrospective) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of The Defence Line of Amsterdam' was sent to the World Heritage Centre. The rSoOUV has not been determined yet. The text of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is too long for this box, so we refer to the Statement that is already in your possession.
- Geographic Information Table**  
 Reason for update: In the second half of the year 2013 a boundary clarification of the Defence Line of Amsterdam will be supplied. In this document we will give more geographical information about the extend of the Defence Line of Amsterdam. As has been reported before in a clarification of boundaries that was part of the Retrospective Inventory Project , Fort Kijkuit in 's-Graveland is NOT a fort of the Defence Line of Amsterdam, but belongs to the Nieuwe Hollandse Waterlinie, which is on the Tentative List!
- Map(s)**  
 Reason for update: In the second half of the year 2013 a boundary clarification of the Defence Line of Amsterdam will be supplied. In this document we will give more geographical information about the extend of the Defence Line of Amsterdam.

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