

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Mill Network at Kinderdijk-Elshout

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Netherlands

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

818

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Mill Network at Kinderdijk-Elshout	51.883 / 4.649	0	0	0	1997
Total (ha)			0		

Comment

Property = 322 ha; see rSoOUV.

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Kinderdijk-Elshout, gemeenten Nieuw-Lekkerland en Alblasserdam. Toelichting bij het besluit tot aanwijzing van het molencomplex te Kinderdijk-Elshout als beschermd dorpsgezicht.	28/06/1996	
Mill Network at Kinderdijk-Elshout, scale 1:25,000	28/06/1996	

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

- Hans Hofstede
Kinderdijk World Heritage Foundation
Mr

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- Patrimonium-mundi.org : visit this site in [panophotographies - immersive and interactive spherical images](#)
- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- [Stichting Werelderfgoed Kinderdijk](#)
- [Kinderdijk \(Kinderdijk Promotions\)](#)
- [Werelderfgoed in Nederland \(dutch only\)](#)
- [Stichting Platform Werelderfgoed Nederland](#)

Section II-Mill Network at Kinderdijk-Elshout

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

Comment

See question 4.2.1

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

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

(i)(ii)(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		
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities		
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure		
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure		
3.2.3	Marine transport infrastructure		
3.3	Services Infrastructures		
3.3.1	Water infrastructure		
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric		
3.7.2	Relative humidity		
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage		
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system		
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation		
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
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure				
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	restricted	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric				
3.7.2	Relative humidity	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	high capacity

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

3.17.1 - Comments

Humidity affects the bricks and wood of some of the 8 brick windmills. The management of the site has contacted the Technical University of Delft for research and solutions to the problem.

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 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 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 both the management authority and 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

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**

-With respect to spatial planning, the site is a protected townscape ('beschermd dorpsgezicht') under article 35 of the 1988 Monuments Act (Monumentenwet 1988), which means that it is subject to a compulsory and specific (hence protective) zoning plan developed for it by the

municipality (article 36)

-On the basis of the 'Municipal Zoning Plan for the Rural Area of Nieuw-Lekkerland' (Bestemmingsplan Buitengebied Nieuw-Lekkerland), the municipal executive can stipulate additional requirements in relation to :
-situating the buildings, to the extent this is necessary to achieve a proper fit in the landscape'

-Since 2 September 2005, the 'Preliminary Zoning Plan for the Rural Area (Voorontwerp Bestemmingsplan Landelijk Gebied) has been available for general inspection in the municipality of Alblasserdam, where the Blokweer polder is located.
Subsequent action will take place in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Spatial Planning Act (Wet op de Ruimtelijke Ordening)

-Under the Nature Conservancy Act (Natuurbeschermingswet), the higher reservoirs (hoge boezems) are protected nature reserves covering an area of some 175 hectares. These include the Hoge Boezem Nederwaard, with an area of about 71 hectares, most of which is used to grow reeds, but the remaining 16 hectares are open water. There are also the Hoge Boezem Overwaard, which is marshy for the most part, and the Hoge Boezem Nieuw-Lekkerland. ('Kinderdijk Reservoirs' (Boezems Kinderdijk), 22 February 1989, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, NMF-89-1258, Government Gazette (Staatscourant)1989 (43)).

Consequently, in these areas motor vessels are not allowed to be operated without a permit and trash is not allowed to be burned.

-Under the terms of the 1990 Nature Policy Plan (Natuurbeleidsplan) of the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries (LNV), the reservoirs at Kinderdijk are an integral part of the National Ecological Network (Ecologische Hoofdstructuur – EHS) of the Netherlands. This was jointly endorsed by the Minister of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (VROM) and the Minister of Transport, Public Works and Water Management (V&W). In 1998, the Province of Zuid-Holland completed the details of the nature development corridors in de Provincial Ecological Network (Provinciaal Ecologische Hoofdstructuur – PEHS) and provided guidelines for their management and organization

-The reservoirs at Kinderdijk encompass the higher reservoirs of the Nederwaard, the Overwaard and the municipality of Nieuw-Lekkerland, along with the adjacent parts of the reservoir canals of Groote (or Achterwaterschap) and Nieuwe Waterschap, and parts of the adjacent polders of Blokweer and the municipality of Nieuw-Lekkerland, plus embankments, marshes, thickets and osier beds. All this has been designated within the framework of the Council Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds (Dir. 79/409/EEC) of the Council of the European Communities, dated 2 April 1979, regarding the preservation of the bird population (OJEC L 103/1979), especially the prevalence of the purple heron. The site encompasses an area of 340 hectares and is known as 'Kinderdijk Reservoirs' (Boezems Kinderdijk), in accordance with a Decree of the State Secretary of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries (LNV), dated 24 March 2000, reference N/2000/310

-Because of Kinderdijk's international significance as a

World Heritage site, it was named as part of the 'Green Heart' (Groene Hart) National Landscape in the Space Document - Space for Development (Nota Ruimte. Ruimte voor ontwikkeling) published jointly in 2004 by the Ministries of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (VROM), Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries (LNV), Transport, Public Works and Water Management (V&W) and Economic Affairs (EZ).

'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...'. The Government functions as an 'area partner' in this respect

-One of the core issues (no. 18) of the 2003 Regional Planning for Eastern Zuid-Holland (Streekplan Zuid-Holland

Oost) is :

'Preserving and, if possible, strengthening the cultural historical values in the Top and Belvedere areas shown on map 7.

This will involve preserving the open character of the landscape, the pattern of the parcels and the spatial quality of the cultivated strips with cultural historical value that are indicated on the map'

-In 2002, the Province of Zuid-Holland drew up a Plan Assessment Document (Nota Planbeoordeling) for approving municipal plans based on regional plans that apply to the province. This document provides (policy) rules for approving zoning plans

-The Main Cultural Historical Structure in Zuid-Holland (Cultuurhistorische Hoofdstructuur Zuid-Holland – CHS) was mapped out to provide an overview of the province's cultural historical hallmarks and values. On the basis of the structure, separate policy matters are formulated as part of the 'Policy Framework for the Main Cultural Historical Structure in Zuid-Holland' (Beleidskader Cultuurhistorische Hoofdstructuur Zuid-Holland) and fleshed out further in regional, spatial and cultural historical policies for the province. The Alblasserwaard, which encompasses Kinderdijk, is included in these policies as one of the 14 'top cultural heritage areas in Zuid-Holland'

-In 2002, the Province of Zuid-Holland introduced Approval Criteria for Mill Biotopes (Goedkeuringscriteria Molenbiotoop) to ensure that nothing would obstruct the flow of wind or block a clear view of the mills

- On the basis of the Environmental and Water Policy Plan (Beleidsplan Milieu en Water), the Province of Zuid-Holland has designated the reservoirs at Kinderdijk as an environmental protection area

-Article 23 of the 1993 Aquatic Areas and Pleasure Boating Bye-Law for Zuid-Holland (Verordening watergebieden en Pleziervaart Zuid-Holland) prohibits all sailing, including windsurfing, on the higher reservoirs of the Nederwaard, the Overwaard and the municipality of Nieuw-Lekkerland

-The 1996 Water Management Bye-Law for Zuid-Holland (Verordening Waterbeheer Zuid-Holland 1996) regulates water management (quality / quantity) according to the terms of the provincial water management plan.

-The 1993 Landscape and Nature Protection Bye-Law for Zuid-Holland (Verordening Bescherming Landschap en Natuur Zuid-Holland) regulates the posting of notices / signs, storage of goods and drainage of watercourses in the 'rural parts' of the Province.

-The 2005 Shipping Rules Bye-Law for Water Board District Rivierenland (Keur Scheepvaartregeling Waterschap Rivierenland (2005), prohibits motor vessels from sailing on the lower reservoirs of the Nederwaard and the Overwaard.

-In 2005, the District Water Board Rivierenland laid down regulations on the maintenance of dams and watercourses in the Bye-Law for Dams and Watercourses of Water Board District Rivierenland (Keur voor Waterkeringen en Wateren van Waterschap Rivierenland)

-The District Water Board Rivierenland is responsible for enforcing the Water Administration Act (Waterstaatswet) in the site

Comment

See SOUV for up-to-date new text. Ministries do change their names now and then. In the text above the ministries mentioned have other names these days.

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

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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/system 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 5.02

Steering group or similar management committee has been set up to guide the management of the site

• Question 5.03

Set up date: 2002

Function: -The membership of the Kinderdijk World Heritage Foundation (Stichting Werelderfgoed Kinderdijk) consists of the municipalities of Alblasserdam and Nieuw-Lekkerland, the Province of Zuid-Holland and the District Water Board Rivierenland, which was formed from the Polder Board of the Alblasserwaard and the Vijfheerenlanden on 1 January 2005. All of these organisations are legal persons under public law. The goals of the Kinderdijk World Heritage Foundation include: 'the preservation and conservation of the Kinderdijk mill area as a cultural historical monument and nature reserve; the promotion of the preservation of mills and structures belonging to the Kinderdijk mill area that have been completely or partially designated as protected monuments under the definition given in the 1988 Monuments Act (Monumentenwet 1988).....; the promotion of educational aspects of the Kinderdijk mill area'. -Currently in effect until the end of 2005, the Covenant on the Management of the Kinderdijk Mill area (Convenant Beheer Molengebied Kinderdijk) was drawn up by the above legal bodies, who have property and hence corresponding tasks and responsibilities in the area, for the purpose of exercising effective management according to a set of uniform standards -The Kinderdijk World Heritage Foundation (Stichting Werelderfgoed Kinderdijk) has held a 30-year lease on the site's 19 mills, including the surrounding premises, access paths and any outbuildings, since 29 April 2005. Legal ownership is in the hands of the District Water Board Rivierenland and the Province of Zuid-Holland (Overwaard). The Wisboom pumping station is on loan to the Foundation from the District Water Board Rivierenland; See 05.05 The director of the Kinderdijk World Heritage Foundation (Stichting Werelderfgoed Kinderdijk) is responsible for its management. He is also responsible for achieving the goals and performing the tasks of the Foundation, as stipulated in article 9 (12) of the Articles of Association The Board of Directors of the Foundation takes decisions and is authorised to enter into agreements (article 7 (1) of the Articles of Association). The director prepares the decisions the Foundation must take, but not necessarily in consultation with the chairman.

Mandate: See 05.05

Constituted: formal

• Question 5.04 Plans in place to set up a "steering group:

Section II-Mill Network at Kinderdijk-Elshout

• Question 5.05

Overall management system of the site

- Other effective management system

Co-operation between local governments (the municipalities of Nieuw-Lekkerland and Alblasserdam, the Province of Zuid-Holland and the District Water Board Rivierenland) and the Kinderdijk World Heritage Foundation (Stichting Werelderfgoed Kinderdijk), as formalised in a covenant (2002).

Moreover, the Articles of Association of the Kinderdijk World Heritage Foundation (Stichting Werelderfgoed Kinderdijk) also function as guidelines

Comment

In 2013 part of the immovable property, amongst which mills and land, has moved from the Water Board to the municipality of Molenwaard. The SWEK organisation holds these in long lease. At the end of 2013 a new management plan will be realized by SWEK and it will be in operation in 2014. The final management plan will be forwarded to Unesco.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

At the end of 2013 a new management plan will be realized and in operation in 2014. The definite management plan will be forwarded to Unesco.

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	Non-existent
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

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?

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

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

No indigenous peoples are resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone

4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?

There is contact but **little or no cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

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

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)	15%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	15%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	70%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	0%

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

Comment

No assistance received or asked for.

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

Section II-Mill Network at Kinderdijk-Elshout

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

There is a **major flow** of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the World Heritage property

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?

There is **basic** 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	50%
Part-time	50%

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	10%
Volunteer	90%

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

A range of human resources exist, but these are **below optimum** to manage the World Heritage Property.

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

Research and monitoring	Fair
Promotion	Fair
Community outreach	Fair
Interpretation	Fair
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Fair
Conservation	Good
Administration	Poor
Risk preparedness	Fair
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	Medium
Promotion	Medium
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	Medium

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

Education	Medium
Visitor management	Medium
Conservation	Medium
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?

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

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 **comprehensive, integrated programme of research**, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

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

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

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

The latest research to the needs of management will be completed in July 2013

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-Mill Network at Kinderdijk-Elshout

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

Local communities / residents	Average
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Average
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 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	Adequate
Site museum	Adequate
Information booths	Adequate
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Poor
Other	Adequate

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

Awareness building has been very important the last few years and more facilities like guided tours, information points have been realised.

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	Static
Five years ago	Static

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

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

Entry tickets and registries
Transportation services
Visitor surveys

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

results of research on visiting data will be available in July 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?

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

More visiting points including improvement of reachability in the site will be realised in 2014

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 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	Non-existent
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Average
Industry	Non-existent
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

Section II-Mill Network at Kinderdijk-Elshout

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
3.2 Transportation Infrastructure						
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	The Outstanding Universal Values of the site are not affected. This is a merely a management problem.	Management actions will be taken in 2013	Once a year	Problems must be solved in 2 years	The World Heritage Foundation Kinderdijk and the Water Board Rivierenland The mill site of Kinderdijk-Elshout is a partly public area that is accessible and this requires special management actions
3.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
3.7.2	Relative humidity	Outstanding Universal Values will not be affected apart from a possible deteriorating of the mills by milldew and rot in brickwork and wood due to a high RH.	Research and improvement of maintenance by better techniques.	Once a year	2013-2014	Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands Province of Zuid-Holland Technical University of Delft The research has already started.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.3 Management System / Management Plan						
	Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.3.10	There is little or no cooperation with industry regarding management	This issue will be addressed in the new MP.	2013	Kinderdijk World Heritage Foundation	none	
4.8 Monitoring						
4.8.1	Some monitoring, but it is not planned	This issue will be addressed in the new MP.	2013	Kinderdijk World Heritage Foundation	none	

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

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

5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

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

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

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

5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

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

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

5.4.1 - Comments

6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

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

Conservation	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	No impact
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	Very positive
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	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

6.1.4 Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples. Comment: in some aspects it has a positive impact and in some other ways a negative impact .

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
Non Governmental Organization

Section II-Mill Network at Kinderdijk-Elshout

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

yes

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

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

UNESCO	Very good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Fair

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

All required information was accessible

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

The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Integrity and / or Authenticity
Managing the property to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting
Management effectiveness

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

UNESCO	Not Applicable
State Party	Not Applicable
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

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

- **Geographic Information Table**

Reason for update: Property = 322 ha; see rSoOUV.

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