

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Røros Mining Town and the Circumference

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Norway

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

55bis

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980, 2010



1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
	0 / 0	?	?	?	
Town and Cultural Landscapes including the present World Heritage Site + Winter Transport Route	62.574 / 11.386	15508.6	240.62	15749.22	2010
Femundshytta	62.322 / 11.834	950	240.62	1190.62	2010
Total (ha)		16458.6	481.24	16939.84	

Comment

The pre-filled data is not correct regarding the buffer zone
Updated data from the nomination dossier: Town and the Cultural Landscapes including the present World Heritage Site: 14000 ha Femundshytta: 950 ha Winter transport route: 1560 ha Buffer Zone: 481 240 ha Total: 497 750 ha

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Røros Mining Town	30/09/2005	
Map of Inscribed Property 2010	30/01/2009	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Trond Taugbøl
Directorate for Cultural Heritage – Riksantikvaren
Senior Adviser

Comment

Directorate for Cultural Heritage - Riksantikvaren Petter Koren
Senior Adviser Department for Buildings, Monuments and Sites
PO BOX 8196 N-0034 Oslo phone: + 47 982 02 780
email: petter.koren@ra.no

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Erlend Gjelsvik
Røros Kommune
World Heritage Coordinator

Comment

Røros kommune Erlend Gjelsvik Site Coordinator
Bergmannsgata 19 7374 Røros Norway Telephone: +47 724 19 555 Fax: +47 724 19 404 Cell: -47 922 28 772 Email: erlend.gjelsvik@roros.kommune.no

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- [Directorate for Cultural Heritage \(Riksantikvaren\)](#)

Comment

www.worldheritageroros.no - to be updated

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

Comment

The nomination dossier lists relevant acts in Norwegian legislative instruments (See chapter 5b "protective designation", pp56). Also, the "Management Framework and Plans" (part of the nomination dossier) lists relevant international charters, conventions and policies that are regarded as binding for the management of the World Heritage Site (see chapter 2, "Management framework" pp14)

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Røros Mining Town and the Circumference consist of three sites within the Circumference, i.e. the area of privileges awarded by the Danish-Norwegian King to Røros Copper Works in 1646.

The town and the cultural landscapes cover a large continuous area which includes the landscape surrounding the mining town, the urban agricultural areas, and the most important mining landscapes where agricultural practices and copper work operations were carried out.

Femundshytta is a largely relict landscape which includes the industrial cultural landscape with the remains of a smelter, water management systems, and the community that grew up around them. The Winter Transport Route is made up of a sequence of lakes, rivers, and creeks in an almost untouched landscape. It was used from November to May.

Røros Mining Town, established in 1646, is unique. It is built entirely of wood, and interlinked with a cultural landscape that shows in an outstanding and almost complete manner how mining operations, transportation, and the way of life had to be adapted to the requirements of the natural environment – the mountain plains, the cold climate, the remote location without roads and with marginal growth conditions for forests and agriculture. On this basis a unique culture developed that has partly disappeared, but an outstanding testimony of the existence of which has been preserved.

Criterion (iii): From the time copper ore was found in the mountains at Røros in 1644 until the copper works went bankrupt in 1977, with German mining technology as a starting point, employing German, Danish, Swedish immigrants, and Norwegian nationals, a unique culture developed to extract the valuable copper in a remote and sparsely inhabited area. Today there is no mining in the area, but Røros Mining Town and the traces of mining, smelters, transport, and water management systems bear unique

witness to the adaptation of technology to the requirements of the natural environment and the remoteness of the situation.

Criterion (iv): Røros townscape and its related industrial and rural landscapes, with their interlinked industrial activity and domestic and agricultural accommodation within an urban environment, illustrate in an outstanding manner how people adapted to the extreme circumstances in which they had to live and how they used the available indigenous resources to provide shelter, produce food for their sustenance, and contribute to the national wealth of the country.

Technologically, their buildings and installations evolved through the use of available indigenous materials to functionally satisfy the combined approach of mining and agrarian practices whilst at the same time accommodating the consequences of dealing with extreme climatic conditions.

Criterion (v): Røros Mining Town and the Circumference constitute a totality that is an outstanding example of traditional settlement and land-use. The various activities that have been carried out in the area constitute a coherent and interdependent unit. These activities have shaped a cultural landscape that provides a unique picture of how the mines and the mining town functioned as a complex and at times vulnerable system that verged on the limits of what was possible in an inhospitable environment with a harsh climate.

Integrity and authenticity
The nominated property contains all elements that convey the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and its most relevant features present a high or good level of integrity. The mining landscape is relict in nature, but almost no transformations or encroachment occurred after the closure of the copper works.

The authenticity of the property is expressed in almost all its aspects and features. All the remains bear credible witness to the history and development of the site. This is also reinforced by the rich archive documenting the copper company's history.

Protection and management requirements
The most important legislative instruments that help to protect and manage Røros Mining Town and the Circumference are the Cultural Heritage Act (1978) and the Planning and Building Act (1985).

The management framework for Røros Mining Town and the Circumference is embodied in a Statement of Intent which has been signed by all responsible bodies for the nominated property.

The basis for management relies on the existing Norwegian legal framework, the planning instruments in force, the administrative and private bodies responsible for the property and sources of funding for heritage conservation, agricultural activities in heritage areas, productive and marketing activities based on cultural and natural heritage, and sustainable tourism. The management framework contains an action programme including short- and long-term actions.

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

(iii)(iv)(v)

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							
3.1.3	Industrial areas							
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure							
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities							
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure							
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure							
3.2.2	Air transport infrastructure							
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure							
3.3	Services Infrastructures							
3.3.1	Water infrastructure							
3.4	Pollution							
3.4.3	Surface water pollution							
3.4.5	Solid waste							
3.5	Biological resource use/modification							
3.5.3	Land conversion							
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production							
3.6	Physical resource extraction							
3.6.1	Mining							
3.6.2	Quarrying							
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric							
3.7.2	Relative humidity							
3.7.8	Micro-organisms							
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							
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community							
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation							
3.9	Other human activities							
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage							
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events							
3.10.2	Flooding							
3.10.6	Temperature change							
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events							
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)							
3.13	Management and institutional factors							
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities							
3.13.3	Management activities							
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside		

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.1 Buildings and Development					
3.1.1 Housing	restricted	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.1.2 Commercial development	restricted	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.1.3 Industrial areas	restricted	one off or rare	minor	low capacity	static
3.1.4 Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	restricted	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities	restricted	on-going	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.2 Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure	restricted	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.2.2 Air transport infrastructure	restricted	one off or rare	significant	medium capacity	static
3.2.4 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	restricted	frequent	minor	medium capacity	static
3.4 Pollution					
3.4.3 Surface water pollution	localised	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.4.5 Solid waste	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.5 Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.3 Land conversion	restricted	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.6 Physical resource extraction					
3.6.2 Quarrying	restricted	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.8 Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.2 Society's valuing of heritage	extensive	on-going	significant	high capacity	static
3.8.4 Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.8.5 Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	extensive	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.8.6 Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.9 Other human activities					
3.9.2 Deliberate destruction of heritage	restricted	one off or rare	minor	high capacity	static
3.11 Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.6 Fire (wildfires)	localised	one off or rare	catastrophic	high capacity	static
3.13 Management and institutional factors					
3.13.3 Management activities	extensive	on-going	significant	high capacity	increasing

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

3.17.1 - Comments

The questions are asked in a way that makes it really hard to answer. I.e. I don't understand what I have answered regarding the question about management. We are currently considering the impact of the implementation of national reforms regarding organizational aspects of the Røros museum. The reform may have a negative impact on management.

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) Note WHC (July 2012)

Please carefully review and update the information provided below:

The most important legislative instruments that help to protect and manage Røros Mining Town and the Circumference are the Cultural Heritage Act (1978) and the Planning and Building Act (1985).

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Friday, October 28, 2005

• Question 6.02

The centre of the town is covered by a land-use plan with special regulations, according to the Plan and Building Act. Some 80 houses in this area are listed for protection according to the Cultural Heritage Act. A part of former miners' smallholdings agricultural land (Småsetran) close to the town is protected by special regulations according to the Plan and buildings Act.

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 is **acceptable** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies remain

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

A regional plan for the World Heritage area is implemented. The municipalities will update their land-use plans accordingly when they are to be revised.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

Note WHC (July 2012)

Please carefully review and update the information provided below:

The management framework for Røros Mining Town and the Circumference is embodied in a Statement of Intent which has been signed by all responsible bodies for the nominated property.

The basis for management relies on the existing Norwegian legal framework, the planning instruments in force, the administrative and private bodies responsible for the property

and sources of funding for heritage conservation, agricultural activities in heritage areas, productive and marketing activities based on cultural and natural heritage, and sustainable tourism. The management framework contains an action programme including short- and long-term actions.

Periodic Reporting Cycle 1 (2001-2006) Section 2

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

Submitted on Friday, October 28, 2005

• **Question 5.02**

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

• **Question 5.03**

Set up date: 1993

Function: Mutual information between bodies involved, coordination of initiatives and interests. A forum for discussions of matters that affect the World Heritage.

Mandate: To follow up the advices given in evaluation reports from ICOMOS Norway (1994, 2003), to oversee that suggested improvements on current protection schemes, management structure and measures are handled by the authorities in charge. To be a referee for the local authority in its work.

Constituted: formal

• **Question 5.05**

Overall management system of the site

- o Management under protective legislation

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

Regional plan for the World Heritage area - active
Municipal land-use plans - active

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	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Fair
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Fair
Researchers	Fair
Tourism industry	Fair

Industry	Fair
----------	------

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 **directly contribute** to some decisions relating to 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?

Indigenous peoples directly contribute to **some decisions** relating to management but their involvement could be improved

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

Uncertainty about future management resources due to national reforms within the museum field.

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)	90%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	5%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	5%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	0%

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

Title	Year	Amount	Link to source
World Heritage seminar and summer camp for young people and teachers, Roros August 1999	1999	10000.00	
Total		10000	

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

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

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

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

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

There is 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?

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

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

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

Full-time	2%
Part-time	98%

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

Permanent	2%
Seasonal	98%

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

Paid	2%
Volunteer	98%

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	Fair
Interpretation	Fair
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Fair
Conservation	Good
Administration	Fair

Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Fair

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

Research and monitoring	Medium
Promotion	Medium
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	Medium
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 fully implemented**; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, who are assuming leadership in management

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

Institutionalized programmes for local craftsmen and training within the field of traditional craftsmanship - holds national/international level.

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

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

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for most key areas **but there are gaps**

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

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

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared 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

<http://www.riksantikvaren.no/filestore/Rros/litteraturjanuar2012.pdf>

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	Average
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Poor
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 **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	Poor
Site museum	Excellent
Information booths	Poor
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Not provided but needed
Information materials	Poor
Transportation facilities	Poor
Other	Adequate

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

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

Comment

http://www.roros.no/?set_lang=en

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

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

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

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

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

The fee is collected, and makes **some contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

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

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	Not applicable
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?

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	
3.8 Social/cultural uses of heritage							
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	All criterias	Awareness programs, education, local history programs	Yes	Continuous	All parts	Continuous need to make sure heritage and management be part of the local debate
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	(iv) (v)	As in 3.5.3	Underway	Continuous	State, municipalities	--
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	All	Debates, books, research	continuous	continuous	All stakeholders	Identity and social cohesion are always changing - strange question
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	?	debates and municipal planning	Continuous	Continuous	All stakeholders	Not relevant
3.13 Management and institutional factors							
3.13.3	Management activities	All criterias	Work hard	Continuous	Continuous	Municipality, museum	As mentioned earlier. Uncertain future because of national reforms

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

4.1 Boundaries and Buffer Zones						
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment	
4.1.4	The boundaries of the World Heritage property are not known by local residents / communities / landowners	Outreach, municipal planning program, signs	Continuous	Municipality	--	
4.1.5	The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are not known by local residents / communities/landowners	Outreach, municipal planning program, signs	Continuous	Municipality	--	
4.3 Management System / Management Plan						
4.3.10	There is little or no cooperation with industry regarding management	Little cooperation, but it's not needed	--	--	--	
4.4 Financial and Human Resources						
4.4.13	Promotion	Negotiations with state party and regional bodies	continuous	stakeholders	--	
4.6 Education, Information and Awareness Building						
4.6.5	The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is not adequately presented and interpreted	Books, lectures, debates, research	continuous	stakeholders	--	

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 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 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	No impact
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Not applicable
Political support for conservation	Negative
Legal / Policy framework	No impact
Lobbying	Negative
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	Not applicable
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status

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

Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
Staff from other World Heritage properties
Non Governmental Organization
External experts

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

no

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

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

UNESCO	Poor
State Party Representative	Good
Advisory Body	Good

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 concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of 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	Not Applicable
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Satisfactory
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: The pre-filled data is not correct regarding the buffer zone Updated data from the nomination dossier: Town and the Cultural Landscapes including the present World Heritage Site: 14000 ha Femundshytta: 950 ha Winter transport route: 1560 ha Buffer Zone: 481 240 ha Total: 497 750 ha

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