

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Western Caucasus

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

State(s) Party(ies)

- Russian Federation

Type of Property

natural

Identification Number

900

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (latitude/longitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Kavkazkiy Nature Reserve , Russian Federation	43.958 / 40.267	280335	0	280335	1999
Buffer zone of the Kavkazkiy Nature Reserve , Russian Federation	44.103 / 39.878	6000	0	6000	1999
Bolshoy Thach Nature Park , Russian Federation	44.053 / 40.4	3700	0	3700	1999
Ridge Buijniy Nature Monument , Russian Federation	43.964 / 40.019	1480	0	1480	1999
River Tsitsa headwaters Nature Monument , Russian Federation	44.061 / 39.936	1913	0	1913	1999
Headwaters of Rivers Pshecha and Pshechashcha Nature Monument , Russian Federation	43.974 / 39.814	5776	0	5776	1999
Total (ha)		299204	0	299204	

1.4 - Map(s)

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Grigory E. Ordzhonikidze
Commission of the Russian Federation for UNESCO
Executive Secretary

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Sergei Shevelev
GPZ "Kavkazsky" Natural State Reserve with the buffer zone

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [Greenpeace Russia](#)
2. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](#)
3. [Natural Heritage Protection Fund](#)
4. [www.kgpbz.ru](#)

Comment

<http://www.kgpbz.com/>

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

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

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

(ix)(x)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

See nomination.

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

No needed.

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

No comments.

3. Factors Affecting the Property

3.14. Other factor(s)

3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

No factors.

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact				Origin
3.1	Buildings and Development					
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					
3.3.5	Major linear utilities					
3.5	Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.3	Land conversion					
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals					
3.5.8	Commercial hunting					
3.5.9	Subsistence hunting					
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production					
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					
3.9.1	Illegal activities					
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.1	Translocated species					
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species					
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				
3.1.4	restricted	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	increasing
3.1.5	restricted	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	increasing
3.5	Biological resource use/modification				
3.5.4	restricted	on-going	insignificant	medium capacity	static
3.5.9	restricted	one off or rare	insignificant	high capacity	decreasing
3.5.10	restricted	on-going	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage				
3.8.4	extensive	on-going	significant	no capacity and / or resources	increasing
3.9	Other human activities				

		Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.9.1	Illegal activities	restricted	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	static
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	restricted	frequent	minor	no capacity and / or resources	increasing

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

3.17.1 - Comments

No 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, but there is a need for one

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 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

No comments.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

The site consists of land under three types of ownership and legal status:

- 1) Caucasus State Biosphere Reserve (CSBR): created in 1924 and now under federal jurisdiction through the State Committee for Environment Protection (Goskomekologiya) under the federal law on protected natural areas (15.02.95);
- 2) Sochi National Park: created in 1983 and under federal jurisdiction through the Ministry of Forestry under the federal law on protected natural areas (15.02.95);
- 3) the buffer zone of the CSBR, the Bolshoy Thach Nature Park, and the Nature Monuments of Buiny Ridge and the headwaters of the Tsitsa, Pshecha, and Pshechashcha rivers which are protected territories of regional importance, under

the jurisdiction of the Forests Committee of the Republic of Adygea. The buffer zone was declared in 1981 and the other protected areas in the 1990s, by decree of the President of the Republic of Adygea.

The protected areas included in the Property are governed by the national protected area legislation, in particular the federal law "On environmental protection" dating back to 1991 but updated in 2002 and federal law 33-FZ "On specially protected natural areas" of 1995. The first law defines standards for environmental quality, makes provisions for the protection of biota and provides a basis for federal protected areas and activities permitted in them. The protected area law regulates the organization, protection and use of protected areas. This legislation recognizes different types of protected areas such as, at the federal level strict nature reserves, national parks, wildlife reserves and nature monuments and at the regional level nature parks, nature reserves and nature monuments. The law further foresees that in certain Strict Nature Reserves ("Zapovednik") which are part of the World Network of Biosphere Reserves, biosphere polygons can be created. These areas are functionally attached to the reserve with the objective of implementing scientific research, ecological monitoring. In the polygons, low impact natural use can also be tested, however without degrading the environment or affecting the biological resources. "Western Caucasus World Heritage site" is composed of 5 different protected areas. The major part of the property is WCSNR, a federal protected area with the status of a Strict Nature Reserve, corresponding to IUCN protected area category I and enjoying a high protection status where no economic uses are allowed. A biosphere polygon was established in the WCSNR in 1992, following the return of the Lagonaki area and Mount Fisht and Oshten into the reserve.

The 4 other components have a regional protected area status: Bolshoy Thach Nature Park, Ridge Buijnij Nature Monument, River Tsitsa headwaters Nature Monument and Headwaters of Rivers Pshecha and Pshechashcha Nature Monument. These regional protected areas have a much weaker protection status, equivalent to IUCN category IV (nature parks) or III (nature monuments). Certain uses, such as recreational use, can be allowed by the regional administrations that are in charge of their management. The management regimes of these regional protected areas are clarified in so-called "certificates", which are legally adopted by the regional authorities. The property also includes the northern buffer zone to the WCSNR created by the Adygeya Republic. The 1995 federal law gave the authority to create - and therefore also to abolish - buffer zones to federal Strict Nature Reserves to the regional authorities. However this provision was changed in 2004, which returned this authority to the Federal Government.

Several new decisions and changes in legislation were made:

- Resolution 0⁸33 was adopted on 14 October 2010 creating a "tourism cluster" in the North Causasian Federal District ; this resolution stipulates the establishment of a Special Economic Zone for the development of tourism programs and activities in the LBP, located partly within the property;
- Federal Law No. 365-FZ was adopted concerning special economic zones in the Russian Federation on 30 November 2011. This Law includes amendments to several existing legislative acts, including Federal Law n^o33-FZ dated 14 March 1995 on protected areas: more specifically, the law makes it possible to allow capital construction facilities and infrastructure within biosphere polygons inside the Strict Nature Reserves to develop educational tourism, physical culture and sports and to lease out land for these activities. The law foresees that a list of activities and infrastructure which can be permitted within the biosphere polygons will be established for each biosphere reserve;

- Order n°603-r, signed on 23 April 2012 approves the list of infrastructures which can be permitted within the LBP, including mass tourism and mountain ski facilities;

- Order No. 31 -pr/1 of the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Adygeya as of October 9. 2008 - CERTIFICATE OF THE NATURAL MONUMENT OF REGIONAL IMPORTANCE "THE UPPER REACH OF RIVER TSITSA" (as amended by Order No. 34-pr as of October 27, 2011);

- Order No. 7-pr of the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Adygeya as of April 11. 2008 – CERTIFICATE OF THE NATURAL MONUMENT OF REPUBLICAN SIGNIFICANCE "THE UPPER REACHES OF RIVERS PSHEKHA AND PSHEKHASHKHA" (as amended by Orders of the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Adygeya: as of June 29, 2009 No. 111-k, as of February 19, 2010 No. 49-k, as of October 27, 2011 No. 33-pr);

- Order No. 41 -pr of the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Adygeya of November 17, 2008 – CERTIFICATE OF THE NATURAL MONUMENT OF REPUBLICAN SIGNIFICANCE "BUYNY RIDGE" (as amended by Order No. 35-pr of October 27, 2011);

- RESOLUTION No. 21 dated January 19, 1998 issued by the CABINET OF MINISTERS OF THE REPUBLIC OF ADYGEYA "ON APPROVAL OF THE REGULATION ON "BOLSHOY TKHACH" NATURAL PARK IN THE REPUBLIC OF ADYGEYA" (as amended by Resolution No. 247 dated 13.12.2010 issued by the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Adygeya);

- Resolution No.21 dated January 19, 1998 issued by the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Adygeya REGULATION ON "BOLSHOY TKHACH" NATURAL PARK OF THE REPUBLIC OF ADYGEYA (as amended by Resolution No.247 dated 13.12.2010 issued by the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Adygeya)

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?

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 is **inadequate** to ensure 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

No comments.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

The various parts of the site are under different management regimes. Totals for staff are given for the entirety of both the CSBR and Sochi National Park, although both of these include areas outside the nominated site.

1) CSBR. The director-general is in Adler, with a sub-director in Maikop responsible for the part of the reserve in Adygea (about one-third of the CSBR). There are regulations for the reserve, and a management plan was prepared in 1997. The reserve is divided into six regions, each with a head ranger and other rangers under him. The total staff of the reserve is 199, including 15 administrative staff, 45 scientific workers, 95 rangers, 8 people in the department of ecological education, and 44 technical personnel.

2) Sochi National Park. The director is in Sochi; as well as the federal Ministry of Forestry, the Forest Committee of Krasnodar Krai has some influence over activities in the park through its complex programme of nature protection. In 1987, a project for the forest management of the park was produced, with detailed maps showing four zones: protected, landscape protection (zakaznik), extensive use, and intensive use. The total staff of the park is 169, including 17 in administration, and 15 forest guards. The remainder are guards, technicians, and other workers.

3) Buffer zone, nature monuments and nature park in Adygea. There are no personnel allocated to the management of these areas, but they are managed to some extent by staff of the CSBR, under agreement with the government of the Republic of Adygea. While these areas have had regulations for two years, there is no management plan for any of them, though they fall within the scope of the complex programmes of social-ecological development and of tourism for the Republic. According to the regulations, all human uses (particularly logging and hunting) are forbidden in the nature monuments. No logging takes place in the Bolshoy Thach Nature Park.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

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

There is a range of administrative bodies / levels involved in management but there is **little or no coordination** between them for managing different aspects of the property

4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ? No management system / plan is currently in place to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

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

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

No annual work / action plan exists

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

Local communities / residents	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities	Poor
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Poor
Visitors	Poor
Researchers	Poor
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 have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management

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

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

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

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

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

No comments.

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

No important changes.

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)	99%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	1%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%

In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	0%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0%
Other grants	0%

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

Comment

No international assistance, 0.00 USD

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

The available budget is **inadequate** for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage

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

Existing sources of funding are **not secure**

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

The World Heritage property **does not deliver any economic benefits** to local communities

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

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

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

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

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

No comments.

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

Full-time	80%
Part-time	20%

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

Permanent	80%
Seasonal	20%

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

Paid	99%
Volunteer	1%

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

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 drafted or in place, but is **not being implemented**

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

No comments.

4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

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

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

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

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

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

Research results are **shared 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

No comments.

4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?

In one location, but **not 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	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Poor
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 **no education and awareness programme**, despite an identified need

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

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

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

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

4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

Visitor centre	Not provided but needed
Site museum	Not needed
Information booths	Not provided but needed
Guided tours	Not provided but needed
Trails / routes	Poor

Information materials	Not provided but needed
Transportation facilities	Not provided but needed
Other	Not provided but needed

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

No comments.

4.7. Visitor Management

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

Last year	Minor Increase
Two years ago	Minor Increase
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Minor Increase

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

Entry tickets and registries
Visitor surveys

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

Visitor management documents is not ready for using. Now there is no one visitor management documents for the World Heritage property Western Caucasus at all.

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

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is **not being actively managed** despite an identified need

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

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

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

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

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

No comments.

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 to define key indicators, **but this has not been done**

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

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Poor
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Poor
Industry	Poor
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

No comments.

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

No comments.

4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs

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

Please refer to question 5.2

5. Summary and Conclusions

5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

		World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.1	Buildings and Development						
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	Destroy the integrity of the object.	Regulation and control.	No monitoring.	Annually	Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation	No comments.
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities	Destroy the integrity of the object.	Regulation and control.	No monitoring.	Annually.	Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation.	No comments.
3.5	Biological resource use/modification						
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals	Destroy the integrity of the object.	Prohibition and control.	Constantly as control	Annually	Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation.	No comments.
3.5.10	Forestry /wood production	Destroy the integrity of the object.	Prohibition and control.	Constantly as control	Annually	Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation.	No comments.
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage						
3.8.4	Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	Destroy the integrity of the object.	no actions	No monitoring	No time.	No agency	No comments.
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species						
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	Violation of conservation of natural complexes in the natural state	Monitoring and control. Prohibition of the introduction of plant and animal species.	Monitoring as a research.	All the time.	Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation.	No comments.

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		
4.1.1	There is a need for a buffer zone	A project of buffer zone is making by Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation.	till 2016 year.	Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation.	No comments.		
4.1.2	Boundaries could be improved	Correct boundaries of World Heritage property Western Caucasus presented by Russian Federation as renomination World Heritage property Western Caucasus in 2014 year.	Till 2016 year.	Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation.	No comments.		
4.3 Management System / Management Plan							
4.3.4	No management system / plan is currently in place	To make management system / plan.	Till 2016 year.	Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation.	No comments.		
4.4 Financial and Human Resources							
4.4.3	The budget is inadequate for management needs	To make adequate budget for management needs.	Till 2016 year.	Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation.	No comments.		
4.4.15	Capacity development plan not implemented	To prepare a new development plan.	Till 2016 year.	Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation.	No comments.		

4.8 Monitoring					
4.8.2	Key indicators have not been defined	To identify key indicators and rapid methods for assessing.	Till 2016 year	Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of the Russian Federation.	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

No additional 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	No impact
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	No impact
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Very positive
Legal / Policy framework	No impact
Lobbying	Positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	No impact
Other (please specify)	No impact

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

No comments.

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?

yes

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

No suggestions.

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

UNESCO	Fair
State Party Representative	Poor
Advisory Body	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

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

Automatically generated in online version

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

No comments.