Periodic Report - Second Cycle

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property
Mesa Verde National Park

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details
State(s) Party(ies)
- United States of America

Type of Property
cultural

Identification Number
27

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1978

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Mesa Verde National Park	37.262 / -108.486	21043	0	21043	1978
Total (ha)		**21043**	**0**	**21043**	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Mesa Verde National Park	03/04/2006	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property
- Jonathan Putnam
  US National Park Service Office of International Affairs
  World Heritage Program Officer

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency
- Cliff Spencer

  Superintendent

Comment
Modify address to read: P.O. Box 8, Mesa Verde, CO 81330-0008, United States of America. Modify Superintendent's telephone number from +970-529-4465 to +970-529-4600.

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)
1. View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection
2. Mesa Verde National Park (U.S. World Heritage)
3. Mesa Verde National Park (U.S. National Park Service)
4. Mesa Verde Museum Association
5. World Heritage in the United States

Comment
Remove second link - website removed/inaccessible. Links 1, 3, 4, and 5 all contain accurate web address - www.nps.gov/meve.

1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)
Comment
Additional designations providing both recognition of historical significance and further protection include: National Register Nominations (12) and Determinations of Eligibility (5) covering 63 historic structures Designation of the park's Administrative District as a National Historic Landmark Nomination of Park Mesa (relictual Pinyon-Juniper woodland) as a Colorado Natural Area. This isolated mesa woodland is characteristic of landscapes occupied by Ancestral Pueblo from 6th to 13th c. AD

2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Statement of Significance
The Mesa Verde landscape in the American south-west is considered to be the type site of the prehistoric Ancestral Puebloan culture, which lasted for some nine hundred years from c 450 to 1300, on this plateau in south-west Colorado at an altitude of more than 2600 meters (8,500 feet). There is a great concentration of spectacular Pueblo Indian dwellings. Some 600 'cliff dwellings' have been recorded within Mesa Verde National Park, including the famous multi-storey ones such as Cliff Palace, Balcony House, and Square Tower House, built of sandstone and mud mortar, and an additional 4100 archaeological sites have been discovered. New discoveries are routinely made.
Criterion (iii) The exceptional archaeological sites of the Mesa Verde landscape provide eloquent testimony to the ancient cultural traditions of Native American tribes. They represent a graphic link between the past and present ways of life of the Puebloan Peoples of the American south-west.

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

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**						
3.1.4	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		➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	⇗
3.3	**Services Infrastructures**						
3.3.1	Water infrastructure	➕		🔴	🟡	⊙	⇗
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities	➕		🔴	🟡	⊙	
3.3.4	Localised utilities	➕	➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	
3.3.5	Major linear utilities	➕	➖	🔴	🟡		⇗
3.4	**Pollution**						
3.4.2	Ground water pollution		➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	
3.4.3	Surface water pollution		➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	
3.4.4	Air pollution		➖	🔴	🟡		⇗
3.5	**Biological resource use/modification**						
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals		➖	🔴	🟡		⇗
3.7	**Local conditions affecting physical fabric**						
3.7.1	Wind		➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	⇗
3.7.2	Relative humidity		➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	⇗
3.7.3	Temperature		➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	⇗
3.7.5	Dust		➖	🔴	🟡		
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)		➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	⇗
3.7.7	Pests		➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	
3.7.8	Micro-organisms		➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	
3.8	**Social/cultural uses of heritage**						
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses	➕	➖	🔴	🟡		⇗
3.8.2	Society's valuing of heritage	➕	➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	⇗
3.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	➕		🔴	🟡		⇗
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	➕	➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	⇗
3.9	**Other human activities**						
3.9.1	Illegal activities		➖	🔴	🟡		⇗
3.9.2	Deliberate destruction of heritage		➖	🔴	🟡		⇗
3.10	**Climate change and severe weather events**						
3.10.1	Storms		➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	⇗
3.10.2	Flooding		➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	
3.10.3	Drought		➖	🔴	🟡		⇗
3.10.4	Desertification		➖	🔴	🟡		⇗
3.10.6	Temperature change		➖	🔴	🟡		⇗
3.10.7	Other climate change impacts		➖	🔴	🟡		⇗
3.11	**Sudden ecological or geological events**						
3.11.4	Avalanche/ landslide		➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition		➖	🔴	🟡	⊙	

	Name	Impact					Origin	
3.11.6	Fire (widlfires)		⊖	🚩	🚩		⊙	🔄
3.12	**Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species**							
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species		⊖	🚩	🚩			🔄
3.12.3	Invasive / alien freshwater species		⊖	🚩	🚩			🔄
3.12.5	Hyper-abundant 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	**Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure**	localised	one off or rare	insignificant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.2	**Transportation Infrastructure**					
3.2.1	**Ground transport infrastructure**	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.2.2	**Air transport infrastructure**	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	significant	low capacity	decreasing
3.3	**Services Infrastructures**					
3.3.4	**Localised utilities**	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
3.3.5	**Major linear utilities**	restricted	one off or rare	significant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.4	**Pollution**					
3.4.2	**Ground water pollution**	restricted	one off or rare	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
3.4.3	**Surface water pollution**	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	decreasing
3.4.4	**Air pollution**	widespread	frequent	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.5	**Biological resource use/modification**					
3.5.4	**Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals**	localised	frequent	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.7	**Local conditions affecting physical fabric**					
3.7.1	**Wind**	widespread	frequent	significant	medium capacity	static
3.7.2	**Relative humidity**	widespread	frequent	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.7.3	**Temperature**	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.7.5	**Dust**	widespread	intermittent or sporadic	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.7.6	**Water (rain/water table)**	widespread	on-going	significant	medium capacity	decreasing
3.7.7	**Pests**	localised	on-going	significant	high capacity	increasing
3.7.8	**Micro-organisms**	restricted	one off or rare	significant	medium capacity	static
3.8	**Social/cultural uses of heritage**					
3.8.1	**Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses**	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	insignificant	high capacity	static
3.8.2	**Society's valuing of heritage**	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	static
3.8.6	**Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation**	restricted	frequent	minor	high capacity	increasing
3.9	**Other human activities**					
3.9.1	**Illegal activities**	restricted	one off or rare	significant	high capacity	static
3.9.2	**Deliberate destruction of heritage**	restricted	one off or rare	significant	high capacity	decreasing
3.10	**Climate change and severe weather events**					
3.10.1	**Storms**	widespread	frequent	significant	low capacity	static
3.10.2	**Flooding**	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	static
3.10.3	**Drought**	widespread	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.10.4	**Desertification**	extensive	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.10.6	**Temperature change**	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.10.7	**Other climate change impacts**	widespread	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.11	**Sudden ecological or geological events**					
3.11.4	**Avalanche/ landslide**	localised	intermittent or sporadic	significant	medium capacity	static
3.11.5	**Erosion and siltation/ deposition**	extensive	on-going	significant	medium capacity	static

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.11.6 Fire (widlfires)	extensive	frequent	catastrophic	medium capacity	static
3.12 Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.2 Invasive/alien terrestrial species	extensive	on-going	significant	medium capacity	increasing
3.12.3 Invasive / alien freshwater species	restricted	on-going	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.12.5 Hyper-abundant species	extensive	on-going	minor	medium capacity	static
3.13 Management and institutional factors					
3.13.3 Management activities	restricted	intermittent or sporadic	minor	medium capacity	increasing

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

3.17.1 - Comments

Based on the assessment, spatially restricted impacts resulting from park development, social/cultural use and localized factors contrast with more frequent significant to catastrophic events (e.g. fire) occuring at a landscape scale. While both require management analysis and action, the latter of the two poses the greatest challenge to the park's Outstanding Universal Values. Clearly, these processes have the potential to devastate archaeological resources and their contextual landscapes.

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

The boundaries of Mesa Verde NP encompass the NE portion of a much larger, isolated plateau overlooking valleys 1000' below. The north, east, and west boundaries follow steep escarpments, the south boundary crosses four major N/S canyons. These characteristics, when combined with a mix of State, Federal, and Tribal lands on all sides, provides an effective boundary for Mesa Verde National Park.

4.2. Protective Measures

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

Mesa Verde National Park is owned by the United States Government on behalf of the American people. It is managed by the National Park Service, a federal agency. As a National Park (or unit of the National Park System), it receives the highest level of conservation protection afforded by federal law in the United States. Mesa Verde National Park was established by the United States Government through legislation (Public Law 34, Stat. 616) signed on June 29, 1906. The park was established specifically to protect cliff dwellings built by the Ancestral Puebloan peoples between 1100-1300 AD.

Regulation:

PL 34-616 Enabling Legislation for Mesa Verde National Park (June 29, 1906)

PL 36-796 Legislation to grant leases & permits, exclude public from access
to ruins (June 25, 1910)

PL 38-82 Boundary Amendment (June 30, 1913)

PL 64-235 National Park Service Organic Act (1916)

PL 40-152 Legislation to accept donation of lands to the park (June 12, 1917)

PL 45-458 Further definition of Exclusive Federal Jurisdiction (April 25, 1928)

PL 46-315 Authorization of Operation & Rates at Aileen Nusbaum Hospital in
Mesa Verde (May 14, 1930)

PL 46-1043 Prohibition of Leasing or Permitting of Mineral Resources in Park
(January 26, 1931)

PL 46-1422 Authorized Executive Proclamation to add land to park for access
to Cortez-Mancos road (February 26, 1931)

PL 47-2511 Presidential Proclamation No. 1998 enacting PL 46-1422 (May
27, 1932)

PL 77-473 Boundary Revision (December 23, 1963)

PL 90-2692 Designated 8,100 acres of Wilderness in Mesa Verde (October
20, 1976)

PL 59-209 Antiquities Act of 1906

PL 89-665 National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended

PL 91-190 National Environmental Policy Act, 1969

PL 96-95 Archeological Resources Protection Act, 1979

PL 101-601 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 1990

National Park Service Management Policies, 2001

National Park Service Director's Order #28, Cultural Resource Management

36 CFR 68 Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology
and Historic Preservation

Comment

Change - National Park Service Management Policies, 2001 to National Park Service Management Policies, 2006

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

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or

Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?
The property had **no buffer zone at the time of inscription** on the World Heritage List

4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?
The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?
There is **excellent** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property

4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures
Most of the protective designations noted in 4.2.1 are equally applicable on State, Federal, and Tribal properties which have shared boundaries with Mesa Verde National Park. Fortunately, this situation further enhances management and protection of both the park and surrounding protected areas.

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System
Day-to-day operations of Mesa Verde National Park are overseen by the Superintendent of the park. The Superintendent reports to the Intermountain Regional Director; the Regional Director reports to the Director of the National Park Service. The park consults regularly with representatives from 24 culturally-affiliated Native American tribes who are descendents of the Ancestral Puebloan peoples. These consultants work with park staff to revise information booklets and films, review the content of museum exhibits, advise on the content of public interpretive programs, and review proposed construction/development plans.
Mesa Verde National Park's General Management Plan was completed in 1979. All parks are required to have a General Management Plan by law. The park would like to initiate the process of preparing a new General Management Plan, but there is no schedule for accomplishing this.
The current plan focuses on existing conditions and discusses alternatives for visitor use and interpretation, access and circulation, concessioner operations, administration, housing and maintenance. Most of the proposed alternatives have not been implemented. Some projects are in the planning stages, including a new curatorial facility and a Cultural/Visitor Center at the park entrance, and development of a transportation system for visitors. The current plan is not available on the Internet.

Comment
Park operations overseen by Superintendent and Management Team. Superintendent reports to Intermountain Regional Director who in turn reports to the Director of the National Park Service. Park consults with local, State, Federal Agencies, and 26 culturally-affiliated/traditionally associated Tribal communities on issues of mutual concern. Management guided by public law, DOI/NPS management policies, and park's strategic plan. New Visitor & Research Center (park museum collection) open 2013.

4.3.2 - Management Documents
Comment
Management documents include Strategic Plan (2011); draft Fire, Invasive Plant, Pest Management, and Long Range Interpretive Plans; Museum Collection Management Plan; Archaeological Sites and Natural Resources Conservation Program designs; Feral Horse Plan: Park Safety Plans; numerous database systems designed to organize, analyze, and compare relevant data in support of park decision making; and an array of focused operational plans that assist with day to day management issues.

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 **fully adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?
The management system is being **fully** implemented and monitored

4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?
An annual work / action plan exists and **most or all activities** are being implemented and monitored

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

Local communities / residents	Good
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Fair
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Poor

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?

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 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

The management system of Mesa Verde National Park reflects a combination of long standing practices, increased cooperation between park and partners, focused operational planning, and highly effective use of project funding to enhance park infrastructure, resources, and visitor experience. Next steps should include enhanced integration of cultural/natural resources management, archaeological conservation planning, implementation of science-based decision making, and creative visitor education.

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)	2%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO´s, foundations, etc)	2%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	4%
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	2%
Other grants	

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

Comment

No assistance received from the World Heritage Fund.

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

The available budget is **sufficient** but further funding would enable more effective management to international best practice standard

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

Management of park finance and infrastructure is facilitated by automated database systems focused on design, implementation, monitoring of program/project budgets, human resources, park assets, and workplan accomplishments. At present, park finances and infrastructure are sufficient to protect and preserve the park's Outstanding Universal Values. This system would be further enhanced by the inclusion of long range modeling that would assist in identifying and analyzing relevant trends.

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

Full-time	86%
Part-time	14%

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

Permanent	93%
Seasonal	7%

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

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

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	Fair
Community outreach	Good
Interpretation	Good
Education	Good

Visitor management	Good
Conservation	Good
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Good
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

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	High
Promotion	Low
Community outreach	Low
Interpretation	High
Education	Medium
Visitor management	Medium
Conservation	High
Administration	High
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 **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

In the interest of preserving the park's Outstanding Universal Value it is imperative that Mesa Verde NP embrace efforts to build capacity from as full a spectrum of resources as possible. By necessity, this will include interagency cooperation far beyond existing levels; vigorous partnerships with academia and business; and the incorporation of approaches aimed at designing capacity that meets planned needs over long spans of time.

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 widely** with the local, national and international audiences

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

Perhaps the most important task we face is to encourage the integration/synthesis of information into accessible, easily understood formats designed to support park operations. Ideally, this effort would produce a 'common platform of knowledge' capable of informing science based decision making.

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	Poor
Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Poor

4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?

There is a planned education and awareness programme but it only **partly meets the needs** and could be improved

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

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, **but it could be improved**

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

There is **excellent presentation and interpretation** of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property

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

Visitor centre	Excellent
Site museum	Excellent
Information booths	Adequate

Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Excellent
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Not needed

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

While the park has done a very good job educating staff, visitors, partners, and surrounding communities regarding the status of Mesa Verde as a World Heritage Site, significant effort remains to effectively explain the fundamental concepts of Outstanding Universal Value, the scope and breadth of the World Heritage system, and the inherent factors threatening the preservation of world heritage.

4.7. Visitor Management

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

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

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

Entry tickets and registries
Accommodation establishments
Transportation services
Visitor surveys
Other

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents
Comment

Primary documents include: Interpretive Prospectus (1993); Comprehensive Interpretive Plan (2001); Long Range Interpretive Plan (2013); Visitor Distribution and Transportation Plan (2002); Mesa Verde National Park Visitor Study (2012); Impacts of Visitor Spending on the Local Economy (2012); Mesa Verde National Park and Yucca House National Monument 5-Year Strategic Plan 2012 - 2016.

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 **effectively managed** and does not impact its Outstanding Universal Value

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

A challenge we face in managing visitors is to provide a more individualized experience. Over the years there have been numerous efforts to open backcountry areas to visitors and thereby provide an enhanced experience. From an interpretive view this is a laudable objective, while from a conservation perspective very problematic. Given technology, the solution may lie in integrating backcountry visits with digital data capable of an enhanced virtual experience along with a conservation charette.

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 **comprehensive, integrated programme** of monitoring, which is relevant to 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** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

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

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
3.7	**Local conditions affecting physical fabric**						
3.7.3	**Temperature**	As noted in 3.7.2, painted architectural surfaces are evident in sandstone alcoves. Inconjunction with relative humidity, temperature fluctuations (e.g. rapid freeze/thaw cycles) may also affect the conservation of painted architectural surfaces.	Park actions include further inventory, detailed architectural documentation, and condition assessment; materials analysis; field research focused on conservation of architectural surfaces; and continued development of proactive management strategy.	Monitoring of localized effects focuses on annual site inspection, collection of field data from instruments, and review of treatments employed to stabilize architectural surfaces. This data is analyzed to determine efficacy of treatments parkwide.	Described actions and monitoring programs are carried out on a recurring basis, with a long term objective to complete inventory, documentation, and assessment of all extant architectural surfaces: creating in effect a comparative conservation lab.	The National Park Service is lead agency in cooperation with the Colorado State Historic Preservation Office, 26 affiliated tribal communities, and University of Pennsylvania, School of Conservation which provides essential scientific expertise.	Along with other site specific factors (e.g. pests, diverse plants, water, air pollution, visitation and alcove instability) fluctuations in both temperature and relative humidity can severely affect conservation of painted architectural surfaces.
3.10	**Climate change and severe weather events**						
3.10.3	**Drought**	Prolonged drought threatens archaeological resources identified in Criterion iii by altering the rate, scale, intensity, and specific character of formation processes. Examples include enhanced threat of wildland fire and broadscale desertification.	Park actions include development of an enhanced Cultural/Natural Resources Program; working with range of governmental, institutional, and academic partners; long range planning:and reconstructing history of drought cycles over the last 1,500 years.	Monitoring of drought conditions accomplished through two park weather stations; continual evaluation of park vegetation and soil profiles; interagency partnerships with USFS, BLM, FWS, and BIA; maintained park fire lookouts; and aerial inspection.	Given severity of present drought conditions, Mesa Verde NP maintains scientific (NPS and partners) and monitoring capacity throughout the year. Systematic and anecdotal information is recorded and analyzed in support of multidisciplinary studies.	The National Park Service is the Lead Agency in cooperation with the USFS, BLM, FWS, BIA, State of Colorado, local and tribal communities.	While much of the park's efforts focus on ecological monitoring and change, the effects of drought upon archaeological resources are of equal concern. Both archaeological sites and landscapes are monitored to assess the effects of drought.
3.10.6	**Temperature change**	Increasing temperatures threaten archaeological resources identified in Criterion iii through landscape scale drought, desertification, altered hydrology, erosion, and erratic fire behaviour leading to accelerated deterioration and loss of integrity	Park actions include development of an enhanced Cultural/Natural Resources Program; working with range of governmental, institutional, and academic partners; long range planning;and development of alternative conservation strategies.	Monitoring of temperature change and its effects accomplished through two park weather stations; continual evaluation of vegetation monitoring plots, wildlife communities, seeps, and springs; interagency partnerships with USFS, BLM, FWS, and BIA.	Given severity of present drought conditions, Mesa Verde NP maintains scientific (NPS and partners) and monitoring capacity throughout the year. Systematic and anecdotal information is recorded and analyzed in support of multidisciplinary studies.	The National Park Service is the Lead Agency in cooperation with the USFS, BLM, FWS, BIA, State of Colorado, local and tribal communities.	While much of the park's efforts focus on ecological monitoring and change, the effects of drought upon archaeological resources are of equal concern. Both archaeological sites and landscapes are monitored to assess the effects of drought.
3.10.7	**Other climate change impacts**	Storm severity and periodicity, significant changes in overall seasonal weather patterns, loss of vegetative cover, etc. will adversely affect archaeological resources identified in Criterion iii.	Mesa Verde is engaged in long range effort to establish baseline data for both cultural and natural resources. This effort, in combination with understanding of climate factors, will assist in development of preventive conservation strategies.	Monitoring of climate change accomplished through two park weather stations; continual evaluation of park vegetation and soil profiles; interagency partnerships with USFS, BLM, FWS, and BIA; maintained park fire lookouts; and aerial inspection.	Given severity of present drought conditions, Mesa Verde NP maintains scientific (NPS and partners) and monitoring capacity throughout the year. Systematic and anecdotal information is recorded and analyzed in support of multidisciplinary studies.	The National Park Service is the Lead Agency in cooperation with the USFS, BLM, FWS, BIA, State of Colorado, local and tribal communities.	Overall, the adverse effects of climate change have potential to fundamentally alter the OUV identified in Criterion iii. In response, park is preparing Archaeological Site & Landscape Conservation Plans designed to focus on preservation of OUV.
3.11	**Sudden ecological or geological events**						

	World Heritage criteria and attributes affected	Actions	Monitoring	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
3.11.6 Fire (widlfires)	Wildland fire is the most significant threat to the preservation of archaeological sites and landscapes identified in Criterion iii. Virtually all components of the archaeological record will sustain moderate to devastating adverse effects.	Park actions include development of a Fire Management Program and Plan; post fire assessment and protection of archaeological resources; ongoing fuel reduction projects; stringent restrictions during fire seasons; and support of academic research.	Roughly 75% of the landscape has been affected by fire with conditions steadily worsening. The monitoring of hazardous fuels/fire weather is accomplished via two weather stations, fire lookouts, ground/aerial assessments, and satellite imagery.	Given the severity of present drought conditions, Mesa Verde NP allocates human and fiscal resources on a year round basis. There is a clear realization that the actions and monitoring already noted will require continual effort.	The National Park Service is the Lead Agency in cooperation with the US Forest Service, BLM, BIA, State of Colorado, local and tribal communities.	Since 1933, Mesa Verde has had18 fires from three to 22,405 acres in extent. This history has affected ca. 50% of park's archaeological resources with consequent loss of integrity; mitigated only by rapid assessment, documentation, and preservation.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

Answers provided have not outlined any serious management need.

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
Resources identified in Criterion iii reflect two distinct components. The first, composed of major alcoves containing monumental architecture and excavated sites, has been open to visitation for over a century. These have been managed and heavily stabilized. Authenticity has been retained, Integrity intact. The second, backcountry sites not open to visitation. Authenticity and integrity intact.

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	Very positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Very positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Very positive
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Not applicable
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	Positive
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status
Overall, Mesa Verde's status as a World Heritage Site has been vitally important in regards to Foreign visitation. Not only has this encouraged larger visitation numbers, but also a more informed visitor. Being a WHS has also provided opportunities

to interact with WHS managers and scientists from throughout the world, and thereby allowed for a greater appreciation of world heritage in general. At their very best, these contacts have encouraged a sense of delight in working for the common good!

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

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff
Staff from other World Heritage properties
Indigenous peoples
External experts

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
Incorporate geographical capability into the questionnaire so those responding could map specific information, observations, and factors affecting the site. This would also be beneficial in terms of identifying alternate management strategies throughout the WHS, providing fine-grained resolution regarding questions of authenticity and integrity, and allowing for illustrating particularly problematic issues. Along these same lines is the possibility of posting images of one sort or another.

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

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Very poor

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

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

The World Heritage Convention
The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and / or Authenticity
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	Satisfactory
State Party	Excellent
Site Managers	Satisfactory
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