

## 1. World Heritage Property Data

### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Kaziranga National Park

### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

#### State(s) Party(ies)

- India

#### Type of Property

natural

#### Identification Number

337

#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

#### Comment

Type of Property: Natural Total 429.56 km<sup>2</sup> contiguous area has been added to the original 430 km<sup>2</sup> area .In 2005 AD the property become a part of the Kaziranga Karbi Anglong Elephant Reserve. Later, the property become a part of Kaziranga Tiger Reserve. These changes have made the property more viable.

### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Kaziranga National Park	26.667 / 93.417	42996	0	42996	1985
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>42996</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42996</b>	

### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Map showing the inscribed property	18/04/1984	

### 1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

#### Comment

Department of Environment & Forests of Government of Assam of India is responsible for the property. This is not a Institution but a functioning department headed by a minister of Government of Assam.

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

- Surajit Dutta  
Kaziranga National Park

#### Comment

Surajit Dutta, IFS Director Kaziranga National Park

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

1. [1001wonders.org](http://1001wonders.org) : visit this site in panophotographies - 360 x 180 degree images
2. [The official Website of Ministry of Tourism](http://www.tourism.gov.in)
3. [Natural site datasheet from WCMC](http://www.wcmc.org)

#### Comment

Official website: [www.worldheritagekaziranga.com](http://www.worldheritagekaziranga.com)

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

#### Comment

The Kaziranga National Park along with some nearby areas have been declared as Kaziranga Tiger Reserve in December 2007. The World Heritage Property constitutes CORE AREA of Kaziranga Tiger Reserve.

## 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

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

#### Comment

The Draft SOUV has been submitted to be UNESCO World Heritage Center by the State Party on 31 March, 2011 and is under consideration.

### 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

\*Largest world population of rare, endangered or vulnerable population of Rhinoceros unicornis, Bubalis bubalis Arnee, Cervus duvauceli Ranjitsinhii. \*Significant source population of Panthera tigris, Elephas maximus, Hyalobatis hoolock, Platinista gangeticus \*Wintering or breeding habitat for large number of migratory avifaunal species. \*Representative of the Brahmaputra valley flood plain vegetation.

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

Because the statement was not available at the time of inscription.

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

Some of the significant values of the property have been listed in the approved management plan. These provide the basis for retrospective statement.

## 3. Factors Affecting the Property

### 3.14. Other factor(s)

#### 3.14.1 - Other factor(s)

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact				Origin
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>					
3.1.3 Industrial areas						
3.1.4 Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure						
3.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities						
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>					
3.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure						
3.2.4 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure						
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>					
3.3.1 Water infrastructure						
3.3.3 Non-renewable energy facilities						
3.3.4 Localised utilities						
3.3.5 Major linear utilities						
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>					
3.4.1 Pollution of marine waters						
3.4.3 Surface water pollution						
3.4.5 Solid waste						
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>					
3.5.3 Land conversion						
3.5.4 Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals						
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Physical resource extraction</b>					
3.6.2 Quarrying						
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>					
3.8.2 Society's valuing of heritage						
3.8.6 Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation						
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Other human activities</b>					
3.9.1 Illegal activities						
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>					
3.10.2 Flooding						
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>					
3.11.2 Earthquake						
3.11.5 Erosion and siltation/ deposition						
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>					
3.12.2 Invasive/alien terrestrial species						
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>					
3.13.1 Low impact research / monitoring activities						
3.13.3 Management activities						
<b>Legend</b>						

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>				
3.1.3 Industrial areas	restricted	on-going	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.1.4 Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	localised	on-going	minor	low capacity	increasing

		Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend
3.2	Transportation Infrastructure					
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	localised	on-going	minor	no capacity and / or resources	increasing
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	localised	on-going	significant	no capacity and / or resources	increasing
3.3	Services Infrastructures					
3.3.5	Major linear utilities	restricted	frequent	minor	no capacity and / or resources	static
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.3	Surface water pollution	localised	intermittent or sporadic	minor	no capacity and / or resources	static
3.5	Biological resource use/modification					
3.5.3	Land conversion	restricted	frequent	minor	low capacity	increasing
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals	localised	on-going	significant	medium capacity	static
3.6	Physical resource extraction					
3.6.2	Quarrying	localised	on-going	significant	no capacity and / or resources	increasing
3.8	Social/cultural uses of heritage					
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	localised	frequent	minor	medium capacity	increasing
3.9	Other human activities					
3.9.1	Illegal activities	localised	frequent	minor	medium capacity	static
3.10	Climate change and severe weather events					
3.10.2	Flooding	extensive	frequent	significant	low capacity	static
3.11	Sudden ecological or geological events					
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/ deposition	localised	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing
3.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species					
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	extensive	on-going	significant	low capacity	increasing

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

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

Poaching of rhinoceros is major problem. Weed invasion, sediment deposition in the water bodies, bank erosion, unplanned growth of hotels and restaurants in the vicinity, straying of rhinoceros, depredation by elephant are some of the increasing problem which affects the property.

### 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

Though there was no buffer zones at the the time of inscription, subsequently, 6 contiguous areas totaling 43000 has been proposed as Addition areas to the Park. The process has been delayed due to litigation. After declaration of Kaziranga Tiger Reserve with the World Heritage as Core Zone, some areas has been added as buffer zone.

### 4.2. Protective Measures

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

#### 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 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

#### 4.2.4 - 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 **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

More trained manpower is needed for effective protective measures.

### 4.3. Management System / Management Plan

#### 4.3.1 - Management System

#### 4.3.2 - Management Documents

##### Comment

The property has been managed under the guidance of Kaziranga National Park Management Plan (2003-4 to 2013-14), which is approved by Federal as well as Provincial Government.

#### 4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional /

**Periodic Report - Second Cycle**

**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 **only partially** being implemented

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

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

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

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

**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

**Section II - Kaziranga National Park (337)**

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

The Conservation Plan for entire Kaziranga Tiger Reserve which is in draft stage will replace the existing Management Plan in due time.

**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**



The management system has been remain same for the property, some minor changes has been taken place since the time last reporting. \*The Director , now also Field Director of Kaziranga Tiger Reserve (declared in 2007) which look after a total of 103000 ha. \*A new administrative range named as Northern Range Range now looks after the Brahmaputra River portion of the 6th Addition.

**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)	1%
Governmental (National / Federal)	57%
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	40%
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	0%
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	2%
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
N, Kaziranga, reinforcement protection	1997	50000.00	
Reinforcement of Kaziranga National Park	1997	50000.00	
<b>Total</b>		100000	

**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

Periodic Report - Second Cycle

**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**

The property gets severely affected by floods annually and massive effort and resources are needed to rebuild and maintain the infrastructure.

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

Full-time	90%
Part-time	10%

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

Permanent	90%
Seasonal	10%

**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	Poor
Promotion	Not applicable
Community outreach	Non-existent
Interpretation	Non-existent
Education	Non-existent
Visitor management	Poor
Conservation	Good
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Poor
Tourism	Poor
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	Not available
Promotion	Not applicable
Community outreach	Not available
Interpretation	Not available

Section II - Kaziranga National Park (337)

Education	Not available
Visitor management	Low
Conservation	Low
Administration	Low
Risk preparedness	Low
Tourism	Low
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Low

**4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?**

A capacity development plan or programme is in place and **partially implemented**; some technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally **but most of the technical work is carried out by external staff**

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

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** 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**

**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	Poor
Local Indigenous peoples	Average
Local landowners	Average
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Excellent
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 **limited and ad hoc** education and awareness programme

**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 **not influenced** education, information or 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 adequately presented and interpreted **but improvements could be made**

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

Visitor centre	Poor
Site museum	Not provided but needed
Information booths	Not provided but needed
Guided tours	Not provided but needed
Trails / routes	Poor
Information materials	Poor
Transportation facilities	Poor
Other	Adequate

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

Further efforts are needed to appropriately communicate the OUVs of the property to the range of visitors that come to the park especially children and youth.

**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
------------------------------

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**Comment**

No document is available.

**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, but it makes **no contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

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

**4.8. Monitoring**

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

There is a **small amount** of monitoring, but it is not planned

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

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

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

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities	Non-existent
Local communities	Poor
Researchers	Poor
NGOs	Poor
Industry	Non-existent
Local indigenous peoples	Non-existent

**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	
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>						
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	ix	Traffic regulations need to be continuously regulated.	Measurement of road induced mortality of wild animals.	Annually.	Park Management	No comments.
3.2.4	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	ix	Speeding of vehicles	Measurement of road induced mortality of wild animals.	Annually	Park Management and Public Works Department (PWD).	No comments.
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Physical resource extraction</b>						
3.6.2	Quarrying	ix	Regulation of quarrying in and around the property.	Quantum of material removed from the park.	Annually.	Department of Forests of Karbi Anglong Autonomous Council	No comments.
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>						
3.10.2	Flooding						
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>						
3.11.5	Erosion and siltation/deposition	ix and x	Control of erosion and removal of silt.	Measurement of silt deposition at various locations in the park.	Annually	Park Management	No comments.
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>						
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species	ix	Destruction of tall prime habitat	Distribution and abundance status of invasive species in various parts of the park.	Annually.	Park Management, Scientific Institutions and NGOs.	No comments.

### 5.2. Summary - Management Needs

#### 5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

<b>4.7 Visitor Management</b>						
	Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment		
4.7.6	Fees collected makes no contribution to the management of the property	Government needs to frame regulations for recycling of park revenues through tourism.	One year.	State Forest Department.	No comments.	
<b>4.8 Monitoring</b>						
4.8.1	Some monitoring, but it is not planned	A monitoring plan needs to be developed.	One year.	Park Management, Scientific Institutions and NGOs.	No comments.	

**Periodic Report - Second Cycle**

**5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property**

**5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity**

Not applicable (for sites inscribed exclusively under criteria vii to x)

**5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity**

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

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

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

**5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values**

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

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

**5.4.1 - Comments**

**6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise**

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

Conservation	Positive
Research and monitoring	No impact
Management effectiveness	No impact
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	No impact
Recognition	Positive
Education	No impact
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	No impact
International cooperation	No impact
Political support for conservation	No impact
Legal / Policy framework	No impact
Lobbying	No impact
Institutional coordination	No impact
Security	No impact
Other (please specify)	No impact

**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

**Section II - Kaziranga National Park (337)**

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

yes

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

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

UNESCO	Fair
State Party Representative	Fair
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

**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	

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

**• Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance**

Reason for update: The Draft SOUV has been submitted to be UNESCO World Heritage Center by the State Party on 31 March, 2011 and is under consideration.

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