

1. World Heritage Property Data**1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property**

Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome)

1.2 - World Heritage Property Details**State(s) Party(ies)**

• Japan

Type of Property

cultural

Identification Number

775

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome)	34.383 / 132.45	0.4	42.7	43.1	1996
Total (ha)		0.4	42.7	43.1	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Map indicating the extent of the property	28/09/1995	

1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property**Comment**

The Agency for Cultural Affairs 3-2-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8959 TEL: +81-3-5253-4111 FAX: +81-3-6734-3822

1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

• KIMURA Nobuyuki

"Cultural Properties Division, Administrative Department,

Comment

Cultural Properties Division, Administrative Department, Hiroshima Prefectural Board of Education

1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

1. [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)

2. [The City of Hiroshima](#)

Comment

<http://www.city.hiroshima.lg.jp/toshiseibi/dome/>

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****Comment**

The Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) was the only structure left standing in the area where the first atomic bomb exploded on 6 August 1945. Through the efforts of many people, including those of the city of Hiroshima, it has been preserved in the same state as immediately after the bombing. Not only is it a stark and powerful symbol of the most destructive force ever created by humankind; it also expresses the hope for world peace and the ultimate elimination of all nuclear weapons. The most important meaning of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial is in what it symbolizes, and is the point that architecture itself doesn't have an aesthetic, architectural meaning. This silent structure symbolizes tremendous destructive power, which humankind can invent on one hand, but on the other hand, it reminds us of the hope for the world permanent peace. Thus the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) has an outstanding universal value.

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

(vi)

2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

Criterion (vi) The Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) is a stark and powerful symbol of the achievement of world peace for more than half a century following the unleashing of the most destructive force ever created by humankind.

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

nothing in particular

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

nothing in particular

3. Factors Affecting the Property**3.14. Other factor(s)****3.14.1 - Other factor(s)**

nothing in particular

3.15. Factors Summary Table

3.15.1 - Factors summary table

					Name	Impact			Origin
3.1					Buildings and Development				
3.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities									
3.11					Sudden ecological or geological events				
3.11.2 Earthquake									
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside			

3.16. Assessment of current negative factors

3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors

No factor is both current and negative.

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

3.17.1 - Comments

nothing in particular

4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is a buffer zone

4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are **known** by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

nothing in particular

4.2. Protective Measures

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

Comment

The Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) is protected under the provisions of the Act for the Protection of Cultural Properties, having been designated as a historic site under the act in 1995, while the surrounding Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park, which includes the Dome, was designated a place of scenic beauty under the act in 2007.

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 **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

nothing in particular

4.3. Management System / Management Plan

4.3.1 - Management System

The property is owned by the City of Hiroshi ma. Matters relating to the 1950 Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties are the concern of the national Agency for Cultural Affairs (Bunka-cho). Other bodies participating in the management of the monument are the Council for the Protection of Cultural properties and its Committee of Experts, the Ministry of construction, Hiroshima Prefecture and its Board of Education, and the Board of Education of the City of Hiroshima.

A management office operated by the City of Hiroshima located in the Peace Memorial Park is responsible for the daily management of the Dome. The City assigns specialists for the preservation maintenance of the Dome and carries out a survey three years to monitor the degree of stability of its structure and its general condition.

The Peace Memorial Park within which the Dome is situated is managed in accordance with the City Parks Law and the Byelaw for the Parks of Hiroshima. There is buffer zone around the Dome within which no structures may be erected other than park facilities (which are limited to 12% of the total area of the Park). The City has also set up regulatory guidelines relation to the environment around the Park which control all construction in the surrounding area.

4.3.2 - Management Documents

Comment

Cultural Section, Lifelong Learning Department, Hiroshima City Board of Education, Preservation and Maintenance Plan for the Genbaku Dome Historic Site (former Hiroshima Prefectural Industrial Promotion Hall) (1999); Peace Promotion Division, Citizens Affairs Bureau, Hiroshima City, Policies for Preservation and Maintenance of Peace Memorial Facilities (2006)

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 **excellent coordination** between all bodies / levels involved in the management of the property

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	Not applicable
Landowners	Good
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Good

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 **regular contact** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone and **substantial co-operation** on management

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

nothing in particular

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

nothing in particular

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)	
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	100%
Governmental (National / Federal)	
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	
Other grants	

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

Comment

not applicable

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

nothing in particular

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

Full-time	100%
Part-time	0%

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

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	0%

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

Paid	100%
Volunteer	0%

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

Human resources are **adequate** for management needs

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	Fair
Interpretation	Fair
Education	Fair
Visitor management	Fair
Conservation	Good
Administration	Fair
Risk preparedness	Fair
Tourism	Fair
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	Low
Promotion	Low
Community outreach	Low
Interpretation	Low
Education	Low
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 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

nothing in particular

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

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

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

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

4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?

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

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

Cultural Section, Lifelong Learning Department, Hiroshima City Board of Education, Preservation and Maintenance Plan for the Genbaku Dome Historic Site (former Hiroshima Prefectural Industrial Promotion Hall) (1999); Peace Promotion Division, Citizens Affairs Bureau, Hiroshima City, Policies for Preservation and Maintenance of Peace Memorial Facilities (2006)

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

nothing in particular

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 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	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Excellent
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Excellent
Visitors	Excellent
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Excellent

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 and effective** education and awareness programme that contributes to the protection of the World Heritage property

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 been an **important influence** on education, information and awareness building activities

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	Adequate
Site museum	Adequate
Information booths	Adequate
Guided tours	Adequate
Trails / routes	Adequate
Information materials	Adequate
Transportation facilities	Adequate
Other	Adequate

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

nothing in particular

4.7. Visitor Management

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

Last year	Static
Two years ago	Static
Three years ago	Static
Four years ago	Static
Five years ago	Static

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

Other

4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

Comment

nothing in particular

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

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

No fees are collected

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

Method for collecting statistical data on visitors: counting the number of people entering the Genbaku Dome and the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum also located in Peace Memorial Park.

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	Excellent
Local communities	Average
Researchers	Excellent
NGOs	Average
Industry	Average
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

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

nothing in particular

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

nothing in particular

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

No factor is both current and negative.

5.2. Summary - Management Needs

5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs

Please select your top management needs in question 4.9 before filling in the summary table.

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

nothing in particular

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	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	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

nothing in particular

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

nothing in particular

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

UNESCO	Fair
State Party Representative	Good
Advisory Body	Fair

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

All required information was accessible

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

The property's Outstanding Universal Value
--

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

• Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

Reason for update: The Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) was the only structure left standing in the area where the first atomic bomb exploded on 6 August 1945. Through the efforts of many people, including those of the city of Hiroshima, it has been preserved in the same state as immediately after the bombing. Not only is it a stark and powerful symbol of the most destructive force ever created by humankind; it also expresses the hope for world peace and the ultimate elimination of all nuclear weapons. The most important meaning of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial is in what it symbolizes, and is the point that architecture itself doesn't have an aesthetic, architectural meaning. This silent structure symbolizes tremendous destructive power, which humankind can invent on one hand, but on the other hand, it reminds us of the hope for the world permanent peace. Thus the Hiroshima Peace Memorial (Genbaku Dome) has an outstanding universal value.

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

nothing in particular