

## Periodic Report - Second Cycle

### 1. World Heritage Property Data

#### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Kuk Early Agricultural Site

#### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

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

- Papua New Guinea

##### Type of Property

cultural

##### Identification Number

887

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

2008

#### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

| Name                        | Coordinates      | Property (ha) | Buffer zone (ha) | Total (ha) | Inscription year |
|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|------------|------------------|
| Kuk Early Agricultural Site | -5.784 / 144.332 | 116           | 195              | 311        | 2008             |
| <b>Total (ha)</b>           |                  | <b>116</b>    | <b>195</b>       | <b>311</b> |                  |

#### 1.4 - Map(s)

| Title   | Date       | Link to source   |
|---|------------|--|
| Kuk, Map of the Kuk Early Agricultural Site, showing boundaries and buffer zone | 31/01/2007 |  |

#### 1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

##### Comment

Department of Environment and Conservation

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

- Department of Environment and Conservation  
Intern  
CLT/WHC/SPU  
4.21

- Vagi Renagi Genorupa  
National World Heritage Secretariat  
Manager  
Department of Environment & Conservation

##### Comment

Head of Department email is wiamo@dec.gov.pg

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

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

## Section II - Kuk Early Agricultural Site (887)

### 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

##### Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The Kuk Early Agricultural Site, a well-preserved buried archaeological testimony, demonstrates an independent technological leap which transformed plant exploitation to agriculture around 7,000-6,400 years ago, based on vegetative propagation of bananas, taro and yam. It is an excellent example of transformation of agricultural practices over time from mounds on wetland margins around 7,000-6,400 years ago to drainage of the wetlands through digging of ditches with wooden tools from 4,000 BP to the present. The archaeological evidence reveals remarkably persistent but episodic traditional land-use and practices where the genesis of that land-use can be established and changes in practice over time demonstrated from possibly as early as 10,000 BP to the present day.

Criterion (iii): The extent of the evidence of early agriculture on the Kuk site can be seen as an exceptional testimony to a type of exploitation of the land which reflects the culture of early man in the region.

Criterion (iv): Kuk is one of the few places in the world where archaeological evidence suggests independent agricultural development and changes in agricultural practice over a 7,000 and possibly a 10,000 year time span.

Archaeological investigations have been intensive rather than extensive and excavations have affected only a minor proportion of the core area of the site. Modern farming activities at Kuk remain relatively low-key and do not intrude upon the archaeological features of the site. The integrity of the site is thus maintained. The excavations and scientific work that have been done at the site are of the highest international professional standard and thus the excavated remains retain their authenticity. Contemporary land-use has been restricted to modern versions of traditional activities and is supportive to the authenticity of the core evidence on the site.

The legal protection in place is adequate, but customary protection needs confirmation as soon as possible through the designation of the property as a Conservation Area and through the associated formal land management agreement with the local community for aspects of site management. The Management Plan should be completed as soon as possible and formally resourced and implemented, and a formal memoranda of understanding established among relevant national, provincial and local government authorities and other stakeholders concerning management responsibilities on the ground and reporting lines.

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

(iii)(iv)

**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)**

Some low level agricultural drainage activities are occurring

**3.15. Factors Summary Table**

**3.15.1 - Factors summary table**

| Name   | Impact  | Origin  |
|--|---|---|
| <b>3.5</b>   | <b>Biological resource use/modification</b>   |   |
| 3.5.5 Crop production  |      |   |
| <b>3.6</b>   | <b>Physical resource extraction</b>   |   |
| 3.6.4 Water (extraction)   |       |   |
| <b>3.7</b>   | <b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>   |   |
| 3.7.6 Water (rain/water table)   |       |   |
| <b>3.8</b>   | <b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>   |   |
| 3.8.2 Society's valuing of heritage  |      |   |
| 3.8.5 Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community |       |   |
| <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>   |   |
| 3.10.3 Drought   |      |   |
| <b>3.11</b>  | <b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>   |   |
| 3.11.6 Fire (wildfires)  |      |   |
| <b>3.12</b>  | <b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>   |   |
| 3.12.2 Invasive/alien terrestrial species                                  |      |   |
| 3.12.3 Invasive / alien freshwater species                                 |       |   |
| <b>Legend</b>  |  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

## 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 **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 buffer zones of the World Heritage property **do not limit** the ability to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value **but they could be improved**

#### 4.1.4 - 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

### 4.2. Protective Measures

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

The *National Cultural Property (Preservation) Act and Regulations (1965)* currently protect Kuk as national cultural property of "particular importance to the cultural heritage of the country". This is the highest level of cultural heritage protection normally afforded by Papua New Guinea legislation.

#### 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 **no effective 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

### 4.3. Management System / Management Plan

#### 4.3.1 - Management System

##### Comment

A Management System is in process of development

#### 4.3.2 - Management Documents

##### Comment

An interim Management Plan for Kuk was developed in 2010. Full Management Plan is being developed.

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

There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies / levels involved in the management of the property **but it could be improved**

#### 4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?

The management system/plan is only **partially adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

## Periodic Report - Second Cycle

### 4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?

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

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

No annual work / action plan exists **despite an identified need**

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

|                               |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Local communities / residents | Fair           |
| Local / Municipal authorities | Fair           |
| Indigenous peoples            | Fair           |
| Landowners                    | Fair           |
| Visitors                      | Non-existent   |
| Researchers                   | Fair           |
| Tourism industry              | Poor           |
| Industry                      | Not applicable |

### 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 have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role

### 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

### 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) | 00% |
|---|-----|

## Section II - Kuk Early Agricultural Site (887)

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)                     | 00% |
| Governmental (National / Federal)                                     | 60% |
| Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)                          | 40% |
| Governmental (Local / Municipal)                                      | 00% |
| In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)                        | 00% |
| Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)  | 00% |
| Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.) | 00% |
| Other grants  | 00% |

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

#### Comment

There is no International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)

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

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

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

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)?

**Potential** economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed

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

There are **little or no** equipment or facilities despite an identified need

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

There is **little or no** maintenance of existing equipment and facilities or no equipment and facilities, despite an identified need.

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

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

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Full-time | 100% |
| Part-time | 0%   |

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

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Permanent | 100% |
| Seasonal  | 0%   |

## Periodic Report - Second Cycle

### 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 **inadequate** 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          | Fair         |
| Promotion                        | Poor         |
| Community outreach               | Non-existent |
| Interpretation                   | Non-existent |
| Education                        | Poor         |
| Visitor management               | Non-existent |
| Conservation                     | Poor         |
| Administration                   | Fair         |
| Risk preparedness                | Poor         |
| Tourism                          | Poor         |
| Enforcement (custodians, police) | Non-existent |

### 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                        | Low           |
| Community outreach               | Not available |
| Interpretation                   | Not available |
| Education                        | Low           |
| Visitor management               | Not available |
| Conservation                     | Low           |
| Administration                   | Not available |
| Risk preparedness                | Not available |
| Tourism                          | Not available |
| Enforcement (custodians, police) | Not available |

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

**No capacity** development plan or programme is in place; management is implemented by external staff and skills are not transferred

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

## 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**

## Section II - Kuk Early Agricultural Site (887)

### 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 **no research** taking place in the World Heritage property despite an identified need

### 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

There was comprehensive research immediately prior to nomination but there has been no research since.

## 4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

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

Not displayed at all

### 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 | Excellent |
| Local Indigenous peoples   | Excellent |
| Local landowners   | Excellent |
| Visitors   | Poor      |
| Tourism industry   | Average   |
| Local businesses and industries                                  | Average   |

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Periodic Report - Second Cycle**

**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 needed |
| Information booths        | Not needed |
| Guided tours              | Not needed |
| Trails / routes           | Not needed |
| Information materials     | Poor       |
| Transportation facilities | Not needed |
| Other                     | Not needed |

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

These aspects will be addressed in the Management Planning process

**4.7. Visitor Management**

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

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| Last year       | N/A |
| Two years ago   | N/A |
| Three years ago | N/A |
| Four years ago  | N/A |
| Five years ago  | N/A |

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

|       |
|-------|
| Other |
|-------|

**4.7.3 - Visitor management documents**

**Comment**

Current visitation is negligible and future visitation will be addressed in the management process

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

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

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

Although the tourism industry is active in the property, there is **little or no contact** between tourism operators and those responsible for the World Heritage property

**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

**Section II - Kuk Early Agricultural Site (887)**

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

The site is small and World Heritage Values are buried and not visible to visitors. There are no visitor facilities provided at the site. A policy on visitor use and facilities will be developed during the management planning process.

**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 **no monitoring** taking place in the World Heritage property or buffer zone despite an identified need

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

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient to define key indicators, **but this has not been done**

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

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff | Non-existent |
| Local / Municipal authorities                    | Non-existent |
| Local communities                                | Non-existent |
| Researchers                                      | Non-existent |
| NGOs   | Non-existent |
| 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**

Management planning has commenced and process of formal protection is underway

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

An effective means of monitoring the underground World Heritage Values has not yet been developed

**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**

| 4.2 Protective Measures                      |  |   |                    |   |  |
|--|--|---|--------------------|---|--|
|  |  | Actions   | Timeframe          | Lead agency (and others involved)   | More info / comment  |
| 4.2.5  | No effective capacity / resources to enforce legislation                 | Seek funding from departmental re-current budget and Australian aid PPSLP and put in place a workable management structure.   | 2011 - 2013        | Department of Environment and Conservation and partner stakeholders and NGOs. | The Department of Environment & Conservation will collaborate with Australian Government, etc.   |
| 4.3 Management System / Management Plan      |  |   |                    |   |  |
| 4.3.6  | No annual work / action plan exists                                      | Work Plans and Strategic Action Plans are being developed jointly between PNG and Australia.  | 2011 to 2013.      | Department of Environment & Conservation (PNG) and DSEWPac (Australia).       | The Annual Work/Action Plans exists provisionally but will be reviewed when real action takes place.                                       |
| 4.5 Scientific Studies and Research Projects |  |   |                    |   |  |
| 4.5.2  | There is no research taking place in the property                        | Maintain continuous linkages with researchers who undertook past research work at Kuk site. (e.g. Dr. Tim Denham, Prof. Jack Golosn, and Dr. John Muke.                       | 2011 and on-going. | Department of Environment and Conservation and partner stakeholders and NGOs. | There was past researches undertaken by many doctrate scholars who are also depository of vital research work and information in achieves. |
| 4.8 Monitoring                               |  |   |                    |   |  |
| 4.8.1  | No monitoring taking place in the World Heritage property or buffer zone | Action 1: To design a effective monitoring methodology. Action 2: To co-opt with stakeholders partners, NGO's and landowners to undertake periodic monitoring and evaluation. | 2011 and on-going. | DEC and stakeholders partners (NGO's).  | Monitoring has not taken place in the Core and Buffer areas bascially because on-site work has not begun as yet.                           |



**Periodic Report - Second Cycle**

**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**

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

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

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

|  |
|--|
| 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?**

no

**Section II - Kuk Early Agricultural Site (887)**

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

As for first time State Parties to prepare Periodic Reporting, it is primarily hard to get going.

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

|                            |           |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| UNESCO                     | Fair      |
| State Party Representative | Very good |
| Advisory Body              | Very good |

**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 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 |
| 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   | Excellent    |
| Advisory Bodies | Excellent    |

**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**