

Rio de Janeiro: Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage property

Rio de Janeiro: Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea

1.2 - World Heritage property details


1.3 - Geographic information table

Name	Coordinates	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Tijuca Forest, Pretos Forros and Covanca – Tijuca National Park	-22.948 / -43.291	1982.58	8621.38	10603.96	
Pedra Bonita and Pedra da Gávea - Tijuca National Park	-22.998 / -43.287	257.89	?	257.89	
Carioca Mountain range - Tijuca National Park and Botanic Gardens	-22.954 / -43.247	1823.97	?	1823.97	
Mouth of Guanabara Bay and Manmade Shorelines – Flamengo Park, Historic Forts of Niterói, Sugar Loaf Natural Monument Copacabana Seafront	-22.949 / -43.152	3184.34	?	3184.34	
Total (ha)		7248.78	8621.38	15870.16	

Comment

Minimum limits are updated according to the georeferencing. 1. TNP Tijuca Forest, Pretos Forros and Covanca S22,937 /W43,297 - 1979,77 ha 2. TNP Pedra Bonita and Pedra da Gávea S22,959/W43,285 - 250,75 ha 3. TNP Carioca Mountain range and Botanic Gardens S22,959/W43,239 - 1865,11 ha 4. Mouth of Guanabara Bay and Manmade Shorelines – Flamengo Park, Historic Forts, Sugar Loaf, Copacabana Seafront S22,946/W43,148 - 3094,05 ha Buffer Zone S22,955 /W43,227 - 8157,36 ha Total - 14347,04ha

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Rio de Janeiro: Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea - inscribed property	2012	

Comment

Minimal boundary updating - the property limits were updated as a result of the georeferencing. The minimum boundary adjustments will be officially presented to UNESCO in February 2023. <https://siurb.rio/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=f751555b01284282b8adc0d7777a19a5>

1.5 - Web and Social Media data of the property (if applicable)

Comment

<http://portal.iphan.gov.br/pagina/detalhes/45/> <https://www.data.rio/apps/patrimonio-cultural-carioca/explore> <https://www.icomos.org.br/virtual-visit-to-the-botanic-gardens> <https://www.gov.br/pt-br/apps/jbrj-jardim-virtual>

2. Other Conventions/Programmes under which the World Heritage property is protected (if applicable)

2.1 - Records indicate that your World Heritage property (in whole or in part) is designated and/or protected under the Conventions/programmes shown in the prefilled table below. Please check and amend as necessary.

		The World Heritage property (in whole or in part) <u>is</u> designated and/or protected under this convention/programme	The World Heritage property (in whole or in part) <u>is not</u> designated and/or protected under this convention/programme
2.1.1	International Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection (1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict)		✗
2.1.2	List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection (Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict)		✗
2.1.3	The List of Wetlands of International Importance (The Ramsar List) (Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention))		✗
2.1.4	World Network of Biosphere Reserves Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme	✗	

2.1.5 **Global Geoparks Network**
UNESCO Global Geoparks

The World Network Biosphere Reserve applies in the Tijuca National Park.

No

No

No

No

2.7.1	1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.2	Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention)	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.5	UNESCO Global Geoparks	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	

2.8 - Please add any further comments on cooperation with the other designation(s)/programme(s)

We have nothing to add.

2.9 - Are you aware of any elements associated with the World Heritage property that have been inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage?

Yes

2.10 - Please list any elements associated with the World Heritage property inscribed under the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of which you are aware

Roda de Capoeira (2014). The 9th Session of the Intergovernmental Committee for Safeguarding approved, in November 2014, in Paris, the Roda de Capoeira. One of the greatest symbols of Brazilian identity, it is present throughout the national territory, in addition to being practiced in more than 160 countries, on all continents.

2.11 - Are you aware of any documentary heritage listed under the Memory of the World Programme associated with the World Heritage property?

Yes

2.12 - Please list any documentary heritage associated with the World Heritage property listed under the Memory of the World Programme of which you are aware.

-The Emperor's Collection: Brazilian and Foreign Photography from the 19th Century, proposed by the National Library, in 2003 - Aforamentos Series, presented by the General Archive of the City of Rio de Janeiro, in 2014 - Official Photographic Records of Urban Interventions in the City of Rio de Janeiro (1900-1950), presented by the General Archive, in 2015 - Iconography of Rio de Janeiro in the Geyer Collection (16th to 19th) presented by Casa Geyer /Museu Imperial/IBRAM, in 2015

3. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

3.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property as adopted by the World Heritage Committee

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief Synthesis

The city of Rio de Janeiro, shaped by interaction with mountains and sea, lies in the narrow strip of alluvial plain between Guanabara Bay and the Atlantic Ocean. Its exceptionally dramatic landscape is punctuated by a series of forested mountains that tower over the city, rising to the uppermost peak of the Tijuca massif at 1,021 m high, and cascading down to the coast where the steep cone shapes of Sugar Loaf (Pão de Açúcar), Urca, Cara de Cão and Corcovado frame the wide sweeps of Guanabara Bay that shelters Rio de Janeiro from the Atlantic Ocean.

Cradled between these mountains and Guanabara Bay, the urban landscape of the city has been shaped by significant historical events, influenced by a diversity of cultures, is perceived to be of great beauty, and is celebrated in the arts, through painting and poetry in particular.

The property encompasses all the key natural, structural elements that have constrained and inspired the development of the city. These stretch from the highest points of the mountains of the Tijuca National Park with its restored Atlantic forest, down to the sea, and include the Botanical Gardens established in 1808, Corcovado mountain, with its statue of Christ, and the chain of dramatic steep green hills, Sugar Loaf, Pico, Leme and Glória, around Guanabara Bay, as well as the extensive designed landscapes on reclaimed land along Copacabana Bay which, together with Flamengo and other parks, have contributed to the outdoor living culture of the city.

The boundary includes all the best view points to appreciate the way nature has been shaped to become a significant cultural part of the city as well as the Guanabara Bay system of historic fortifications that gave Rio de Janeiro the character of a fortified city.

The city's densest buildings sit on the narrow strips of alluvial land between the mountains and the sea laid out in irregular clusters of tall white blocks which contrast vividly with the green vegetation of the mountains and the blue of the sea. None of these buildings are included in the property, but a significant number are included in the buffer zone.

Criterion (v): The development of the city of Rio de Janeiro has been shaped by a creative fusion between nature and culture. This interchange is not the result of persistent traditional processes but rather reflects an interchange based on scientific, environmental and design ideas that led to innovative landscape creations on a major scale in the heart of the city during little more than a century. These processes have created an urban landscape perceived to be of great beauty by many writers and travellers and one that has shaped the culture of the city.

Criterion (vi): The dramatic landscape of Rio de Janeiro has provided inspiration for many forms of art, literature, poetry, and music. Images of Rio, which show the bay, Sugar Loaf and the statue of Christ the Redeemer have had a high worldwide recognition factor, since the middle of the 19th century. Such high recognition factors can be either positive or negative: in the case of Rio, the image that was projected, and still is projected, is one of a staggeringly beautiful location for one of the world's biggest cities.

Integrity

The property encompass all the key natural, structural elements that have constrained and inspired the development of the city of Rio, stretching from the highest points of the Tijuca mountains down to the sea, and including the chain of dramatic steep green hills around the Guanabara Bay, as well as the extensive designed landscapes on reclaimed land around the Bay, that have contributed to the outdoor living culture of the city.

None of these elements is under threat, although the interface between these natural elements and the built-up city is vulnerable to urban pressures, the higher peaks are marred by a profusion of antennae and the Rodrigo da Freitas Lagoon (in the buffer zone) and the sea are subject to a degree of water pollution.

Authenticity

The mountains and open green areas of the Tijuca National Park, together with Corcovado and the hills around the Guanabara Bay still retain a similar combination of forest and open observation points as at the time of colonisation and allow access to vistas of the city from many high vantage points that demonstrate very clearly the extraordinary fusion between culture and nature in the way the city has developed.

The Botanical Gardens have retained their original neoclassical design with its special alignments and the fortresses keep alive the memory of the Portuguese settlements, engraved and described by the travellers that navigated the marine routes that focused on Rio de Janeiro.

The landscape designs of Burle Marx around almost the entire coast of Guanabara Bay, comprising Flamengo Park and the redesign of Copacabana beach conserve entirely the landscape morphology of their original designs and still confer high social benefits to the city.

However, in some instances elements of the designed landscape are vulnerable to incremental change – such as the paving and planting along Copacabana and

Flamengo Park, where missing trees and mosaics need replacing, and in the Botanical Garden where the Imperial Palms along the main avenue are dead and need replacing.

Protection and Management Requirements

The Tijuca National Park was created by Federal Decrees in 1961. The Research Institute of the Botanical Garden was created by a federal autarchy under the auspices of the Ministry of Environment by a Law of 2001, which establishes its legal statutes, objectives, its structure of management and administration. The Pão de Açúcar (Sugar Loaf) and Urca were declared national monuments under the Law Nº 9.985, of June 18 of 2000.

The Institute of the National Historical and Artistic Heritage (IPHAN) and its predecessors have catalogued, since 1938, the entirety of the sites and defined individual structures for national protection. They include as well as Tijuca National Park and the Botanical Gardens, the Parque Lage mansion, Flamengo Park, Cara de Cão, Babilônia, Urca, Sugar Loaf, Dois Irmãos and Pedra da Gávea hills, São João fort, Santa Cruz fort, and the urban landscape of Leme, Copacabana, Ipanema and Leblon beaches.

The Decree of IPHAN Nº 127 of 30 April 2009 – established the designation of Brazilian Cultural Landscapes and a request has been made to designate Rio de Janeiro Landscape, as a Brazilian Cultural Landscape.

In the 20th century, high buildings were regulated through the creation of a norm establishing that it was not allowed to build more than twelve stories in height. In the 1970, planning instruments were adopted to control urban growth toward the hills in order to protect the nature conservation areas, sanctioned in 1976. This means that construction is not allowed beyond 60 meters above the sea level in the surroundings of the Pão de Açúcar (Sugar Loaf) and in Urca and the limit of no more than 100 meters above the level in the other hills of the city, considered areas of forest reserve.

A new Master Plan for Sustainable Urban Development of the City of Rio de Janeiro came into force in February 2011. The Plan establishes that the Landscape of Rio de Janeiro represents the most valuable asset of the city.

The Plan includes principles and guidelines to promote sustainable development as a means to promote economic development, social equity, and environmental and landscape preservation; sustainable use of the environment, landscape, and natural, cultural, historical, and archaeological heritage in the city's development and management; and conditioning of urban occupation to the preservation of the city's identity and cultural landscapes.

The Plan also allows for land use and occupation to be regulated by limitations of density, of economic activities, of the right to enjoy the natural landscape of the city, and of the quality of the urban environment. Heights of buildings shall be defined by the preservation and conservation of the integrity of the natural landscape.

The implementation of the Plan needs to progress through the adoption of its policies in the different areas of the city, including through specific laws.

The protection offered by the buffer zone needs strengthening with stricter guidelines on preservation, and, if found necessary by the Management Committee, more restrictive soil use and occupation parameters. The buffer zone needs to ensure the protection of views and the broad setting of the property as well as the interface with the property.

All areas of the buffer zone needs to be designated as Cultural Environment Protection Areas (APACs) and management plans for individual APACs developed accordingly further clarification is needed as to what is to be managed within the buffer zone.

A Management Committee to coordinate the management of the serial sites was established by Decree No. 464 of 29 December 2011 to develop and deliver an overall Management Plan for the property. The Management Committee, chaired by IPHAN, draws together the key stakeholders at the Federal, State and Municipal levels involved in the management of the different areas of the property. The Committee will determine the joint management structure and develop the joint management plan for the property and its buffer zone.

The Management Committee will ensure the adoption of possible additional protection measures for the sites, enforced through enhanced preservation structures.

A Management Plan needs to be finalized for the property and its buffer zone that addresses potential threats and possible remaining gaps in protection .so that preservation of the overall cultural landscape might be achieved.

As a basis for the Management Plan, there is a need to put in place a system for defining, recording and inventorying the key components of the overall cultural landscape and for defining monitoring indicators related to the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value.

The management of the property needs to address the issue of water pollution around Guanabara Bay through monitoring and positive action. In order to conserve both long views and the individual details of the property, there is a need to develop an overall Conservation Plan or Conservation approach for the property and for Conservation projects at various sites in order to conserve their important details.

Comment

- Decree No. 35879 of July 5, 2012, created the Instituto Rio Patrimônio da Humanidade (IRPH), ratified by Law 5547 of December 27, 2012, which has, at the municipal level, the assignment of managing the property. - Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.93, Bonn, 2015, The World Heritage Committee approved the Management Plan for the property. - A Management Committee to coordinate the management of the serial sites was established by The Federal Decree of IPHAN Nº 454 of 10 November 2016.

3.2 - Please list the key attributes of Outstanding Universal Value of your property and give an assessment of their condition. As a guideline, it is suggested to focus on approximately five key attributes (no more than 15 overall).

	Brief identification of attribute	Preserved	Compromised	Seriously compromised	Lost
3.2.1	City – mountain – sea relation	✗			
3.2.2	Tijuca National Park/NTP - Cultural and Environmental preservation/biodiversity	✗			
3.2.3	Botanical Gardens/BG - Spatial configuration, cultural and landscape preservation of the arboretum	✗			
3.2.4	Flamengo Park and Copacabana waterfront - Landscape design/ Modernism	✗			
3.2.5	Historical Forts - Historical, cultural and landscape significance / public and social use	✗			
3.2.6					
3.2.7					
3.2.8					
3.2.9					

3.2.10					
3.2.11					
3.2.12					
3.2.13					
3.2.14					
3.2.15					

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

PNT - Tijuca National Park BG - Rio de Janeiro Botanical Gardens FP - Flamengo Park CS - Copacabana Seafront SL - Sugar Loaf Natural Monument HF - Historical Forts

4. Factors Affecting the Property

4.1. Buildings and Development

4.1.1 - Housing

✕ Relevant			Not relevant				
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕		→	

4.1.2 - Commercial development

✕ Relevant			Not relevant				
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕		✕	✕				


4.1.3 - Industrial areas

Relevant			✕ Not relevant				
----------	--	--	----------------	--	--	--	--

4.1.4 - Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure

✕ Relevant			Not relevant				
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕		✕		✕		→	
 Negative							

4.1.5 - Interpretative and visitation facilities

✕ Relevant			Not relevant				
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕				
 Negative							

4.1.6 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.1 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.1.1 - The control of the horizontality of the surroundings is the object of municipal legislation, state and federal; 4.1.2 - Large commercial developments are restricted to specific areas; 4.1.4 - The municipality seeks investments and strengthening of the visitor assistance network, promoting existing businesses, and seeking new projects. 4.1.5 - The municipality seeks to implement new interpretative signage and the IPHAN an Integrated Interpretation Center. Both are in the fundraising phase.











4.2. Transportation Infrastructure

4.2.1 - Ground transport infrastructure

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.2.2 - Underground transport infrastructure

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------











	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕			✕			
 Negative							

4.2.3 - Air transport infrastructure

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------









4.2.4 - Marine transport infrastructure

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕		✕				

4.2.5 - Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕		✕				

4.2.6 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.2 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.2.2 - The city has a wide transportation infrastructure, especially the Metro, which is seeking to expand its network. 4.2.4 - The installations at Marina da Glória caused a negative impact on Flamengo Park. The lawsuit was judged and modifications will have to be made. 4.2.5 - Tourism helicopters - Tijuca National Park has suspended the use of its helipad.

4.3. Services Infrastructures

4.3.1 - Water infrastructure

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.3.2 - Renewable energy facilities










Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.3.3 - Non-renewable energy facilities

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------












4.3.4 - Localised utilities

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			

4.3.5 - Major linear utilities

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕				
 Negative ✕	✕		✕				

4.3.6 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.3 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.3.4 - The sewage treatment services pumping station located at Orla de Copacabana causes a negative landscape impact. The Rio Carioca water treatment plant at Flamengo Park causes a negative landscape impact. 4.3.5 - Positive - The broadcast antenna installations in Tijuca National Park are being removed. 4.3.5 - Negative - The power transmission towers in the Botanical Garden are necessary for the city, but they impact the landscape.

4.4. Pollution

4.4.1 - Pollution of marine waters

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕		✕	✕			

4.4.2 - Ground water pollution

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕	✕		✕			

4.4.3 - Surface water pollution

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.4 - Air pollution

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.5 - Solid waste

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.6 - Input of excess energy

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			

4.4.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.4 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.4.1- Pollution in Flamengo Beach. The Environmental Sanitation Program for Municipalities Surrounding Guanabara Bay (PSAM) was implemented in March 2012. 4.4.2 - Effluents and depletion in the rivers that flow into Guanabara Bay. 4.4.6 - Excessive LED lighting and advertising on lampposts along the Copacabana waterfront and on billboards and street furniture, both on the site and in the buffer zone.

4.5. Biological resource use/modification

4.5.1 - Fishing/collecting aquatic resources

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.5.2 - Aquaculture

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.5.3 - Land conversion

Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.5.4 - Livestock farming/Grazing of domesticated animals

Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.5.5 - Crop production

Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.5.6 - Commercial wild plant collection

Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.5.7 - Subsistence wild plant collection

Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.5.8 - Commercial hunting











Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.5.9 - Subsistence hunting

Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.5.10 - Forestry/Wood production

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Relevant	<input type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
--	---------------------------------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
 Negative							

4.5.11 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.5 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.5.10 The national and municipal parks regularly organize reforestation efforts, especially in Tijuca National Park and the Pão de Açucar Natural Monument.

4.6. Physical resource extraction

4.6.1 - Mining

Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.6.2 - Quarrying

Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.6.3 - Oil and gas

Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.6.4 - Water (extraction)

Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.6.5 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.6 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Not Applicable

4.7. Local conditions affecting physical fabric

4.7.1 - Wind

Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.7.2 - Relative humidity

Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.7.3 - Temperature

Relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not relevant
----------	--

4.7.4 - Radiation/Light

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.5 - Dust

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.6 - Water (rain/water table)

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.7 - Pests

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.8 - Micro-organisms

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------











4.7.9 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.7 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Not Applicable

4.8. Social/Cultural uses of heritage











4.8.1 - Ritual/Spiritual/Religious and associative uses

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕		→	
 Negative ✕		✕	✕				

4.8.2 - Society's valuing of heritage

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			
 Negative							

4.8.3 - Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting












Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.8.4 - Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------










4.8.5 - Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community


✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			
 Negative ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			

4.8.6 - Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation

✕ Relevant	Not relevant
------------	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕				

 Negative							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

4.8.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.8 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.8.1. Positive - The Christ the Redeemer monument is a Catholic shrine bringing people together. 4.8.1. Negative - In specific places in the Tijuca National Park, religious cults are held. Educational actions are being developed. 4.8.2. Appropriation of Carioca landscapes by their inhabitants. 4.8.5. Positive - Increased use of federal and municipal parks and open public spaces. 4.8.5. Negative - Increased social inequality in the buffer zone. 4.8.6. Tourism with high visitation rates boosts

4.9. Other human activities

4.9.1 - Illegal activities

 Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative 							

4.9.2 - Deliberate destruction of heritage

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.9.3 - Military training

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.9.4 - War

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.9.5 - Terrorism

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.9.6 - Civil unrest

 Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative 							

4.9.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.9 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.9.1 Increase of irregular occupations on the slopes and irregular occupation of public spaces. 4.9.2 The practice of releasing balloons causes fires in the Tijuca National Park, but the Park has a permanent fire brigade. 4.9.6 Social tensions heightened by social inequality. Inadequate security policy.

4.10. Climate change and severe weather events

4.10.1 - Storms














Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.10.2 - Flooding

 Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative 							

4.10.3 - Drought

 Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		

Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative 							

4.10.4 - Desertification

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.10.5 - Changes to oceanic waters

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.10.6 - Temperature change

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.10.7 - Other climate change impacts

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.10.8 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.10 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.10.2 - Sporadic flooding affects the Rio de Janeiro Botanical Garden and the Passeio Público. They also impact the buffer area. 4.10.3 - In the driest years, the vegetation at Flamengo Park is affected.

4.11. Sudden ecological or geological events

4.11.1 - Volcanic eruption

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.11.2 - Earthquake
















Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	---

4.11.3 - Tsunami/Tidal wave


Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.11.4 - Avalanche/Landslide

 Relevant	Not relevant
--	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative 							

4.11.5 - Erosion and siltation/Deposition

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.11.6 - Fire (wildfire)

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.11.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.11 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.11.4 - Landslides occur regularly in Tijuca National Park during the rainy season, risk management is necessary.




4.12. Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species






4.12.1 - Translocated species

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--


4.12.2 - Invasive/Alien terrestrial species

 Relevant	Not relevant
--	--------------


	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							

 Negative 							
--	---	--	---	--	---	--	--

4.12.3 - Invasive/Alien freshwater species

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.12.4 - Invasive/Alien marine species

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.12.5 - Hyper-abundant species

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--

4.12.6 - Modified genetic material

Relevant	 Not relevant
----------	--
















4.12.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.12 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.12.2 - Positive - There are exotic tree species in Tijuca National Park introduced in the 19th century by reforestation. 4.12.2 - Negative - The presence of domestic animals affects the wild animals in the NTP.

4.13. Management and institutional factors















4.13.1 - Management system/Management plan

 Relevant	Not relevant
--	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive 							
 Negative							





















4.13.2 - Legal framework

 Relevant	Not relevant
--	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive 							
 Negative							














4.13.3 - Governance

 Relevant	Not relevant
--	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive 							
 Negative 							

4.13.4 - Management activities

 Relevant	Not relevant
--	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive 							
 Negative							

4.13.5 - Financial resources

 Relevant	Not relevant
--	--------------

	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing

Positive							
Negative							

4.13.6 - Human resources

Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	Decreasing	Stable	Increasing
Positive							
Negative							

4.13.7 - Low impact research/monitoring activities

Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	Decreasing	Stable	Increasing
Positive							
Negative							

4.13.8 - High impact research/monitoring activities

Relevant	Not relevant
----------	--------------

4.13.9 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.13 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.13.3 Positive Management Committee was fully functional for eight years 4.13.3. Negative Dismissed by Decree 9,759/2019 we are working to get it reinstated
 4.13.5 Each component has sufficient specific legislation for the management of the property and has financial resources from the governments 4.13.6 It is necessary to increase the number of technicians with qualification in landscape heritage 4.13.7 and 4.13.8 - The property has a network that brings together researchers and universities

4.14. Other factor(s)

4.14.1 - Other factor(s)

Not applicable

4.15. Factors Summary Table

4.15.1 - Factors Summary Table

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.1 Buildings and Development						
4.1.1 Housing						
4.1.2 Commercial development						
4.1.4 Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure						
4.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities						
4.2 Transportation Infrastructure						
4.2.2 Underground transport infrastructure						
4.2.4 Marine transport infrastructure						
4.2.5 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure						

4.3 Services Infrastructures						
4.3.4 Localised utilities						
	⊖	⚡	⚡	⊕	↺	→
4.3.5 Major linear utilities	⊕	⚡		⊕		↗
	⊖	⚡		⊕		→
4.4 Pollution						
4.4.1 Pollution of marine waters						
	⊖	⚡		⊕	↺	→
4.4.2 Ground water pollution						
	⊖	⚡	⚡		↺	→
4.4.6 Input of excess energy						
	⊖	⚡	⚡	⊕	↺	↗
4.5 Biological resource use/modification						
4.5.10 Forestry/Wood production	⊕	⚡	⚡	⊕	↺	→
4.8 Social/Cultural uses of heritage						
4.8.1 Ritual/Spiritual/Religious and associative uses	⊕	⚡	⚡	⊕	↺	→
	⊖		⚡	⊕		↘
4.8.2 Society's valuing of heritage	⊕	⚡	⚡	⊕	↺	↗
4.8.5 Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	⊕	⚡	⚡	⊕	↺	↗
	⊖	⚡	⚡	⊕	↺	↗
4.8.6 Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation	⊕	⚡	⚡	⊕		↗
4.9 Other human activities						
4.9.1 Illegal activities						
	⊖	⚡	⚡	⊕	↺	↗
4.9.6 Civil unrest						
	⊖	⚡	⚡		↺	↗
4.10 Climate change and severe weather events						
4.10.2 Flooding						
	⊖	⚡	⚡	⊕	↺	→
4.10.3 Drought						
	⊖	⚡		⊕		→
4.11 Sudden ecological or geological events						
4.11.4 Avalanche/Landslide						
	⊖	⚡	⚡	⊕	↺	↗
4.12 Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species						
4.12.2 Invasive/Alien terrestrial species						
	⊖	⚡		⊕		↘
4.13 Management and institutional factors						
4.13.1 Management system/Management plan	⊕	⚡	⚡	⊕	↺	↗
4.13.2 Legal framework	⊕	⚡		⊕	↺	↗

4.13.3 Governance					
4.13.4 Management activities					
4.13.5 Financial resources					
4.13.6 Human resources					
4.13.7 Low impact research/monitoring activities					
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside Outside

4.16. Assessment of current and potential positive and negative factors

4.16.1 - Assessment of current and potential negative and positive factors

4.1 Buildings and Development

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.1.1 Housing			

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Restricted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Localised
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Extensive
<input type="checkbox"/>	Widespread



Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
<input type="checkbox"/>	One off or rare
<input type="checkbox"/>	Intermittent or sporadic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Frequent
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Insignificant
<input type="checkbox"/>	Minor
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Significant
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
<input type="checkbox"/>	High capacity
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium capacity
<input type="checkbox"/>	Low capacity
<input type="checkbox"/>	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Decreasing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Static

	Increasing
--	------------

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.1.2 Commercial development			
			

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Restricted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Localised
<input type="checkbox"/>	Extensive
<input type="checkbox"/>	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact

<input type="checkbox"/>	One off or rare
<input type="checkbox"/>	Intermittent or sporadic
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Frequent
<input type="checkbox"/>	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes



<input type="checkbox"/>	Insignificant
<input type="checkbox"/>	Minor
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Significant
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond

<input type="checkbox"/>	High capacity
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Medium capacity
<input type="checkbox"/>	Low capacity
<input type="checkbox"/>	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Decreasing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Static
<input type="checkbox"/>	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.1.4 Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure			




Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor

<input type="checkbox"/>	Restricted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Localised
<input type="checkbox"/>	Extensive
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact

<input type="checkbox"/>	One off or rare
<input type="checkbox"/>	Intermittent or sporadic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Frequent





✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
✕	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static

✕	Increasing
---	------------

4.2 Transportation Infrastructure

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.2.2 Underground transport infrastructure						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor

	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
✕	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact

	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes





	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond

	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years

	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.2.4 Marine transport infrastructure						
						




Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor

	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact

	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic




	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
✕	Decreasing
	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.2.5 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure						
						







Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
✕	Decreasing

	Static
	Increasing

4.3 Services Infrastructures

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.3.4 Localised utilities			
			






Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.3.5 Major linear utilities			
			

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare





	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

4.4 Pollution

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.4.1 Pollution of marine waters						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.4.2 Ground water pollution						
						






Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing







Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.4.6 Input of excess energy						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
---	--

	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
✕	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing










4.5 Biological resource use/modification

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.5.10 Forestry/Wood production						






Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity

	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

4.8 Social/Cultural uses of heritage











Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.8.1 Ritual/Spiritual/Religious and associative uses	  	 	
	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
✕	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.8.2 Society's valuing of heritage	  	 	






Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive

✕	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.8.5 Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	  	 	
	  	 	

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity

	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.8.6 Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation	  		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
✕	Widespread






Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
✕	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources




Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

4.9 Other human activities

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.9.1 Illegal activities	  	 	

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive




	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.9.6 Civil unrest						
						




Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity

✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
✕	Decreasing
	Static
	Increasing

4.10 Climate change and severe weather events

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.10.2 Flooding			
			







Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
✕	Decreasing
	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.10.3 Drought			
			

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised

	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing





4.11 Sudden ecological or geological events

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.11.4 Avalanche/Landslide						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	

	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

4.12 Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.12.2 Invasive/Alien terrestrial species			
	 		



Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
✕	Frequent
	On-going





Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

4.13 Management and institutional factors

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.1 Management system/Management plan	  	 	

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor							
	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
X	Widespread						
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact							
	One off or rare						
	Intermittent or sporadic						
X	Frequent						
	On-going						
Impact - Impact on the attributes							
	Insignificant						
	Minor						
X	Significant						
	Major						
Management response - Capacity of management to respond							
	High capacity						
	Medium capacity						
X	Low capacity						
	No capacity and / or resources						
Trend - Development over the last 6 years							
	Decreasing						
	Static						
X	Increasing						

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.13.2 Legal framework						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor							
	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
X	Widespread						
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact							
	One off or rare						
	Intermittent or sporadic						
	Frequent						
X	On-going						
Impact - Impact on the attributes							
	Insignificant						
	Minor						




	Significant
✕	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.3 Governance	<div> </div>	<div> </div>	<div> </div>
	<div> </div>	<div> </div>	<div> </div>

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
✕	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
✕	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing






Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.4 Management activities	<div> </div>	<div> </div>	<div> </div>

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor							
	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
X	Widespread						
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact							
	One off or rare						
	Intermittent or sporadic						
	Frequent						
X	On-going						
Impact - Impact on the attributes							
	Insignificant						
	Minor						
X	Significant						
	Major						
Management response - Capacity of management to respond							
	High capacity						
X	Medium capacity						
	Low capacity						
	No capacity and / or resources						
Trend - Development over the last 6 years							
	Decreasing						
	Static						
X	Increasing						

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.13.5 Financial resources						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor							
	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
X	Widespread						
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact							
	One off or rare						
	Intermittent or sporadic						
	Frequent						
X	On-going						
Impact - Impact on the attributes							
	Insignificant						
X	Minor						

	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing





Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.6 Human resources	 	 	

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
✕	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.7 Low impact research/monitoring activities	 	 	

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor											
	Restricted										
	Localised										
X	Extensive										
	Widespread										
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact											
	One off or rare										
	Intermittent or sporadic										
X	Frequent										
	On-going										
Impact - Impact on the attributes											
	Insignificant										
	Minor										
X	Significant										
	Major										
Management response - Capacity of management to respond											
	High capacity										
X	Medium capacity										
	Low capacity										
	No capacity and / or resources										
Trend - Development over the last 6 years											
	Decreasing										
	Static										
X	Increasing										

4.17. Serial inscriptions (national or transnational)

4.17.1 - If your property is a serial inscription (national or transnational) please identify which components of the property are impacted by each factor

Component 1, 2 and 3: 4.2.5; 4.3.5; 4.5.10; 4.8.1; 4.8.5; 4.9.2; 4.10.2; 4.11.4; 4.12.2 Component 4 - 4.2.4; 4.3.1; 4.4.1; 4.4.2; 4.4.6; 4.5.10; 4.10.2; 4.10.3; Buffer Zone: 4.1.1; 4.1.2; 4.4.6; 4.5.10; 4.8.2; 4.8.5; 4.9.1; 4.9.6; 4.10.2 Global (4 components)- 4.1.4; 4.1.5; 4.2.2; 4.8.6; 4.13.3; 4.13.4; 4.13.6; 4.13.7; 4.13.8

4.18. Prediction of the state of conservation at next cycle of Periodic Reporting.

4.18.1 - Please predict what the state of conservation of each attribute will be approximately 6 years from now (at the time of the next cycle of Periodic Reporting)

	Attribute	Preserved	Compromised	Seriously compromised	Lost
4.18.1.1	City-mountain-sea relationship	X			
4.18.1.2	Tijuca National Park/NTP - Environmental preservation/biodiversity	X			
4.18.1.3	Botanical Gardens/BG - Spatial configuration and cultural preservation of the arboretum	X			
4.18.1.4	Flamengo Park and Copacabana waterfront - Landscape design/ Modernism	X			
4.18.1.5	Historical Forts - Historical and cultural significance / public and social use	X			

5. Protection and Management of the Property

5.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

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

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

5.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known and recognised?

The boundaries **are known** by the management authority **but are not known** by local communities/landowners

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

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

5.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the buffer zones known and recognised?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property **are known and recognised** by the management authority **but are not known** by local communities/landowners

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

The core areas and the buffer zone are under the guardianship of three heritage agencies: IPHAN (federal), INEPAC (state), and IRPH-PCRJ (municipal), with autonomy to manifest themselves about the authorization of works and interventions. The georeferenced map of the Rio de Janeiro property provided a refinement in the delimitation of the Buffer Zone. The imaginary lines of the visuals in the Terrestrial Buffer Zone now follow the limits of the urban mesh. Available on the DATA.RIO platform.

5.2. Protective Measures

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

Comment

The Management Plan was developed from the need to establish an institutional arrangement capable of promoting shared and integrated management. All current legislation that affects the Core Area and the Buffer Area can be found in item 4.2 Existing Protection of the Management Plan, 2014.

http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/ckfinder/arquivos/Plano_de_Gestao_versao_ingles_candidatura_RIO_2014.pdf

5.2.2 - Please list any legislation and other measures (regulatory -including spatial planning- contractual, institutional or traditional) not included in 5.2.1 and indicate the category

1937 / Organizes the protection of the national historic and artistic heritage /

Decreto-Lei Federal nº 25/1937 http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/decreto-lei/del0025.htm Not Applicable / Not Applicable / Institute of National Historical and Artistic Heritage / Not Applicable / 2010 /

Provides on the procedures to be observed for the concession of authorization to carry out interventions in built properties that are under construction and in the respective setting. / Administrative Order nº 420 / Yes / Not Applicable / Institute of National Historical and Artistic Heritage / Not Applicable / 2016 / Provides for the regulation of the National Immaterial Heritage Program - PNPI /

Administrative Order nº 200 http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/legislacao/portaria_n_200_de_15_de_maios_de_2016.pdf Not Applicable / Not Applicable / Institute of National Historical and Artistic Heritage / Not Applicable / 2019 / National Cultural Heritage Policy / Administrative Order nº 375/2019 http://portal.iphan.gov.br/uploads/legislacao/portaria3752018sei_iphan0732090.pdf

Not Applicable / Not Applicable / Institute of National Historical and Artistic Heritage / Not Applicable / 2019 / Provides for the National Tourism Policy, with a view to developing, organizing, and promoting tourism segments related to Brazil's World Cultural and Natural Heritage. / Federal Decree nº 9763 / Not Applicable /

Not Applicable / Presidency of the Republic / Not Applicable / 2011 / Provides on the Urban and Environmental Policy of the Municipality, institutes the Master Plan for Sustainable Urban Development Master Plan of the Municipality of Rio de Janeiro / Supplementary Law N.º 111 <http://www2.rio.rj.gov.br/smu/buscafacil/Arquivos/PDF/LC111M.PDF> Yes / Not Applicable /

Rio de Janeiro City Government / Not Applicable / 2012 / Created the Instituto Rio Patrimônio da Humanidade (IRPH) / Decree No. 35879, ratified by Law 5547, 2012 https://smaonline.rio.rj.gov.br/legis_consulta/42562Dec%2035879_2012.pdf Not Applicable / Not Applicable / Rio de Janeiro City Government /

Not Applicable / 2021 / Procedures for the analysis of the processes aiming at the licensing of private construction works in assets and areas protected by the Rio World Heritage Institute / Resolution No. 03 <http://www.rio.rj.gov.br/web/irph/exibeconteudo?id=13092037> Yes / Not Applicable / Rio de Janeiro City Government / Not Applicable /

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

The **legal framework** for maintaining of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and/or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides an **adequate basis for effective management and protection**

5.2.4 - 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** in the buffer zone for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and/or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides an **adequate basis for effective management and protection**

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

The **legal framework** for the broader setting of the World Heritage property provides an **adequate 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

5.2.6 - Can the legal 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 of enforcement remain

5.2.7 - Please provide a short summary of how the legislation, including spatial planning and other regulation, works in practice

The areas that make up the declared property are managed by agencies from different public spheres: the Tijuca National Park (PNT) and the Botanical Garden by ICMBio (federal), the Historical Forts by the Ministry of the Army, the Urban Parks at the three levels of government, federal, state and municipal. The buffer zone is managed by municipal legislation, with regard to the protection of assets listed by the state and federal governments.

5.2.8 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations about the information related to the measures taken to protect the World Heritage property

The World Heritage Property has a large number of protected areas, both natural and cultural. The Master Plan, 2011 emphasized the protection and valorization of the Carioca Landscape. The revision of the Master Plan is under debate in the City Council. The new legislation will include the areas of the World Heritage Property and its buffer zone to the macrozone of protection and maintains the existing protection legislation, in view of its environmental, landscape, and touristic relevance.

5.3. Management System/Management Plan

5.3.1 - Please check the box which most closely match the character of the governance and management system of the property

Other

If 'Other', please specify

Public Management system joint National/State/Local joint oint national/


5.3.2 - Management System: Please indicate which of the various management tools listed below are used to help protect the property.

A statutory Management Plan or zoning plan for the property.
Other forms of statutory or non-statutory plans (e.g. strategic plans)
Governance mechanisms that foster and respect traditional practices, knowledge and uses of the property
Agreed 'Memorandums of Understanding' between different managing institutions, groups or others, including documents agreed with local communities for management
A management plan
A visitor/visitation management plan
An environmental management framework
An assessment of biological and cultural diversity and ecosystem services provided by the property
A joint approach to management of cultural and natural heritage

5.3.3 - Please give a brief description of the management system currently in place at your property

The Cultural Landscape Steering Committee of Rio de Janeiro began in December 2011 and regularly worked with quarterly meetings. Decree 9.759/2019, issued on April 11 by the federal government, determined the extinction of all councils, committees, committees, groups, and other types of collegiates linked to the federal public administration that has been created by decree or lower normative act. Thus, the Steering Committee of the Carioca Landscapes began to meet as the Steering Group.

5.3.4 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
2014 Management Plan - Rio de Janeiro: Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain & the Sea	N/A	Available	2014	

Comment

Due to the projects already carried out and the new proposals, it is necessary to update the Management Plan, including the improvement of some instruments.

5.3.5 - Has any use been made of the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape in developing policies and best practices for the protection of this property?

Some use has been made of the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape

5.3.6 - If the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation has been used at this property, please describe briefly what has been done.

2013 - International Meeting of Experts in Urban Historical Landscape, in partnership with the World Heritage Center and with the support of the Lucio Costa Center Aimd at incorporating the methodological approach of the Urban Historical Landscape in the Operational Guidelines for the Application of the Unesco World Heritage Convention of 1972. The results were presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 38th Session in June 2014 in Doha, Qatar.

5.3.7 - Has any use been made of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties at the property?

No use has been made of the World Heritage Policy for Climate Change

5.3.8 - If the Climate Change policy has been used, please briefly describe what has been done along with any research on the impacts of Climate Change on the property:

Not applicable

5.3.9 - Has any use been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties at the property ?

No use has been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties

5.3.10 - If the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties has been used, please briefly describe what has been done

The city of Rio de Janeiro has a mapping of risk areas on the slopes of the Tijuca Massif, where the Tijuca National Park is located.

5.3.11 - Rate the coordination between the various levels of administration (i.e. national/federal; regional/provincial/state; local/municipal etc.) involved in the management of the World Heritage property

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

5.3.12 - 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

5.3.13 - Is the management system being implemented?

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

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

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

5.3.15 - Does the management system include formal mechanisms and procedures that ensure participation and contribution of the following groups, living within or near the World Heritage property and/or buffer zone in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property?

		Not applicable	No mechanisms for participation	Some participation	Direct participation	Transformative participation in all relevant decision processes
5.3.15.1	Local communities			✕		
5.3.15.2	Local authorities				✕	
5.3.15.3	Landowners in the property and the buffer zone			✕		
5.3.15.4	Indigenous peoples	✕				
5.3.15.5	Women	✕				
5.3.15.6	Other specific groups				✕	
	If you selected, 'Other specific groups' please specify	The Residents' Associations of neighborhoods in the site's damping zone have been very popular. The Management Councils of the Conservation Units are very active.				

5.3.16 - Please rate the cooperation/relationship between the World Heritage property managers/coordinators/staff and the following groups

		Not applicable	Non-existent	Poor	Fair	Good
5.3.16.1	Local communities					✕
5.3.16.2	Local/Municipal authorities					✕
5.3.16.3	Indigenous peoples	✕				
5.3.16.4	Landowners				✕	
5.3.16.5	Women	✕				
5.3.16.6	Youth/Children	✕				
5.3.16.7	Researchers					✕
5.3.16.8	Local Visitors/Tourists					✕
5.3.16.9	National/International tourists					✕
5.3.16.10	Tourism Industry					✕
5.3.16.11	Local businesses and industries					✕
5.3.16.12	NGOs					✕
5.3.16.13	Other specific groups					
	If you selected 'Other specific groups', please specify					

5.3.17 - Please rate the extent to which the management system of your property contributes towards achieving the objectives of the World Heritage Committee's Policy for the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the *World Heritage Convention*

		Not applicable	No contribution	Limited	Significant	Full achievement
5.3.17.1	The management system of the property contributes to gender equality			✕		
5.3.17.2	The management system of the property provides ecosystem services/benefits to the local community (e.g. fresh air, water, food, medicinal plants)					✕
5.3.17.3	The management system of the property contributes to social inclusion and equity, improving opportunities for all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status					✕
5.3.17.4	The management system of the property integrates a human rights-based approach				✕	

5.3.17.5	The management system of the property contributes to fostering inclusive local economic development, and to enhancing livelihood				×	
5.3.17.6	The management system of the property contributes to conflict prevention, including respect for cultural diversity within and around the World Heritage property				×	

5.3.18 - Please provide further details on the ratings of the management system given in the table above

The areas of the property are inclusive because they allow access and enjoyment of the public without distinction and with free access, contributing to the improvement of the quality of life of the population.

5.3.19 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the management system/plan

In the case of specific demands, the technicians from the different spheres of government usually promote meetings or working groups in order to discuss the impacts of certain proposals and better integrate the management of the property. The Councils of the Environmental Protection Areas of the Carioca Landscape and the Sugarloaf Mountains, as well as the Tijuca National Park Committee, have become important discussion forums for integrating the management of the property.

6. Financial and Human Resources

6.1. Funding

6.1.1 - If your funding sources do not exactly fit those shown, put the relevant amounts against the funding type that most closely represents your situation, and use the comment box below to provide more details.

		Project costs	Running costs
6.1.1.1	Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc.)	%	%
6.1.1.2	Bilateral international funding	1 %	%
6.1.1.3	World Heritage Fund (International Assistance)	%	%
6.1.1.4	Contribution from other conventions and programmes	%	%
6.1.1.5	International donations (NGOs, foundations, etc.)	%	%
6.1.1.6	Governmental (national/federal)	30 %	30 %
6.1.1.7	Governmental (regional/provincial/state)	30 %	30 %
6.1.1.8	Governmental (local/municipal)	30 %	30 %
6.1.1.9	In-country donations (NGOs, foundations, etc.)	%	%
6.1.1.10	Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, toilets, parking, camping fees, etc.)	9 %	10 %
6.1.1.11	Commercial activities (e.g. merchandising and catering, filming permit, concessions, etc.)	%	%
6.1.1.12	Other	%	%
		Total 100 %	Total 100 %

6.1.2 - Please comment here on any other aspects of funding sources not covered in the table above

The two elements subordinated to the Ministry of Environment, Tijuca National Park and Botanic Garden receive resources from the federal government. The Flamengo Park, the Copacabana waterfront, and the Sugarloaf Mountain receive resources from the municipal government. The historic Forts are maintained by the Brazilian Army. The Guanabara Bay clean-up project is managed by the state government with BID financing.

6.1.3 - 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

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

The existing sources of funding are **secure over both the medium- and long-term**

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

The infrastructure works are financed by the federal, state, and municipal governments.

6.1.6 - Estimate the distribution of men and women involved in the management, conservation, interpretation of the World Heritage properties and the extent to which they are drawn from local communities.

		From local communities %	From elsewhere %
6.1.6.1	Men	25 %	25 %
6.1.6.2	Women	25 %	25 %
		Total 50 %	Total 50 %

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

Human resources **partly meet** the management needs of the World Heritage property

6.1.8 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines

Conservation	Good
--------------	------

Environmental sustainability	Good
Community participation and inclusion	Good
Risk preparedness	Good
Capacity development and education	Fair
Administration	Fair
Research and monitoring	Good
Awareness raising and public information/communication	Not available
Marketing and promotion	Not available
Interpretation	Not available
Visitor management/tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Fair

6.1.9 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines

Conservation	Fair
Environmental sustainability	Good
Community participation and inclusion	Fair
Risk preparedness	Good
Capacity development and education	Fair
Administration	Fair
Research and monitoring	Fair
Awareness raising and public information/communication	Poor
Marketing and promotion	Poor
Interpretation	Poor
Visitor management/tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Poor

6.1.10 - Has any use been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building at the property?

Some use has been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building

6.1.11 - If the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building has been used, please briefly describe what has been done.

2016 - 1st Capacity Building Course for Managers of Cultural Assets World Heritage Center - Regional Center for Capacity Building in Heritage Management - Lucio Costa Center - CLC, Category 2 Center under the auspices of UNESCO, linked to the Institute for National Historic and Artistic Heritage/IPHAN - CLC/IPHAN. 2016 - Workshop on Fundamental Concepts and Methodologies for the Implementation of the Convention concerning the Protection of World Natural and Cultural and Cultural Heritage.

6.1.12 - Are there site-specific capacity building plans or programmes that develop local expertise and that contribute to the transfer of skills for the conservation and management of the World Heritage property?

A site-based capacity building plan or programme is in place and fully implemented; **all technical skills are being transferred** to those managing the property locally

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

- Regional Center for Capacity Building in Heritage Management, Lucio Costa Center (CLC), a Category 2 Center under the auspices of UNESCO, linked to the Institute for National Historic and Artistic Heritage (Iphan). - Professional Master's - Specialization Program in Heritage (PEP), linked to the Institute for National Historic and Artistic Heritage (Iphan).

7. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

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

Knowledge about the values and attributes of the World Heritage property is **adequate**

7.2 - 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**

7.3 - Are results from research programmes publicly available and disseminated?

Research results **are shared** widely **with active outreach** to local communities and national and international audiences

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

There is a lot of research done and in progress related to the components of the property, developed by the managing Public Bodies and Brazilian Universities. The members of the Steering Committee have, likewise, scientific significant production that they present in conferences and seminars.

8. Education, Information and Awareness Building

8.1 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities	Good
Local/municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Fair
Women	Good
Youth/children	Good
Researchers	Good
Local visitors	Good
National/international tourists	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Local businesses and industries	Good
NGOs	Good
Other specific groups	Not applicable
If you selected 'Other specific groups', please describe	

8.2 - Does the property have a heritage education programme(s) for children and/or youth, that can contribute to a better understanding of heritage, promote diversity and foster intercultural dialogue?

There is a planned education and awareness programme for children and/or youth **but it only partly meets the needs**

8.3 - Who are the target audiences for education and awareness programmes at your property?

Local communities
Local/municipal authorities
Youth/children
Local Visitors
National/international tourists
Other specific groups
The State Department of Education is seeking to implement a specific action.

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

Visitor centre	Good
Site museum	Good
Information booths	Good
Guided tours	Good
Trails/routes	Good
Printed information materials	Good
Online (website, social media, etc.)	Good
Transportation facilities	Good
Other	Not needed
If 'Other' is selected, please specify	

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

The Tijuca National park has a visitor center that works with environmental education actions. The Botanical Garden of Rio de Janeiro has a Visitor Center that provides information on the cultural heritage. The Fortresses of São João and Forte Copacabana, as well as the Brazilian Navy, develop education programs.

9. Visitor Management

9.1 - Please provide estimated annual visitor numbers (including national and international visitors) since the last Periodic Report

3.176.970 / 1.840.101 / 5.689.440 / 5.009.388 / 5.766.625 /

9.2 - What information sources are used to collect visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries

9.3 - What is the average length stay of a visitor to the World Heritage property?

More than four overnight stays

9.4 - Please provide the source of information

Data was measured in the points where there is visitation control, excluding the free urban public parks: Botanical Garden, Tijuca National Park (including Christ the Redeemer), Sugar Loaf Mountain, and Fortresses. Visitation rates are decreasing due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Sources: DPHCEX- Cultural and Historical Heritage Directory of the Army Data.Rio - data from the Tijuca National Park Pão de Açúcar Monument and Botanic Garden - ticket office data Botanical Garden Visitor Center

9.5 - What is the approximate average daily visitor expenditure? (Please provide an estimated monetary figure in USD)

87,33 / 40 / 15 / 60 / 10 / 20 /

9.6 - Please provide the source of information

Source: Data Rio portal (<https://www.data.rio/>)

9.7 - Does the management system/plan for the World Heritage property include a strategy with an action plan to manage visitors, tourism activity and its derived economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts?

There is **no strategy** to manage visitors, tourism activity and its derived impacts on the World Heritage property

9.8 - Please provide any comments relating to the answer provided above in question 9.7

Tourism management in the city of Rio is the responsibility of the City Hall, which relies on the Data Rio Portal to provide the necessary data. Those responsible for the components have their statistical bases.

9.9 - Is visitor use effectively managed to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is managed but **improvements could be made**

9.10 - Is the effectiveness of tourism management regularly monitored?

Yes, using a different system

If a different system, please specify

Municipality Data

9.11 - How does the tourism industry cooperate with the site management to improve visitor experiences and maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property?

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

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

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

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

In **one location** and **easily visible** to visitors

9.14 - How does visitor/tourism revenue (e.g. entry charges, permits) contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

Fees are collected, and make **some contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

9.15 - Are there locally driven sustainable tourism initiatives?

Yes

If 'Yes', please specify

In the Environmental Conservation Units

9.16 - Are the benefits of tourism shared with local communities?

Yes

If 'Yes', please specify

People from the Cerro Corá, Guararapes, and other surrounding communities work as tour guides in the Tijuca National Park.

9.17 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to visitation/tourism/public use of the World Heritage property

The city has a large number of visitors, and the implementation of an Integrated Heritage Interpretation Center is indicated.

10. Monitoring

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

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

10.2 - Is necessary information available in order to define key indicators for measuring the state of conservation and are they used in monitoring how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is being maintained?

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

10.3 - Are key indicators defined and in place for the following principal aspects of the property?

	Extend of indicators	Not applicable	No indicators	Indicators have been defined but are not yet in use	Indicators are in place and in use since the last Periodic Reporting cycle
10.3.1	State of conservation				×
10.3.2	Effectiveness of the management system				×
10.3.3	Character of governance				×
10.3.4	Appropriate synergy with other conservation designations				×
10.3.5	Contribution to sustainable development				×
10.3.6	Capacity development			×	

10.4 - Please provide information on relevant key indicators adopted at the property

The property's Management Plan presents more comprehensive and specific key indicators for each component of the cultural landscape: ENVIRONMENTAL, CULTURAL, and INSTITUTIONAL.

10.5 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups:

World Heritage managers/coordinators and staff	Good
Local/municipal authorities	Good
Local communities	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Fair
Women	Not applicable
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Fair
Local businesses and industry	Poor
NGOs	Good
Other specific groups	Not applicable
If you selected 'Other specific groups', please specify	

10.6 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?

Implementation is underway

10.7 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee.

Decision 36 COM 8B.42: a) Contemplated in the Management Plan b) Management Plan approved by the World Heritage Committee in 2014 c) The IRPH feeds a database in the DATA-RIO Portal with information on intervention projects. The sectionalization of the buffer area was defined in the revision of the Master Plan d) Contemplated in the Management Plan e) Key Indicators defined in the Management Plan f) Depollution programs are included in the ongoing Management Plan g) Each component has its plan

10.8 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to Monitoring

The Urban Historic Landscape Recommendation is used in the analysis of the processes of new construction and/or additions in the site's buffer area by IPHAN-RJ. The IRPH participates in the licensing process for construction, interventions, and new buildings or changes in volume in existing buildings in the buffer zone, checking whether possible impacts could compromise the outstanding universal values of the Carioca Landscapes World Heritage property.

11. Identification of Priority Management Needs

11.1 - Identification of Priority Management Needs

5.1	Boundaries and Buffer Zones
5.1.2	The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by the management authority but are not known by local communities/landowners

5.1.4	The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are known and recognised by the management authority but are not known and recognized by local communities/landowners	X
5.2	Protective Measures	
5.2.6	There is acceptable capacity/resources to enforce legislation and/or regulation in the World Heritage property but some deficiencies of enforcement remain	
5.3	Management System/Management Plan	
5.3.5	Some use has been made of the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation to develop policies and best practices for the protection of the property	X
5.3.7	No use has been made of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties at the property	X
5.3.9	No use has been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties at the property	
5.3.11	There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies involved in the management of the property, but it could be improved	X
5.3.13	The management system at the property is only being partially implemented	
5.3.14	There is no existing annual work/action plan for the property despite an identified need	X
5.3.17	In a limited manner , the management system of the World Heritage property does contribute to gender equality	
6.1	Funding	
6.1.3	The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to fully meet the management needs of the World Heritage property	
6.1.7	Human resources partly meet the management needs of the World Heritage property	
6.1.10	Some use has been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Development at the World Heritage property	X
7	Scientific Studies and Research Projects	
7.2	There is considerable research in the World Heritage property but it is not directed towards management needs and/or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value	
8	Education, Information and Awareness Building	
8.2	There is a planned education and awareness programme for children and/or youth but it only partly meets the needs	X
9	Visitor Management	
9.7	There is no strategy to manage visitors, tourism activity and its derived impacts on the World Heritage property	
9.9	Visitor use of the World Heritage property is managed but improvements could be made	
9.11	Although the tourism industry is active in the property, there is no contact between tourism operators and those responsible for the World Heritage property	
9.12	The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is not adequately presented and interpreted	X
10	Monitoring	
10.1	There is considerable monitoring at the World Heritage property but it is not directed towards management needs and/or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value	
10.2	Information on the values of the World Heritage property is adequate and key indicators have been defined but monitoring of the status of indicators could be improved	X
Please select 1 more issues.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Please save this question to reflect changes		

12. Summary and Conclusions

12.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

12.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

4.1	Buildings and Development						
4.1.1	Housing						
4.3	Services Infrastructures						
4.3.4	Localised utilities						
4.3.5	Major linear utilities						

4.4	Pollution						
4.4.1	Pollution of marine waters	Criteria (v) and (vi) - Interferes on the balance between natural and built elements	1. Implement the Guanabara Bay Clean-up Program - PSAM	1. Water quality measurement	1. Monthly Measurement: Guanabara Bay Watershed - Hydrographic Region 5	1. INEA - Instituto Estadual do Ambiente (State Environmental Institute) Committee of the Guanabara Bay Hydrographic Region	1. This Program is one of the items in the property Management Plan, regarding the depollution of the waters of the Guanabara Bay.
4.4.2	Ground water pollution	Criteria (v) - Interferes on the balance between natural and built elements	1. Implement the River Guardians Program (Programa Guardiões dos Rios) - Fundação Rio Águas (Municipal Water Foundation of Rio de Janeiro) 2. Implement Basic Sanitation Actions - Agência Águas do Rio (private agency for water distribution and sewage)	1. Measuring the water quality of rivers 2. Verify the implementation of the sanitation program	1. Monthly Measurement: Guanabara Bay Watershed Monthly Measurement - Hydrographic Region 5	1. Committee of the Guanabara Bay Hydrographic Region; Fundação Rio Águas (Municipal Water Foundation of Rio de Janeiro); S.O.S. Atlantic Rainforest Foundation 2. Agência Águas do Rio (private agency for water distribution and sewage)	1. This Program is one of the items in the property Management Plan, regarding the depollution of the waters of the Guanabara Bay.
4.8	Social/Cultural uses of heritage						
4.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	Criteria (v) and (vi) - Positive: 1. Quality of public and social use; Criteria (vi) - Negative: 2. City, Mountain and Sea Relationship; 3. Landscape and cultural protection	1. Elaborate the disciplining and monitoring of uses of Flamengo Park and the Copacabana waterfront; 2. Implement the Community Based Tourism Program in Tijuca National Park.	1. Use Licensing and Inspection; 2. Verifying the effectiveness of the TBC Program.	1. Daily; 2. Until the next Cycle of the Periodic Report.	1. Rio de Janeiro City Hall: IRPH; Conservation Municipal Secretary; Environmental Municipal Secretary - INEPAC - IPHAN; 2. ICMBio - Tijuca National Park.	1. Review and implement the norms for disciplining the use of the Copacabana waterfront; 2. Expand the Program to the other components of the Property.
4.9	Other human activities						
4.9.1	Illegal activities	Criteria (v) - 1. Environmental and biodiversity quality of Tijuca National Park Criteria (v) - 2. Balance between natural and built elements Criteria (v) - 3. City, Mountain and Sea Relationship	Control irregular occupations on the slopes of the buffer zone Implement the land regularization Program: Social Territories Program in partnership with UN Habitat	Monitoring property areas Monitor the implementation of the Social Territories Program	Partially until the next Periodic Reporting Cycle	Rio de Janeiro City Hall: inspection and land regularization program IPHAN: inspection State Prosecutor's Office	Intention to limit occupations above 100 meters; Implement the Social Territories Program involving actions of land regularization, social housing, and income transfer.
4.9.6	Civil unrest	Criteria (vi) - 1. City, Mountain and Sea Relationship	Develop and implement adequate security policies in line with human rights in the Property territory Implement social policies: Social Territories in partnership with UN Habitat and in adherence to ODS 2030	Accompany the development of security policies Accompany the Social Territories Program	Partially until the next Periodic Reporting Cycle	Rio de Janeiro City Hall Rio de Janeiro State Government - Secretary of Public Security	Adherence to the Social Territories Program in partnership with UN Habitat aiming at social equity
4.12	Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species						
4.12.2		Invasive/Alien terrestrial species					
4.13	Management and institutional factors						

4.13.3	Governance	Criteria (v) and (vi) - In the whole World Heritage property	Restore the governance structure: Steering Committee	Follow up on restitution actions	One year	Federal: IPHAN; ICMbio; Army and Navy State: INEPAC; INEA; Education State Secretary Municipal: IRPH; Urbanism Municipal Secretary; Conservation Municipal Secretary; Environmental Municipal Secretary; Parks and Gardens Foundation; Riotur (Tourism)	The governance structure defined in the Management Plan has proven effective. The restitution of the Steering Committee needs to meet legal requirements imposed by the Federal Decree 9.759 of 2019.
--------	------------	--	--	----------------------------------	----------	---	---

Question not completed

12.2. Summary - Management Needs

12.2.1 - Summary - Management Needs

5.1	Boundaries and Buffer Zones				
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
5.1.4	The buffer zones of the World Heritage property are known and recognised by the management authority but are not known and recognized by local communities/landowners	1. Develop the project for interpretation of the Site-signage and interpretation center: PNT 2. Disseminate the values of the World Heritage Site among the tourist trade and the residents of Copacabana 3. Disseminate and promote the Site with RioTur	1. 5 years 2. Continuous - in progress 3. 1 year	1. IPHAN; BNDES; OCBPM; Prefeitura; Components Managers 2. Municipality e INEPAC 3. Municipality; IPHAN; Components Managers	1. Technical Cooperation Agreement involving IPHAN, OCBPM and BNDES for the implementation 2. Action underway by Rio de Janeiro municipality 3. Proposal to promote the Site and celebrate the 10 years of recognition as a World Heritage Site
5.3	Management System/Management Plan				
5.3.5	Some use has been made of the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation to develop policies and best practices for the protection of the property	1. Expand the use of HUL recommendations among management institutions 2. Develop specific guidelines for site management that follow the HUL recommendations	1. Until the next Periodic Report Cycle 2. Until next Periodic Reporting Cycle	Property Management Institutions	The HUL guidelines are used in the analyses of projects for the buffer zone
5.3.7	No use has been made of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties at the property	1. Expand the use of the recommendations of the Climate Change Impacts Document among management institutions, especially in environmental conservation units	1. Until the next Periodic Report Cycle	1. Property Management Institutions: managers of conservation units	No comments
5.3.11	There is coordination between the range of administrative bodies involved in the management of the property, but it could be improved	1. Officially reestablish the World Heritage Site Management Committee 2. Compatibilize the norms and protection instruments that affect the area of the property	1. One year 2. Continuous - in progress	1. Iphan and the Municipality of Rio de Janeiro 2. Government institutions that are managers of the property	The Management Committee was officially established by IPHAN's Ordinance in 2016, acting until 2019 when it was dismissed by Federal Decree 9.759/2019. From then on and until the year 2020, it functioned as the Management Group.
5.3.14	There is no existing annual work/action plan for the property despite an identified need	1. Review and update the Property Management Plan and prepare the strategic planning establishing the responsibility matrix and the timeline for the elaboration of the actions.	Two years	Property Management Institutions	The update of the Management Plan is necessary due to the fact that most of the planned actions have already been implemented; the revision and improvement of the monitoring instruments aiming at the adequate management and minimization of impacts
6.1	Funding				

6.1.10	Some use has been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Development at the World Heritage property	1. Expand the capacities of the technical personnel involved in management as well as the other actors 2. Develop courses and training activities on World Heritage themes	1. Until the next Periodic Report Cycle - ongoing action 2. Until the next Periodic Report Cycle - ongoing action	IPHAN: CC2 - Lucio Costa Center; Municipality; Universities Management Group	Some courses have been developed under the Lucio Costa Center - UNESCO Category II Center. The master's program in Cultural Heritage at IPHAN/Lucio Costa Center has prioritized the participation of World Heritage property managers
--------	---	--	---	--	--

8	Education, Information and Awareness Building				
8.2	There is a planned education and awareness programme for children and/or youth but it only partly meets the needs	1. Expand the heritage and environmental education actions implemented in the conservation units to the Site's area. 2. Elaborate a proposal for heritage education to the whole area of the Site	1. Until the next Periodic Report Cycle 2. Until the next Periodic Report Cycle	1. Tijuca National Park; Botanical Garden; Fortifications: army and navy 2. Iphan and Municipality	The conservation units develop constant educational activities, as does the Brazilian Army in its fortifications and the Navy in its cultural center. The proposal is to expand these projects to the whole area of the World Heritage Site

9	Visitor Management				
9.12	The Outstanding Universal Value of the property is not adequately presented and interpreted	1. Develop the Site's interpretation project and implement the Interpretation Center and signage throughout the World Heritage Site	1. Until the next Periodic Report Cycle	1. IPHAN; BNDES; OCBPM; Municipality; Component Managers	Tijuca National Park has the Paineiras Visitor Center, with an interpretive structure that is intended to be expanded for the interpretation of the World Heritage Site as a whole and to create other interpretive structures in the other components

10	Monitoring				
10.2	Information on the values of the World Heritage property is adequate and key indicators have been defined but monitoring of the status of indicators could be improved	1. Review and update site monitoring indicators under the Management Plan	1. Until the next Periodic Report Cycle	Property Management Institutions	The revision and updating of the indicators aims to improve the measuring and monitoring mechanisms

Summary - Management Needs completed

12.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

12.3.1 - Following the analysis undertaken for this report, what is the current state of Authenticity of the World Heritage property?

The Authenticity of the World Heritage property **has been preserved**

12.3.2 - Following the analysis undertaken for this report, what is the current state of Integrity of the World Heritage property?

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

12.3.3 - Following the analysis undertaken for this report, what is the current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value?

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

12.3.4 - What is the current state of the property's other values?

Other important cultural and/or natural values are being **partially degraded** but the state of conservation of the World Heritage property has **not been significantly impacted**

12.3.5 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the state of conservation of the property.

In the context of the pandemic, some activities were halted and are beginning to return to operation, following new rules that must respect the world heritage property.

13. Impact of World Heritage Status

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

Conservation	Positive
--------------	----------

Research and monitoring	Very 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
Advocacy	No impact
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	Positive
Gender equality	Not applicable
Provision of ecosystem services/ benefits to local communities	Positive
Social inclusion and equity, and improvement of opportunities for all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, ethnicity, origin, religion, or economic or other status	Positive
Fostering inclusive local economic development and enhancing livelihood	No impact
Contributing to conflict prevention, including respect for cultural diversity within and around heritage properties	Not applicable
Other	Not applicable
If 'Other', please specify	

13.2 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to World Heritage status and its impacts

The projects related to the property conservation actions proposed in the Management Plan have been very successful.

14. Good Practice in the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention

14.1 - Example of good practice in World Heritage protection, identification, conservation or management at the property level

Georeferencing of the property has improved the demarcation of the core and buffer areas. Spatial data infrastructure provided free access to information. Management Plan and creation and operation of the Management Committee Creation of the Instituto Rio Patrimônio da Humanidade - IRPH, due to the recognition of the Carioca Landscapes as a World Heritage Site, with a specific structure to manage the asset Institutional articulation between the Municipality and Iphan, to update the bases of the natural and cultural heritage protection policies of the Master Plan under revision, through the Technical Committee for Monitoring - CTPD. Inclusion of the buffer zone of the World Heritage Site in the zoning of the special protection areas, reinforcing the instruments for protecting the property. Tijuca National Park Management Plan Shared management of Tijuca National Park and Rio de Janeiro's City Hall in the Park's conservation and preservation actions. Creation of the Thematic Chamber of Cultural Heritage at Tijuca National Park Creation of the National School of Tropical Botany at the Botanical Garden Cultural visitation circuit at the Botanical Garden of Rio de Janeiro The participation of civil society in the management of the Botanical Garden and Tijuca National Park, through the Friends Association. Creation of the Environmental Protection Area and Municipal Environmental Park of the Carioca Landscape, reinforcing the protection areas of the declared World Heritage Site. Creation of specific norms for the Copacabana waterfront aimed at the preservation of the landscape elements of Burle Marx's project by the State Institute of Cultural Heritage - INEPAC Management Plan for the Pão de Açúcar Natural Monument Plan for the Revitalization and Conservation of the Historic Bay Entrance Forts Landscape Set. Implementation of the Environmental Sanitation Program for Municipalities Surrounding Guanabara Bay (PSAM) - March 2012, State of Rio de Janeiro/IADB

14.2 - Define which topics are covered by this example of best practice at the property level

State of Conservation
Management
Governance
Capacity Building

15. Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise

15.1. Relevance of Periodic Reporting

15.1.1 - Has the Periodic Reporting process improved the understanding of the following?

Management effectiveness to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value
Monitoring and reporting

15.1.2 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities

State Party	Good
Site Managers	Fair
UNESCO World Heritage Centre	Fair
Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM)	No follow-up

15.2. Use of Data

15.2.1 - How do the authorities in charge of the property plan to use the data recorded from this cycle of Periodic Reporting?

Revision of priorities/strategies/policies for the protection, management and conservation of heritage
Update of management plans
Advocacy

15.2.2 - Comments on use of data from the Cycle of Periodic Reporting

The data from the evaluations are quite relevant, but not very targeted for guidelines and intervention programs.

15.3. Timing and resources

15.3.1 - Entities involved in the filling out of this online questionnaire (tick as many boxes as applicable)

Governmental institutions responsible for cultural and natural heritage
Site Manager/Coordinator World Heritage property staff
Focal points of other international conventions/programmes
Staff from other World Heritage properties

15.3.2 - Has a gender balanced contribution and participation been considered in the filling out of this questionnaire?

Gender balance has **not been explicitly** considered or implemented in the process.

15.3.3 - Were you given adequate time (i.e. roughly ten months) to gather necessary information and to fill in this questionnaire?

No

15.3.4 - Please estimate the time (working hours) needed to complete this questionnaire

160 / 80 / 160 /

15.3.5 - Did you mobilise any additional resources to fill out this questionnaire?

	Additional resources	No	Yes
15.3.5.1	Human resources		×
15.3.5.2	Financial resources for organizing consultation meetings/ training	×	

15.4. Format and content of the Periodic Report

15.4.1 - How accessible was the information required to complete this questionnaire?

Most required information was accessible.

15.4.2 - Was the questionnaire easy to use and clear to understand?

		Very Difficult	Difficult	Easy	Very easy
15.4.2.1	Ease of use of questionnaire			×	
15.4.2.2	Clarity of questions				×

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

Expand the observation fields and Increase the time for completion due to the necessary articulation with all actors and the organization of the information.

15.5. Training and Guidance

15.5.1 - Please rate the level of support in terms of training and guidance from the following entities in completing this questionnaire

UNESCO World Heritage Centre	Fair
UNESCO (other sectors/field offices)	No support
UNESCO National Commission	No support
ICOMOS International	No support

IUCN International	No support
ICCROM international/regional	No support
ICOMOS national/regional	No support
IUCN national/regional	No support

15.5.2 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Reporting questionnaire from the following entities

UNESCO World Heritage Centre	Fair
State Party Representative (national Focal Point)	Good
UNESCO other sectors (e.g. field office)	No support
National Commission for UNESCO	No support
ICOMOS International	No support
ICCROM International/regional	No support
ICOMOS national/regional	No support
IUCN national/regional	No support
IUCN International	No support

15.5.3 - Were the online training resources prepared by the World Heritage Centre regarding Periodic Reporting adequate for you to complete this questionnaire?

No

15.5.4 - If you found that the online training resources were not adequate, what changes would you like to see implemented?

Extend training by the World Heritage Center for site managers beyond the focal points.

15.6. Actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

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

- **Geographic information table**

Reason for update: Minimum limits are updated according to the georeferencing. 1. TNP Tijuca Forest, Pretos Forros and Covanca S22,937 /W43,297 - 1979,77 ha 2. TNP Pedra Bonita and Pedra da Gávea S22,959/W43,285 - 250,75 ha 3. TNP Carioca Mountain range and Botanic Gardens S22,959/W43,239 - 1865,11 ha 4. Mouth of Guanabara Bay and Manmade Shorelines – Flamengo Park, Historic Forts, Sugar Loaf, Copacabana Seafront S22,946/W43,148 - 3094,05 ha Buffer Zone S22,955 /W43,227 - 8157,36 ha Total - 14347,04ha

- **Map(s)**

Reason for update: Minimal boundary updating - the property limits were updated as a result of the georeferencing. The minimum boundary adjustments will be officially presented to UNESCO in February 2023. <https://siurb.rio/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=f751555b01284282b8adc0d7777a19a5>

- **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property as adopted by the World Heritage Committee**

Reason for update: - Decree No. 35879 of July 5, 2012, created the Instituto Rio Patrimônio da Humanidade (IRPH), ratified by Law 5547 of December 27, 2012, which has, at the municipal level, the assignment of managing the property. - Draft Decision: 39 COM 7B.93, Bonn, 2015, The World Heritage Committee approved the Management Plan for the property. - A Management Committee to coordinate the management of the serial sites was established by The Federal Decree of IPHAN Nº 454 of 10 November 2016.

Changes to these items will need to go through the proper processes.

15.7. Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise

15.7.1 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise

The report could provide a space for updating the actions taken in the management of the World Heritage Site.

15.7.2 - Thank you for having filled in all the questions. Please contact your National Focal Point for validation.