Fort Jesus, Mombasa

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

Fort Jesus, Mombasa

- 1.2 World Heritage property details
- 1.3 Geographic information table

Name	Coordinates	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Fort Jesus, Mombasa	-4.063 / 39.679	2.36	31	33.36	2011
Total (ha)		2.36	31	33.36	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Fort Jesus, Mombasa - inscribed property	2011	

- 1.5 Web and Social Media data of the property (if applicable)
- 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) is not 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		×

2.2 - Please provide comments on 2.1 if necessary

No comment

2.3 - Do your national authorities intend to request the granting of Enhanced Protection (if relevant) under the Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict for the World Heritage property in the next three years?

No

- 2.4 Do your national authorities intend to designate whole or part of the World Heritage property for inclusion in the List of Wetlands of International Importance (The Ramsar List), if relevant, in the next three years?
- 2.5 Do your national authorities intend to designate whole or part of the World Heritage property as a Man and Biosphere Reserve (if relevant) in the next three years?
- 2.6 Do your national authorities intend to apply for whole or part of World Heritage property to be designated as a UNESCO Global Geopark (if relevant) in the next three years?

Not applicable

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 1 of 42

2.7 - Please indicate the level of cooperation at property level between designations under different Conventions/Programmes

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)

No comments

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?

No

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

Not applicable

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

Not aware

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

Built by the Portuguese at the end of the 16th century at the southern edge of the town of Mombasa, over a spur of coral rock, and kept under their control for one century, Fort Jesus, Mombasa, bears testimony to the first successful attempt by Western civilization to rule the Indian ocean trade routes, which, until then had

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 2 of 42

remained under Eastern influence. The design of the fort, with its proportions, its imposing walls and five bastions, reflects the military architectural theory of the Renaissance. Fort Jesus, Mombasa, bears physical witness, in its structures and subsequent transformations, also to the interchange of cultural values and influences between and among peoples of African, Arab, Turkish, Persian and European origin that fought to gain and maintain their control over this strategic port.

Criterion (ii): Built in a period and in a region, which were at the centre of the emerging political, commercial, and cultural globalisation, Fort Jesus, with its imposing structure, and the various traces of subsequent modifications, bears significant witness to the interchange of cultural values among peoples of African, Arab, Turkish, Persian and European origin. Built and occupied first by the Portuguese, Fort Jesus, Mombasa, changed hands many times throughout its history, coming under Arab. Swahili and English control. Its important role in the control of trade also saw it host many of the peoples of the Indian Ocean basin.

Criterion (iv): Fort Jesus, Mombasa, eminently exemplifies a new type of fortification that resulted from the innovations in military and weapons technology that occurred between the 15th and 16th centuries. In its layout and form, the Fort reflects the Renaissance ideal whose architectural proportions and geometric harmony are to be found in the proportions of the human body, while at the same time meeting the functional needs of a modern and well-defended fortification. The original layout of the Fort, despite several changes, has survived almost unchanged over centuries of continued occupations and reoccupations.

Integrity

The boundaries of the property have been delineated to include the underwater archaeological remains in the expanse of sea in front of Fort Jesus as well as the moat area adjacent to Mombasa Old Town. Minor changes inside the Fort bear witness to its history and do not threaten its integrity. The property is in good conditions and there is no urban or development encroachment in its immediate vicinity. Mombasa Old Town, which is integral to Fort Jesus' historic context, acts as the buffer zone of the Fort.

Authenticity

In regard to authenticity, Fort Jesus, Mombasa, hasretained its form, design and materials, with coral stone and lime mortar still being used in the traditional way, where necessary, for repair and conservation work. It has also retained its authenticity of setting, located on an otherwise unbuilt property along the coast of Mombasa Island adjacent to the Mombasa Old Town with which it shares a common history.

Protection and management requirements

The legal protection system for the property is adequate: Fort Jesus, Mombasa, was originally designated a National Park in 1958, the protected area included the Fort itself and a 100-meter strip around it; today it falls under the National Museums and Heritage Act, 2006. The buffer zone has been formally declared a Conservation Area, however, a discrepancy between the size of the designated Conservation Area and the size of the Buffer Zone has not been amended yet.

A satisfactory management plan has been put in place for the property with the National Museums of Kenya acting as the key stakeholder in its conservation and safeguarding.

Long-term conservation and management issues include the protection of the Fort from urban encroachment and inappropriate design in the areas adjacent to the Fort and in the surrounding Mombasa Old Town, which require the reinforcement of dedicated management structures and staff, control of erosion of the rocks along the sea coast, and the ongoing maintenance and conservation of the Fort itself.

3.2 - Please list the key attributes of Outstanding Universal Value of your property and give an assessment of their condition. As a quideline, 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	The 17m external walls built of coral stone and lime mortar	×			
3.2.2	The buildings within	×			
3.2.3	The moat	×			
3.2.4	The five bastions	×			
3.2.5	Shipwrecks	×			
3.2.6	The Canons	×			
3.2.7	Inscriptions	×			
3.2.8	The gates	×			
3.2.9	The doors	×			
3.2.10	The artefacts in storage and display		×		
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

The artifacts, Shipwrecks, Canons, Gates, Inscriptions and Doors have now been included as attributes as they highlight the evidence of "interchange of human cultures" that passed through the property.

4. Factors Affecting the Property

4.1. Buildings and Development

4.1.1 - Housing

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 3 of 42

Relevant

** Not relevant

4.1.2 - Commercial development

Relevant

** Not relevant

4.1.3 - Industrial areas

Relevant X Not relevant

4.1.4 - Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure

Relevant X Not relevant

4.1.5 - Interpretative and visitation facilities

X Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	• Inside	Outside	▶ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing
O Positive X	×	×	×		S		
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

Existing interpretation facilities have not been physically changed however there's inadequate information panels within the site

4.2. Transportation Infrastructure

4.2.1 - Ground transport infrastructure

Relevant	X Not relevant			
4.2.2 - Underground transport infrastructure				
Relevant	X Not relevant			
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 X		×		×			<i>P</i>

4.2.5 - Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure

× Relevant			1	Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	№ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing
Positive							
Negative X		×		×			*

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

There is talk of improving waterway accessibility to different parts of the town. The property could potential be used as an access point and result in increased traffic

4.3. Services Infrastructures

4.3.1 - Water infrastructure

Relevant	X Not relevant

4.3.2 - Renewable energy facilities

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 4 of 42

Relevant	Relevant			X Not relevant				
4.3.3 - Non-renewable energ	.3.3 - Non-renewable energy facilities							
Relevant			× Not relevant					
4.3.4 - Localised utilities								
Relevant			× Not relevant					
4.3.5 - Major linear utilities								
× Relevant			1	Not relevant				
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact			
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	▶ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing	
O Positive								
							_	

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

4.4. Pollution

4.4.1 - Pollution of marine waters

4.4.1 - I oliution of marine waters	
Relevant	★ Not relevant
4.4.2 - Ground water pollution	
Relevant	✗ Not relevant
4.4.3 - Surface water pollution	
Relevant	X Not relevant
4.4.4 - Air pollution	
Relevant	X Not relevant
4.4.5 - Solid waste	
Relevant	✗ Not relevant
4.4.6 - Input of excess energy	
Relevant	✗ Not relevant

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

4.5. Biological resource use/modification

4.5.1 - Fishing/collecting aquatic resources

× Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	→ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing
O Positive X	×			×	•		
Negative							

4.5.2 - Aquaculture

Relevant X Not relevant

4.5.3 - Land conversion

Relevant X Not relevant

4.5.4 - Livestock farming/Grazing of domesticated animals

vant	X Not relevant
------	----------------

4.5.5 - Crop production

• •	
Relevant	X Not relevant
4.5.6 - Commercial wild plant collection	
Relevant	¥ Not relevant
4.5.7 - Subsistence wild plant collection	
Relevant	X Not relevant
4.5.8 - Commercial hunting	
Relevant	X Not relevant
4.5.9 - Subsistence hunting	
Relevant	X Not relevant
4.5.10 - Forestry/Wood production	

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

× Not relevant

4.6. Physical resource extraction

4.6.1 - Mining

Relevant

	Relevant	X Not relevant
4	I.6.2 - Quarrying	

, , ,

Relevant X Not relevant

4.6.3 - Oil and gas

Relevant X Not relevant

4.6.4 - Water (extraction)

Relevant X 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

4.7. Local conditions affecting physical fabric

4.7.1 - Wind

※ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	→ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing
O Positive							
Negative X	×			×		→	

4.7.2 - Relative humidity

× Relevant				Not relevant				
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact			
Impact	Current	Potential	• Inside	Outside	→ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing	
O Positive								
	×		×	×		→		

4.7.3 - Temperature

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

4.7.4 - Radiation/Light

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 6 of 42

× Not relevant

4.7.6 - Water (rain/water table)

X Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	▶ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing
Positive							
	×		×	×		→	

4.7.7 - Pests

Relevant

X Relevant				Not relevant				
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact			
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	▶ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing	
O Positive								
○ Negative X	×		×	×			7	

4.7.8 - Micro-organisms

Relevant	X 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

Fungus growth on plants within the Fort regularly managed by herbicide Growth of vegetation on the walls of the Fort weakening the structure if un-managed. Periodically uprooted.

4.8. Social/Cultural uses of heritage

4.8.1 - Ritual/Spiritual/Religious and associative uses

X Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	▶ Decreasing	⇒ Stable	Increasing
O Positive X	×		×	×		→	
Negative							

4.8.2 - Society's valuing of heritage

X Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	© Outside	▶ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing
O Positive 🗶	×		×	×			•
Negative							

4.8.3 - Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting

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

4.8.4 - Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system

≭ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	▶ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing
O Positive							
	×			×		→	

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 7 of 42

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

X Relevant			1	Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	G Current	Potential	• Inside	Outside	▶ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing
Positive							
Negative X	×	×		×			-

4.8.6 - Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation

× Relevant			!	Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	▶ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing
O Positive X	×	×	×	×			•
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

Constitution of the community around the buffer zone has changed, hence their priorities and expertise.

4.9. Other human activities

4.9.1 - Illegal activities

Relevant	X Not relevant
0.0 Polihaneta destruation of havitana	

4.9.2 - Deliberate destruction of heritage

X Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	G Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	▶ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing
O Positive							
○ Negative X	×		×			\rightarrow	

4.9.3 - Military training

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

4.9.4 - War

Relevant	× Not relevant
	The following

4.9.5 - Terrorism

Relevant	X Not relevant

4.9.6 - Civil unrest

|--|

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

Graffiti exists but managed

4.10. Climate change and severe weather events

4.10.1 - Storms

Relevant	X Not relevant
4.10.2 - Flooding	
Relevant	X Not relevant

4.10.3 - Drought	
Relevant	X Not relevant

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 8 of 42

4.10.4 - Desertification

Relevant	X Not relevant
4.10.5 - Changes to oceanic waters	
Relevant	X Not relevant
4.10.6 - Temperature change	
Relevant	X Not relevant
4.10.7 - Other climate change impacts	
Relevant	X 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

4.11. 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	

4.11.5 - Erosion and siltation/Deposition

✗ Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	> Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing
O Positive							
	×			×	S		

4.11.6 - Fire (wildfire)

Rollovant	Not relevant
44.7. Bloom of the footon	and a standard and a standard by AAA and afficiently a standard by the standar

- 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
- 4.12. Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species

4.12.1 - Translocated species

Relevant	X Not relevant
4.12.2 - Invasive/Alien terrestrial species	
Relevant	X Not relevant
4.12.3 - Invasive/Alien freshwater species	
Relevant	X Not relevant
4.12.4 - Invasive/Alien marine species	
Relevant	X Not relevant

4	4.12.5 - Hyper-abundant species								
	Relevant	X Not relevant							

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 9 of 42

4.12.6 - Modified genetic material

Relevant X 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

4.13. Management and institutional factors

4.13.1 - Management system/Management plan

X Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Impact Current Pote		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
O Positive 🗶	×		×	×		\rightarrow	
Negative							

4.13.3 - Governance

✗ Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	Inside	Outside	▶ Decreasing	⇒ Stable	Increasing
O Positive 🗶	×		×	×		\rightarrow	
Negative							

4.13.4 - Management activities

× Relevant		Not relevant					
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	pact Potential		Inside	G 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							
	×		×			→	

4.13.6 - Human resources

× Relevant	1	Not relevant					
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	Current	Potential	• Inside	Outside	→ Decreasing	→ Stable	Increasing
Positive	×	×	×			\rightarrow	
Negative							

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 10 of 42

4.13.7 - Low impact research/monitoring activities

≭ Relevant			1	Not relevant			
Impact Origin			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

The management plan in place is outdated and not fully implemented due to insufficient funds. The plan needs to be reviewed and well funded towards its implementation

4.14. Other factor(s)

4.14.1 - Other factor(s)

The institution needs to establish and gazette clear rules and regulations for the property to ensure legal action is taken against petty offenders like visitors doing graffiti. This will help reduce the occurrence of damage

4.15. Factors Summary Table

4.15.1 - Factors Summary Table

Name				Origin		Trend
	Impact			Origin	Henu	
4.1 Buildings and Development						
4.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities	O	q	9	•		•
4.2 Transportation Infrastructure						
4.2.4 Marine transport infrastructure						
			~		76	
			4		G	
4.2.5 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure						
			9		(1
4.3 Services Infrastructures						
4.3.5 Major linear utilities						
		q		@	Œ	7
4.5 Biological resource use/modification						
4.5.1 Fishing/collecting aquatic resources	()				G	
4.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric						
4.7.1 Wind						
		q			Œ	→
4.7.2 Relative humidity						
					000	_
		4		•	(F	→
4.7.6 Water (rain/water table)						
		q		•	Œ	\rightarrow
4.7.7 Pests						
		A		@	Œ	-
4.8 Social/Cultural uses of heritage						
		m a		0	78F	
4.8.1 Ritual/Spiritual/Religious and associative uses	O	A		•	Œ.	⇒

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 11 of 42

4.8.2 Society's val	uing of heritage				O	q		•	Œ	<i>></i>
4.8.4 Changes in to	raditional ways of life and	d knowledge system								
						9			Œ	→
4.8.5 Identity, soci	al cohesion, changes in I	ocal population and commu	unity							
						9	9		Œ	7
4.8.6 Impacts of to	urism/Visitation/Recreati	on			0	9	9	•	Œ	7
4.9 Other human a	ctivities									
4.9.2 Deliberate de	estruction of heritage									
						9		•		→
4.11 Sudden ecolo	gical or geological event	s								
4.11.5 Erosion and	I siltation/Deposition									
						9			G	•
4.13 Management	and institutional factors									
4.13.1 Managemen	nt system/Management pl	an			O	9	9	•	G	→
						~3			~**	
4.13.2 Legal frame	work				•	4		•	G.	→
4.13.3 Governance					()	~			ndi.	_
4.13.3 Governance	ł				•	4		•	G	-
4.13.4 Managemen	at activities				(m		•	n#	_
4.13.4 Managemen	it activities					7			G	
4.13.5 Financial re	SOURCES									
4. 13.3 1 manda 16	30ui 0e3					q		•		→
4.13.6 Human reso	ources				O	9	9	0		→
10.0 Human resu	, ui 000					-,	-1	9		
4.13.7 Low impact	research/monitoring acti	ivities			③	q		(→
25# impact						•				
Legend	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Insi	de		Outsi	de	

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					Origin		Trend		
4.1.5 Interp	1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities				•		S		
Spatial sca	Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor								
	Restricted								
×	Localised								
	Extensive								

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 12 of 42

	Widespread
Temporal	scale - Occurence of the impact
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
×	On-going Control of the Control of t
Impact - Im	ppact on the attributes
	Insignificant
	Minor
×	Significant
	Major
Manageme	ent response - Capacity of management to respond
	High capacity
×	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - De	velopement over the last 6 years
	Decreasing
×	Static
	Increasing

4.2 Transportation Infrastructure

Name		Impact			Origin		Trend
4.2.4 Marin	e transport infrastructure						
				9		G	/
Spatial sca	le - Area affected by the factor						
×	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
	Widespread						
Temporal s	Femporal scale - Occurence of the impact						
	One off or rare						
×	Intermittent or sporadic						
	Frequent						
	On-going On-going						
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes						
	Insignificant						
×	Minor						
	Significant						
	Major						
Manageme	nt response - Capacity of management to respond						
	High capacity						

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 13 of 42

	Medium capacity
×	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Dev	velopement over the last 6 years
	Decreasing
	Static
×	Increasing

Name	Impact		Origin		Trend	
4.2.5 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure						
			9		Œ	7
Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor						

Spatial sc	ale - Area affected by the factor
×	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal	scale - Occurence of the impact
	One off or rare
×	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Ir	npact on the attributes
	Insignificant
×	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Managem	ent response - Capacity of management to respond
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
×	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - De	evelopement over the last 6 years
	Decreasing
	Static
×	Increasing

4.3 Services Infrastructures

Name	Impact		Origin		Trend	
4.3.5 Major linear utilities						
		9		•	F	/

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 14 of 42

	Restricted					
×	Localised					
	Extensive					
	Widespread					
Temporal s	scale - Occurence of the impact					
	One off or rare					
×	Intermittent or sporadic					
	Frequent					
	On-going Control of the Control of t					
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes					
	Insignificant					
	Minor					
×	Significant					
	Major					
Manageme	ont response - Capacity of management to respond					
	High capacity					
	Medium capacity					
×	Low capacity					
	No capacity and / or resources					
Trend - De	Trend - Developement over the last 6 years					
	Decreasing					
	Static					
×	Increasing					

4.5 Biological resource use/modification

Name		Impact		Origin		Trend
4.5.1 Fishir	1.5.1 Fishing/collecting aquatic resources		9		C	\$
Spatial sca	le - Area affected by the factor					
×	Restricted					
^	Nosinolou					
	Localised					
	Extensive					
	Widespread					
Temporal s	cale - Occurence of the impact					
	One off or rare					
	Intermittent or sporadic					
	Frequent					
×	On-going					
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes					
×	Insignificant					
	Minor					
	Significant					

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 15 of 42

	Major
Manageme	nt response - Capacity of management to respond
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
×	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - De	velopement over the last 6 years
×	Decreasing
	Static
	Increasing

4.7 Local conditions affecting physical fabric

Name		Impact		Origin		Trend
4.7.1 Wind						
			q		Œ	\rightarrow
Snatial sca	le - Area affected by the factor					
Opuliai Soa	Restricted					
	Localised					
×	Extensive					
^	Widespread					
remporal s	cale - Occurence of the impact					
	One off or rare					
×	Intermittent or sporadic					
	Frequent					
	On-going					
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes					
	Insignificant					
×	Minor					
	Significant					
	Major					
Manageme	nt response - Capacity of management to respond					
	High capacity					
×	Medium capacity					
	Low capacity					
	No capacity and / or resources					
Trend - Dev	relopement over the last 6 years					
	Decreasing					
×	Static					
	Increasing					

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.7.2 Relative humidity			

			9	•	G	→
Spatial scale	e - Area affected by the factor					
	Restricted					
	Localised					
×	Extensive					
	Widespread					
Temporal so	cale - Occurence of the impact					
	One off or rare					
	Intermittent or sporadic					
	Frequent					
×	On-going					
Impact - Imp	eact on the attributes					
	Insignificant					
	Minor					
×	Significant					
	Major					
Managemen	t response - Capacity of management to respond					
	High capacity					
×	Medium capacity					
	Low capacity					
	No capacity and / or resources					
Trend - Deve	elopement over the last 6 years					
	Decreasing					
×	Static					
	Increasing					
Name		Impact		Origin		Trend
4.7.6 Water	.7.6 Water (rain/water table)					

		9	•	F	\rightarrow
Continuo	Associated by the feeter				
Spatiai Sca	le - Area affected by the factor				
×	Restricted				
	Localised				
	Extensive				
	Widespread				
Temporal s	scale - Occurence of the impact				
	One off or rare				
	Intermittent or sporadic				
	Frequent				
×	On-going				
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes				
	Insignificant				

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 17 of 42

Minor

×	Significant					
	Major					
Manageme	nt response - Capacity of management to respond					
	High capacity					
	Medium capacity					
×	Low capacity					
	No capacity and / or resources					
Trend - Dev	velopement over the last 6 years					
×	Decreasing					
	Static					
	Increasing					
Name 4.7.7 Pests		Impact		Origin		Trend
4.7.7 Fests			a	•	nd.	a
			7	Q	G	
Spatial sca	le - Area affected by the factor					
×	Restricted					
	Localised					
	Extensive					
	Widespread					
Temporal s	cale - Occurence of the impact					
	One off or rare					
	Intermittent or sporadic					
×	Frequent					
	On-going					
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes					
	Insignificant					
	Minor					
×	Significant					
	Major					
Manageme	nt response - Capacity of management to respond					
	High capacity					
×	Medium capacity					
	Low capacity					
	No capacity and / or resources					
Trend - Dev	relopement over the last 6 years					
	Decreasing					
	Static					
×	Increasing					

4.8 Social/Cultural uses of heritage

Name	Impa	pact	Origin	Trend	

4.8.1 Ritual/Spiritual/Religious and associative uses		0	9	•	C	\rightarrow
Spatial sca	le - Area affected by the factor					
	Restricted					
×	Localised					
	Extensive					
	Widespread					
Temporal s	cale - Occurence of the impact					
	One off or rare					
×	Intermittent or sporadic					
	Frequent					
	On-going					
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes					
	Insignificant					
×	Minor					
	Significant					
	Major					
Manageme	nt response - Capacity of management to respond					
	High capacity					
×	Medium capacity					
	Low capacity					
	No capacity and / or resources					
Trend - Dev	velopement over the last 6 years					
	Decreasing					
×	Static					
	Increasing					
Name	ty's valuing of heritage	Impact	q	Origin	Œ	Trend
	, o		-,	3	3	•
Spatial sca	le - Area affected by the factor					
	Restricted					
×	Localised					
	Extensive					
	Widespread					
Temporal s	cale - Occurence of the impact					
	One off or rare					
×	Intermittent or sporadic					
	Frequent					
	On-going					
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes					
	Insignificant					

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 19 of 42

	Minor					
×	Significant					
~	Major					
Manageme	nt response - Capacity of management to respond					
Manageme						
**	High capacity					
×	Medium capacity					
	Low capacity					
	No capacity and / or resources					
Trend - De	velopement over the last 6 years					
	Decreasing					
	Static					
×	Increasing					
Name	ges in traditional ways of life and knowledge system	Impact		Origin		Trend
	les in traditional ways of the and knowledge system		q		Œ	→
			•		3	
Spatial sca	le - Area affected by the factor					
×	Restricted					
	Localised					
	Extensive					
	Widespread					
Temporal s	scale - Occurence of the impact					
	One off or rare					
×	Intermittent or sporadic					
	Frequent					
	On-going					
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes					
	Insignificant					
	Minor					
×	Significant					
	Major					
Manageme	nt response - Capacity of management to respond					
	High capacity					
×	Medium capacity					
	Low capacity					
	No capacity and / or resources					

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

Trend - Developement over the last 6 years

Decreasing
Static
Increasing

			9	9		G	
Spatial sca	ale - Area affected by the factor						
×	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
	Widespread						
Temporal s	scale - Occurence of the impact						
	One off or rare						
	Intermittent or sporadic						
	Frequent						
×	On-going						
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes						
	Insignificant						
	Minor						
×	Significant						
	Major						
Manageme	nt response - Capacity of management to respond						
	High capacity						
	Medium capacity						
×	Low capacity						
	No capacity and / or resources						
Trend - De	velopement over the last 6 years						
	Decreasing						
	Static						
×	Increasing						
Name	cts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation	Impact	q	9	Origin	Œ	Trend
noio impu			•	0	3	9	Ť
Spatial sca	lle - Area affected by the factor						
	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
×	Widespread						
Temporal s	scale - Occurence of the impact						
	One off or rare						
×	Intermittent or sporadic						
	Frequent						
	On-going						
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes						
	Insignificant						
	Minor						

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 21 of 42

×	Significant
	Major
Manageme	nt response - Capacity of management to respond
	High capacity
×	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Dev	velopement over the last 6 years
	Decreasing
	Static
×	Increasing

4.9 Other human activities

A3.2 Deliberate destruction of heritage	Name		Impac	t	Origin	Trend
Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor X Restricted Localised Extensive Widespread Temporal scale - Occurence of the impact One off or rare X Intermittent or sporadic Frequent On-going Impact - Impact on the attributes Insignificant Minor X Significant Major Management response - Capacity of management to respond High capacity Low capacity Low capacity No capacity and for resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static		iberate destruction of heritage	•			
Restricted Localised Extensive Widespread Temporal scale - Occurence of the Impact One off or rare Intermittent or sporadic Frequent On-going Impact - Impact on the attributes Insignificant Minor X Significant Major Management response - Capacity of management to respond Management response - Capacity of management to respond X Medium capacity X Medium capacity X Mocapacity on capacity of management to respond Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static				q	•	→
Restricted Localised Extensive Widespread Temporal scale - Occurence of the Impact One off or rare Intermittent or sporadic Frequent On-going Impact - Impact on the attributes Insignificant Minor X Significant Major Management response - Capacity of management to respond Management response - Capacity of management to respond X Medium capacity X Medium capacity X Mocapacity on capacity of management to respond Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static						
Localised Extensive Widespread Temporal scale - Occurence of the impact One off or rare X Intermittent or sporadic Frequent On-going Impact - Impact on the attributes Insignificant Minor X Significant Major Management response - Capacity of management to respond Medium capacity X Medium capacity X Medium capacity No capacity and / or resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static	Spatial s	cale - Area affected by the factor				
Extensive Widespread Temporal scale - Occurence of the impact One off or rare X Intermittent or sporadic 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 X Medium capacity No capacity and / or resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static	×	Restricted				
Temporal scale - Occurence of the Impact One off or rare X Intermittent or sporadic 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 Low capacity No capacity of resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static		Localised				
Temporal scale - Occurence of the impact One off or rare X Intermittent or sporadic 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 - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static		Extensive				
Che 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 - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing Static		Widespread				
Intermittent or sporadic Frequent On-going Impact - Impact on the attributes Insignificant Insignificant Minor X Significant Major Management response - Capacity of management to respond High capacity X Medium capacity X Medium capacity Too capacity and / or resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static	Tempora	Il scale - Occurence of the impact				
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 - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static		One off or rare				
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 - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static	×	Intermittent or sporadic				
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 - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static		Frequent				
Insignificant Minor Significant Major Management response - Capacity of management to respond High capacity Medium capacity Low capacity No capacity and / or resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing Static		On-going				
Minor Significant Major Management response - Capacity of management to respond High capacity Medium capacity Low capacity No capacity and / or resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing Static	Impact -	Impact on the attributes				
Significant Major Management response - Capacity of management to respond High capacity Medium capacity Low capacity No capacity and / or resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing Static		Insignificant				
Management response - Capacity of management to respond High capacity Medium capacity Low capacity No capacity and / or resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static		Minor				
Management response - Capacity of management to respond High capacity Medium capacity Low capacity No capacity and / or resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static	×	Significant				
High capacity Medium capacity Low capacity No capacity and / or resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static		Major				
Medium capacity Low capacity No capacity and / or resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static	Manage	nent response - Capacity of management to respond				
Low capacity No capacity and / or resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static		High capacity				
No capacity and / or resources Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static	×	Medium capacity				
Trend - Developement over the last 6 years Decreasing X Static		Low capacity				
Decreasing X Static		No capacity and / or resources				
× Static	Trend - I	Developement over the last 6 years				
		Decreasing				
Increasing	×	Static				
		Increasing				

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 22 of 42

4.11 Sudden ecological or geological events

Name	Impact		Origin		Trend		
4.11.5 Eros	ion and siltation/Deposition						
			9			G	\$
Spatial sca	le - Area affected by the factor						
×	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
	Widespread						
Temporal s	cale - Occurence of the impact						
	One off or rare						
	Intermittent or sporadic						
	Frequent						
×	On-going						
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes						
	Insignificant						
	Minor						
×	Significant						
	Major						
Manageme	nt response - Capacity of management to respond						
	High capacity						
	Medium capacity						
×	Low capacity						
	No capacity and / or resources						
Trend - Dev	relopement over the last 6 years						
×	Decreasing						
	Static						
	Increasing						

4.13 Management and institutional factors

Name	lame Impact		Origin		Trend		
4.13.1 Mar	.13.1 Management system/Management plan		q	9	•	©	\rightarrow
Spatial sca	ale - Area affected by the factor						
	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
×	Widespread						
Temporal	Temporal scale - Occurence of the impact						
	One off or rare						

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 23 of 42

	Intermittent or sporadic					
	Frequent					
×	On-going					
	mpact on the attributes					
	Insignificant					
	Minor					
×	Significant					
^	Major					
Managem	ent response - Capacity of management to respond					
managem	High capacity					
×	Medium capacity					
^	Low capacity					
	No capacity and / or resources					
Trand D						
×	Decreasing					
^	Static					
	Increasing					
	Increasing					
Name		Impac	i	Origin		Trend
4.13.2 Leç	al framework	•	q	•	Œ	→
Snatial sc	ale - Area affected by the factor					
Opatiai 30	Restricted					
	Localised					
	Extensive					
×	Widespread					
	scale - Occurence of the impact					
Tomporta	One off or rare					
	Intermittent or sporadic					
	Frequent					
×	On-going					
	mpact on the attributes					
	Insignificant					
	Minor					
×	Significant					
	Major					
Managem	ent response - Capacity of management to respond					
Managem	ent response - Capacity of management to respond High capacity					
	High capacity					
Managem	High capacity Medium capacity					
	High capacity Medium capacity Low capacity					
×	High capacity Medium capacity					

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 24 of 42

	Decreasing					
	Static					
×	Increasing					
Name		lmmaat		Onlaria	Trand	
Name 4.13.3 Gove	rnance	Impact	9	Origin	Œ	Trend
			•			
Spatial scale	e - Area affected by the factor					
	Restricted					
	Localised					
	Extensive					
×	Widespread					
Temporal so	cale - Occurence of the impact					
	One off or rare					
	Intermittent or sporadic					
	Frequent					
×	On-going					
Impact - Imp	pact on the attributes					
	Insignificant					
	Minor					
×	Significant					
	Major					
Managemen	t response - Capacity of management to respond					
	High capacity					
×	Medium capacity					
	Low capacity					
	No capacity and / or resources					
Trend - Dev	elopement over the last 6 years					
	Decreasing					
	Static					
×	Increasing					
Name		Impact		Origin		Trend
4.13.4 Mana	gement activities	O	9	•	G	→
Spatial scale	e - Area affected by the factor					
	Restricted					
	Localised					
	Extensive					
×	Widespread					
Temporal so	cale - Occurence of the impact					
	One off or rare					

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 25 of 42

	Intermittent or sporadic				
	Frequent				
×	On-going				
Impact - In	npact on the attributes				
	Insignificant				
	Minor				
×	Significant				
	Major				
Manageme	ent response - Capacity of management to respond				
	High capacity				
×	Medium capacity				
	Low capacity				
	No capacity and / or resources				
Trend - De	velopement over the last 6 years				
	Decreasing				
×	Static				
	Increasing				
Name	incial resources	Impact		Origin	Trend
4. 13.3 FIIId	ilicial resources		q	•	
			-1	G.	~
Spatial sca	ale - Area affected by the factor				
	Restricted				
	Localised				

Spatial sca	le - Area affected by the factor
	Restricted
	Localised
×	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal s	scale - Occurence of the impact
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
×	On-going
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes
	Insignificant
	Minor
×	Significant
	Major
Manageme	nt response - Capacity of management to respond
	High capacity
×	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Dev	velopement over the last 6 years

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 26 of 42

×	Decreasing					
	Static					
	Increasing					
Name		Impact			Origin	Trend
4.13.6 Hum	an resources	0	9	9	•	→
Spatial sca	e - Area affected by the factor					
	Restricted					
	Localised					
×	Extensive					
	Widespread					
Temporal s	cale - Occurence of the impact					
	One off or rare					
	Intermittent or sporadic					
	Frequent					
×	On-going					
Impact - Im	pact on the attributes					
	Insignificant					
	Minor					
×	Significant					
	Major					
Manageme	nt response - Capacity of management to respond					
	High capacity					
×	Medium capacity					
	Low capacity					
	No capacity and / or resources					
Trend - Dev	relopement over the last 6 years					
	Decreasing					
×	Static					
	Increasing					
Name		Impact			Origin	Trend
4.13.7 LOW	impact research/monitoring activities	•	q		•	→
Spatial sca	le - Area affected by the factor					
	Restricted					
×	Localised					
	Extensive					
	Widespread					
Temporal s	cale - Occurence of the impact					
	One off or rare					

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 27 of 42

	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
×	On-going
Impact - Im	spact on the attributes
	Insignificant
	Minor
×	Significant
	Major
Manageme	ont response - Capacity of management to respond
	High capacity
×	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - De	velopement over the last 6 years
	Decreasing
×	Static
	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

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	The 17m external wall built of coral and lime	×			
4.18.1.2	The buildings within	×			
4.18.1.3	The moat	×			
4.18.1.4	The five bastions	×			
4.18.1.5	The Shipwrecks	×			

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 both the management authority and 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 both the management authority and local communities/landowners

5.1.5 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage propertyBoth property and buffer zone are under the management of National Museums of Kenya and recognized so by the local authority and community

5.2. Protective Measures

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

Fort Jesus, Mombasa, was originally designated a National Park in 1958 to protect the Fort and a 100m strip around it. Today it is protected under the National Museums and Heritage Act 2006.

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 28 of 42

The Environmental Management and Coordination Act (EMCA) 1999 and the National Museums and Heritage Act 2006 ensure that 'Environmental Impact Assessments are undertaken on sites earmarked for development projects and whose implementation threatens the survival of heritage resources of some kindamong other components of the environment.'

Additional information provided by the State Party on February 2011 explains that the Commission has been in operation since it has been gazetted in 2009 (gazette notice n. 2660). It includes members of the Municipal Council, interest groups from the local community, special interest groups and the NMK, providing technical expertise.

The revised nomination dossier reports that by-laws subject the area to development control measures, which are drawn from the conservation guidelines for Mombasa Old Town, namely buildings are not allowed to be built with more than three storeys; all buildings must retain their historical character and features, in particular with reference to doors and windows as well as their design and proportions; advertising signs should use hand-carved boards.

Source: Advisory Body Evaluation (ICOMOS), 2011

- 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
- 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?

An adequate legal framework for maintaining of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and/or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are some deficiencies in implementation

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 adequate capacity/resources to enforce legislation and/or regulation in the World Heritage property
- 5.2.7 Please provide a short summary of how the legislation, including spatial planning and other regulation, works in practice
- 5.2.8 Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations about the information related to the measures taken to protect the World Heritage property
- 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 Public management system at national level
- If 'Other', please specify
- 5.3.2 Management System: Please indicate which of the various management tools listed below are used to help protect 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

An annual work plan or business plan

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

The property is managed by a curator under the employment of the National Museums of Kenya. There's constant consultation with community whenever there's need/ issue. The community participates as tour guides after training from NMK. There's also opportunity for local community to display their works in temporary exhibitions

5.3.4 - Management Documents

Comment

Monthly reports. Quarterly reports, Work Plans, Strategic Plans

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?

No 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.
- 5.3.7 Has any use been made of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties at the

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 29 of 42

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:
- 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
- 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 little coordination between the range of administrative bodies involved in the management of the property

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

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

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?

An annual work/action plan exists but few of its activities are being implemented

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					

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					

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 30 of 42

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
- 5.3.19 Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the management system/plan
- 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.)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.2	Bilateral international funding	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.3	World Heritage Fund (International Assistance)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.4	Contribution from other conventions and programmes	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.5	International donations (NGOs, foundations, etc.)	10 %	0 %
6.1.1.6	Governmental (national/federal)	85 %	100 %
6.1.1.7	Governmental (regional/provincial/state)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.8	Governmental (local/municipal)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.9	In-country donations (NGOs, foundations, etc.)	5 %	0 %
6.1.1.10	Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, toilets, parking, camping fees, etc.)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.11	Commercial activities (e.g. merchandising and catering, filming permit, concessions, etc.)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.12	Other	0 %	0 %
		Total 100 %	Total 100 %

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

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 the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding over the long-term

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

The secure funding received from the National government by the property in catering for re-current expenses. Repairs and restorations need to be squeezed in. However we have received funding for restoration of the Oman house, an important section of the Fort. We have also managed to have the old ticket office converted into a customer care office through donation in kind by private entity.

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	70 %	67 %
6.1.6.2	Women	30 %	33 %
		Total 100 %	Total 100 %

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	Fair
Capacity development and education	Poor
Administration	Fair
Research and monitoring	Poor
Awareness raising and public information/communication	Fair
Marketing and promotion	Poor
Interpretation	Fair
Visitor management/tourism	Fair
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Poor

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

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

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

No 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.
- 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 partially implemented; some technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, but most technical work is carried out by external staff

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

Training is from personal effort and application; not organized by management.

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 acceptable for most key areas but there are gaps

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 32 of 42

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 a small amount of research, but it is not planned

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

Research results are not shared at any level

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

Most research is towards personal objectives. Data is published but not discussed by stakeholders

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	Poor
Local/municipal authorities	Poor
Indigenous peoples	Poor
Landowners	Poor
Women	Poor
Youth/children	Poor
Researchers	Fair
Local visitors	Good
National/international tourists	Good
Tourism industry	Fair
Local businesses and industries	Poor
NGOs	Poor
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 limited and ad hoc education and awareness programme for children and/or youth

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

Youth/children

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

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

9. Visitor Management

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

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 33 of 42

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?

One to three hours

9.4 - Please provide the source of information

Accounts office within the property. We have no overnight stays.

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

0/20/30/12/0/20/

9.6 - Please provide the source of information

Tickets, restaurant and souvenir shops within property

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

This has been stated in the management plan but has not been implemented due to shortage of resources.

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

There is some management of the visitor use of the World Heritage property

9.10 - Is the effectiveness of tourism management regularly monitored?

No

If a different system, please specify

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?

There is limited cooperation between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

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

The presentation and interpretation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is acceptable but improvements could be made

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?

Nο

If 'Yes', please specify

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

Yes

If 'Yes', please specify

Local community act as tour guides and sale of souvenirs

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

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 a small amount of monitoring, but it is not planned

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 sufficient to define key indicators, but this has not been done

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

Extend of indicators	Not	No	Indicators have been defined but are	Indicators are in place and in use since the last
	applicable	indicators	not yet in use	Periodic Reporting cycle

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 34 of 42

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

Non

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

World Heritage managers/coordinators and staff	Fair
Local/municipal authorities	Non-existent
Local communities	Fair
Indigenous peoples	Poor
Landowners	Poor
Women	Non-existent
Researchers	Poor
Tourism industry	Poor
Local businesses and industry	Poor
NGOs	Non-existent
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 planned, but has not yet begun

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

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

11. Identification of Priority Management Needs

11.1 - Identification of Priority Management Needs

5.2	Protective Measures	
5.2.3	An adequate legal framework for maintaining of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and/or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are some deficiencies in implementation	×
5.3	Management System/Management Plan	
5.3.5	No use has been made of the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation to develop policies and best practices for the protection of the property	
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	×
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 little coordination between the range of administrative bodies involved in the management of the property	
5.3.12	The management system/plan is only partially adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value	×
5.3.13	The management system at the property is only being partially implemented	
5.3.14	An annual work/action plan exists for the property but few of the activities are being implemented	
5.3.17	 In a limited manner, the management system of the World Heritage property does contribute to gender equality In a limited manner, the management system of the World Heritage property does contribute to social inclusion and equity, improving opportunities for all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status In a limited manner, the management system of the World Heritage property does integrate a human rights-based approach 	
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	

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 35 of 42

6.1.7	Human resources partly meet the management needs of the World Heritage property	
6.1.10	No use has been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Development at the World Heritage property	×
6.1.12	A site-based capacity building plan or programme is in place and partially implemented; some technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, but most technical work is carried out by external staff	
7	Scientific Studies and Research Projects	
7.2	There is a small amount of research in the World Heritage property but it is not planned	×
7.3	Research results are not shared at any level	
8	Education, Information and Awareness Building	
8.2	There is a limited and ad hoc education and awareness programme for children and/or youth	×
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	There is some management of the visitor use of the World Heritage property	
9.11	There is limited cooperation between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation	
9.12	The presentation and interpretation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is acceptable but improvements could be made	
10	Monitoring	
10.1	There is a small amount of monitoring at the World Heritage property, but it is not planned	×
10.2	Information on the values of the World Heritage property is sufficient to define key indicators, but this has not been done	
Pleas	se select 1 more issues.	
☑ Ple	ease 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

4.2	Transportation	Transportation Infrastructure							
4.2.4		Marine transport infrastructure							
4.3	Services Infr	astructures							
4.3.5	Major linear utilities	Criteria IV :Be an outstand example of a type of buildin architectural or technologic ensemble or landscape whillustrates significant stage: human history. The Fort war and the buildings within.	ng, electrical lines and organise them in conduits or within s in walls	electrical, telephone internet to ensure	1 year	National Museums of Kenya, Kenya Power and Lighting Co	Improve on safety and reduce risk of short circtuits		
4.7	Local conditi	ons affecting physical fabric							
4.7.2	Relative humidity	Criteria IV :Be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates significant stages in human history.The walls, the Canons, doors and artifacts.	Regular cleaning and checking for weaknesses	checking of all walls conditions	monthly	National Museums of Kenya	Co-operation of entire conservation team in house		

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 36 of 42

4.7.6	Water (rain/water table)	Criteria IV:Be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates significant stages in human history. The walls, moat, gates.		check conditions after rains	weekly	National Museums of Kenya	Requires quick mitigation to avoid damage
4.7.7		Pests					
4.8	Social/Cultural	uses of heritage					
4.8.4		Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system					
4.8.5	Identity, social cohesion, changes in local population and community	Criteria ii: Exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town planning or landscape design. The moat and shipwrecks.	Increased foreigners, reduced cohesion, reduced local technical knowledge, increased insecurity- risk of looting wrecks	Incidences register and usage of external space within the property	1 year	National Museums of Kenya	May need expert to undertake socio- economic analysis and document the community change
4.9	Other human a	ctivities					
4.9.2		Deliberate destruction of heritage					
4.11	Sudden ecolog	ical or geological events					
4.11.5	Erosion and siltation/Deposition	Criteria IV :Be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates significant stages in human history. The 17m external wall fronting the sea and ship wrecks	Construction of buffer/ wall to reduce the effects of erosion; install protective cover to the ship wrecks	Check condition of walls base and integrity of shipwrecks	every 3 months	National Museums of Kenya, Kenya Maritime Authority, National Environment Management Authority	Sensitive towards the stability of the Fort external walls
4.13	Management ar	nd institutional factors					
4.13.5	Financial resources	Criteria ii: Exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town planning or landscape design.	Write proposals to loca and international agencies to supplemer site funding	allocation of	5 years	World Heritage Centre, Africa World Heritage Fund, other local businesses	Establish network of possible funders
Question r	not completed						

12.2. Summary - Management Needs

12.2.1 - Summary - Management Needs

5.2	Protective Measur	Protective Measures								
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment					

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 37 of 42

5.2.3	An adequate legal framework for maintaining of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and/or Integrity of the World Heritage property exists but there are some deficiencies in implementation	safegua	detailed legal items arding the destruction of es, discuss limitation and ements	6 months		NMK Legal office		Very specific regulations need to be enforced
5.3	Management S	System/Ma	anagement Plan					
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	imple	ning of the content, relevance and ementation	9 months		UNESCO		increase awareness to site managers
5.3.9	No use has been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties at the property	estat plan	ertake Risk Identification towards olishing a reduction management	1 year		UNESCO, Consultant, Ni team		Co-ordinated effort with city's disaster risk management plan
5.3.12	The management system/plan is only partially adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value	subm	agement plan done during nission of dossier and has not beer ed, needs to be updated	6 months		Focal point and site com	mittee	Continual improvement necessary
6.1	Funding							
6.1.10	No use h been mad the World Heritage Strategy Capacity Developm the World Heritage property	de of I for nent at	Look into Strategy content	3 years	NI	MK, UNESCO		This requires a multi agency approach
7	Scientific Studies	and Rese	arch Projects					
7.2	There is a small amount of the site requirements additional information research in the World Heritage property but it is not planned		on 3 years		NMK	Co-ordin issues.	ated efforts towards resolving site	
8	Education, Informa	tion and A	Awareness Building					
8.2	limited and ad hoc education	education.	. Design and action plan ndertaking awareness	1 year	National M	Museums of Kenya	Keen o	o-ordination with education officers ite

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 38 of 42

9	Visitor Managemen	Visitor Management							
9.7	strategy to manage visitors,	Look into the policy document, undertake visitor assessment and their impact and strategize on visitor management approach	1 year	National Museums of Kenya	This critical to improve site management and protection of attributes				
10	Monitoring								
10.1	There is a small amount of monitoring at the World Heritage property, but it is not planned	Revise the site management plan to handle current issues in order to draw a new plan and devise a monitoring strategy of the status of the attributes	3 months	National Museums of Kenya	Critical to revise and actualize site management plan				
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 impacted by factors described in this report, but this situation is being addressed through effective management actions.

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

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

- 12.3.5 Comments. conclusions and/or recommendations related to the state of conservation of the 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	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	No impact
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	Positive
Political support for conservation	Positive
Legal/Policy framework	Positive
Advocacy	Positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	Positive
Gender equality	No impact
Provision of ecosystem services/ benefits to local communities	No impact
Social inclusion and equity, and improvement of opportunities for all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, ethnicity, origin, religion, or economic or other status	No impact

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 39 of 42

Fostering inclusive local economic development and enhancing livelihood	Positive
Contributing to conflict prevention, including respect for cultural diversity within and around heritage properties	Positive
Other	Not applicable
If 'Other', please specify	

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

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

Allow for meeting / platform for social discussion and promotion of local entrepreneurs in temporary exhibitions, children's play area and lease of meeting space

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

Sustainable Development
Synergies
Governance

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?

The World Heritage Convention
The concept of Outstanding Universal Value
The property's Outstanding Universal Value
The concept of Integrity and/or Authenticity
The property's Integrity and/or Authenticity
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	Not needed
Site Managers	Not needed
UNESCO World Heritage Centre	Not needed
Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM)	Not needed

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

Fundraising

Awareness raising

Other

Disaster Risk Management

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

The information will be useful in Improving the details of the site management plan critical in protecting the attributes carrying the OUV

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
Local communities
Other specific groups

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 40 of 42

Department heads within property

ICOMOS International

ICCROM International/regional

External experts

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

Gender balance has been $\ensuremath{\mathbf{given \ limited \ consideration}}$ and implementation is in process.

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

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

168 / 48 / 72 /

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?

Not all 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

Clarity in questions - question on funding unclear whether it was monthly or annual revenue.

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	Good
UNESCO (other sectors/field offices)	Good
UNESCO National Commission	Not applicable
ICOMOS International	Fair
IUCN International	No support
ICCROM international/regional	Fair
ICOMOS national/regional	Good
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	Good
State Party Representative (national Focal Point)	Poor
UNESCO other sectors (e.g. field office)	Fair
National Commission for UNESCO	No support
ICOMOS International	Fair
ICCROM International/regional	Fair
ICOMOS national/regional	Fair
IUCN national/regional	Fair
IUCN International	No support

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 41 of 42

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

Not applicable (i.e. I did not use these resources)

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

We need time to access and understand the resources not just to fill the questionnaire but to manage our site as a whole

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

No item were proposed for update

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

When initially attempting this exercise on my own, it was confusing as I have been a manager for a short while and had to constantly refer to previous management and documents. The workshop organized assisted in clarifying approaches to the questions and the available experts and managers assisted in discussions. The workshop also provided for focused time allocated for this exercise, this is difficult on site with other administrative issues arising.

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

Fort Jesus, Mombasa 42 of 42