



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

Organisation  
des Nations Unies  
pour l'éducation,  
la science et la culture

# World Heritage

# 31 COM

Distribution Limited

**WHC-07/31.COM/7B.Add.2**

Paris, 15 June 2007

Original: English / French

## UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

### CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

#### WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirty-first Session

Christchurch, New Zealand

23 June – 2 July 2007

#### **Item 7B of the Provisional Agenda: State of conservation of World Heritage properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

#### SUMMARY

This document contains information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, and is separated in three parts:

I. State of conservation reports of the following World Heritage properties, which were not included in the previous Documents:

- 35. **Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C 274)**

- 55. **Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)**

II. Revised State of conservation reports of World Heritage properties. These reports replace the ones included in Document *WHC-07/31.COM/7B*:

- 32. **Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)**

III. Format for the submission of State of conservation reports by States Parties

The full reports of Reactive Monitoring missions requested by the Committee are available at the following Web address in their original language:

<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2007/>



## Table of content

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>I. STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF THE FOLLOWING WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES, WHICH WERE NOT INCLUDED IN THE PREVIOUS DOCUMENTS...2</b>                   |           |
| MIXED PROPERTIES.....   | 2         |
| LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN .....   | 2         |
| FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION .....   | 2         |
| 35. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C 274) .....   | 2         |
| CULTURAL PROPERTIES .....   | 8         |
| ARAB STATES.....  | 8         |
| FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION .....   | 8         |
| 55. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87) .....   | 8         |
| <b>II. REVISED STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES, WHICH REPLACE THE REPORTS INCLUDED IN DOCUMENT <i>WHC-07/31.COM/7B</i>:.....</b> | <b>13</b> |
| NATURAL PROPERTIES .....  | 13        |
| EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA .....  | 13        |
| FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION .....  | 13        |
| 32. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900).....  | 13        |
| <b>III. FORMAT FOR THE SUBMISSION OF STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS BY STATES PARTIES.....</b>   | <b>15</b> |

# I. STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF THE FOLLOWING WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES, WHICH WERE NOT INCLUDED IN THE PREVIOUS DOCUMENTS

## MIXED PROPERTIES

### LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

#### FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION

#### 35. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C 274)

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

1983

##### Criteria:

(i) (iii) (vii) (ix)

##### Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger:

N/A

##### Previous Committee Decisions:

**28 COM 15B.38; 29 COM 7B.33; 30 COM 7B.35**

##### International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 103,825 for fire suppression equipment; Master Plan development; and consultancies, such as a stone specialist for assessment of restoration work required for the Intihuatana stone sculpture; and for a Machu Picchu, Architecture workshop.

##### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 15,000 for the social participation workshop requested by the Committee (decision 30 COM 7B.35).

##### Previous monitoring missions:

Joint IUCN/ICOMOS mission October 1997; World Heritage Centre IUCN/ICOMOS mission October 1999; World Heritage Centre/IUCN/ICOMOS mission 25 February-1 March 2002; World Heritage Centre visit 23 October 2003; World Heritage Centre mission 15-16 April 2005; World Heritage Centre IUCN/ICOMOS mission 23 to 30 April, 2007.

##### Main threats identified in previous reports:

- a) Delays in reviewing the Master Plan and developing detailed yearly operational plans, and inadequate budgetary support;
- b) No evaluation of transport options, related geological studies, or the impact of bus traffic on increasing the risk of landslides;
- c) Lack of impact studies related to the carrying capacity of the Citadel and Inca Trail;
- d) Delays in the development of a Public Use Plan;

- e) Delays in implementing urban planning and control measures for Machu Picchu Village (Aguas Calientes);
- f) Lack of proper management of the site;
- g) Lack of risk management plans related to natural disasters;
- h) Lack of adequate coordination of activities between institutions involved in site management;

Current conservation issues:

On 30th January 2007, the World Heritage Centre received from the National Cultural Institute (INC) an annual report. Subsequently, on 15 March 2007, the Centre received from the National Natural Resources Institute (INRENA) a natural heritage annual report. This segmented approach to the reporting of this mixed site is an indicator of the ongoing lack of integrated management of the Sanctuary. A single integrated report should be presented in one of the working languages of the Convention by the Sanctuary's Integrated Management Unit, with inputs of each of the participating institutions (INC, INRENA, Ministry of Tourism MINCETUR, and Regional Government).

The World Heritage Committee received on 26 September, 2006, a draft Risk Preparedness Plan. With respect to landslides, technical studies have only been undertaken at the citadel; No mention is made of the risk of landslides on the Hiram Bingham Road, the only vehicular access to the citadel, which has registered more than five landslides over recent months; nor has the carrying capacity of the road been evaluated. No studies have been undertaken in the high risk area that includes the slopes and river beds that converge on Machu Picchu village, and which have produced serious damage that has been increasing over the past five years. Unfortunately no risk mapping of the protected area has been undertaken either, and no analysis has been made of existing satellite photos to detect ongoing geological processes or to monitor the impact of the landslide phenomena, which has increased since glacial regression began to accelerate in 1998. No actions have been undertaken to clean the Alcamayo Riverbed, reinforce the river contention walls throughout Machu Picchu Village and environs, or to develop geological risk cartography at a proper scale. The population living in the core and buffer area have little notion of the risks they face, little cultural inclination to appreciate risk, and no respect for the application of norms and rules. Unfortunately, the existing Risk Preparedness Plan has also not been used as a tool to avoid uncontrolled construction in Machu Picchu village.

In May 2006, the World Heritage Centre requested information on the construction of the Carrilluchayoc bridge in the buffer zone of the Sanctuary, located only a few kilometres from the core zone of the property. The bridge and road are located in a geologically unstable area that is subject to landslides, and now makes possible a new, unplanned and uncontrolled vehicular access route to this very vulnerable area of the Sanctuary. The media announced the decision of the Municipal Government of Santa Teresa to build the bridge and access road last December, 2006. The World Heritage Centre sent an official letter to the Council of Ministers of Peru, and all the related Ministries and national institutions related to the preservation of the property. No official answer was received. In spite of the recommendation of the World Heritage Centre to prevent the construction until the reactive monitoring mission took place. The Centre was informed by press reports that the Regional Government of Cusco and the Representatives of the Municipalities celebrated an official opening ceremony for the bridge on 19 March, 2007.

ICOMOS noted that the INC 2006 report outlined progress achieved in managing the Citadel archaeological site, the Inka trails in the buffer and core area of the Sanctuary, and detailed some of the interventions undertaken in several Valle Sagrado archeological sites. In terms of conservation, progress has been made in (i) demarcating Sanctuary boundaries using GPS equipment; (ii) archaeological explorations and conservation works at Wiñaywayna and Choquesuysuy; (iii) maintenance activities at six archaeological groups associated with the

different Inka trails and the Machu Picchu Citadel. The INC report also notes that several proposed archaeological projects were not implemented last year due to the *Sistema Nacional de Inversión Pública* (SNIP) budgeting procedures that have delayed approval of the funds. Unfortunately no mention was made in the report regarding implementation of the related Urban Planning project in Machu Picchu Village, or the construction of the Carrilluchayoc bridge and access road. ICOMOS is also concerned with the new road projects in the region that provide improved access to Santa Teresa, a community that is not prepared for the increasing flow of tourism. The improvement of roads in this region will facilitate bus and auto access between Cusco and Santa Teresa, and result in uncontrolled tourism development and greater numbers of tourists visiting the Sanctuary.

IUCN noted that the INRENA 2006 report covers the management of the Sanctuary's natural resources. It notes progress in conservation. In relation to Public Use, MINCETUR developed the terms of reference and a bidding process for developing a Tourism Plan as an input into a broader Public Use Plan. In addition, the report notes (i) the development of a draft Communication Plan; (ii) the establishment of tourism baseline statistics; (iii) development of an Information Centre in Cusco; and (iv) the development of plans for a Visitor Centre in Pisqacucho at the eastern entrance of the Sanctuary. In terms of management, the report further noted (i) the development, implementation, and monitoring of the 2006 Operational Plan; (ii) the design of a proposal for alternatives for integrated management to replace the inactive General Management Unit; (iii) the implementation of a cadastral survey of land occupation in the rural areas within the Sanctuary, (iv) the development of a draft Sustainable Finance Plan; and (v) the establishment of a central library for the Sanctuary at the National University in Cusco.

INRENA's report also notes the following unresolved issues:

- a) Construction of the Carrilluchayoc access road and bridge on the western boundary of the Sanctuary without an environmental impact study or design approval, even in the face of strong opposition from the INC and INRENA, and a restraining order by the District Court of Urubamba.
- b) Expansion of Machu Picchu Village beyond the boundaries that had been set, construction of buildings on the banks of the Vilcanota River, and construction of buildings in excess of three stories without the requisite Construction Licenses. This has caused grave concern over the lack of due process, the general failure of governance, increased flooding and landslide risk.

As suggested by the World Heritage Committee, Decision **30 COM 7B.35**, a mission was undertaken by representatives of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN between 23 and 30 April 2007 to assess the state of conservation of the property. A participatory workshop was organized by the World Heritage Centre with the collaboration of the institutions responsible of the conservation of the Sanctuary: INRENA, INC, MINCETUR and the Regional Government of Cusco. During the mission, meetings were held with the mayors of the Urubamba District, and field visits were conducted to various key sites in the Sanctuary. These visits were complemented by several workshops in Machu Picchu Village attended by representatives from the tourist sector, police, medical services, teachers, local tourist agencies and Peru Rail staff. The continuous and chaotic population growth of Machu Picchu Village (264 % increase between 1993 and 2005 - the highest in Peru) has transformed the Village into the main threat to the World Heritage property, accentuated by new pedestrian and vehicular access points in the western part of the Sanctuary. Machu Picchu Village requires implementation of an immediate action plan so that the following issues are urgently addressed in a practical way:

- the limited space in the village which is constrained by a dramatic geography,
- the high risk due to landslides,
- the uncontrolled number and height of buildings,

- the absence of controls on properties and the quality of the construction of the buildings,
- the very limited capacity of medical and fire services for the local population and visitors,
- the increase of solid and liquid waste without adequate disposal systems,
- the level of poverty and problems of conflict of interest.

The World Heritage Centre organized a workshop to facilitate a discussion of the Master Plan among all major stakeholders; the workshop was well attended by civil society representatives of communities of the Sacred Valley, the INC, INRENA, MINCETUR and the Regional Authority of Cusco on 28 and 29 April 2007. Some 82 institutions took part in the event. There was agreement on the urgency of undertaking the Public Use Plan through a participatory process with the stakeholders of the core and buffer zones of the Sanctuary. Risk assessment and preparedness is one of the most immediate concerns.

The mission representatives share the INC, INRENA's, and MINCETUR's concern about the construction of the Carrilluchayoc road and bridge and the uncontrolled growth of Machu Picchu Village. Of particular concern is the growing crisis in governance and due process, and increasing risk to visitors and residents.

The mission noticed with concern:

- a) the lack of progress in developing a Public Use Plan and the consequent delays in the identification and analysis of alternatives for transport and access, diversification of visitor attractions and activities, and decongestion of Machu Picchu Village and the Machu Picchu Citadel;
- b) the failure of the General Management Unit governance mechanism in achieving integrated management of the Sanctuary and the participation of all stakeholders in the development and review of the Sanctuary Master Plan;
- c) the lack of effective measures to mitigate landslides, the danger of building collapse, unsanitary conditions, fire potential, and social dysfunction at Machu Picchu Village; and
- d) the diminishing control of access to the Sanctuary, and the absence of authoritative information for visitors and tourism operators regarding (a) the severity of risks associated with overnight stays in Machu Picchu village, and (b) the level of difficulty and risks associated with use of the alternative trails and access points to the Sanctuary.

Of the several concerns outlined above, two are particularly time sensitive and require immediate emergency action. These are (a) the new western access from Santa Teresa made possible by the illegally constructed Carrilluchayoc road and bridge, and (b) authoritative information for visitors regarding the considerable risks associated with overnight stays at Machu Picchu Village. Therefore, a **Participatory Emergency Strategy for Control of the Western Access** must be developed and implemented to address the following:

- a) The maintenance of options for a properly designed western access to the Sanctuary that takes into account landslide risks, safety concerns, landscape integrity, functionality, and the legitimate interests of associated communities;
- b) The hiking of backpackers along the railroad line connecting the EGEMSA Hydroelectrical Station with Machu Picchu Village, in the immediate proximity of the core zone of the Sanctuary;
- c) The proliferation of makeshift shanties for the sale of food and beverages to backpackers;

- d) The conversion of the train terminus at EGEMSA into a marketplace and parking lot for vehicles transporting backpackers to and from Santa Teresa;
- e) The location of the INRENA Entrance Station next to the EGEMSA powder magazine and the official security measures that should be applied;
- f) The extension of tourism developments from Machu Picchu Village along the rail line to EGEMSA;
- g) The installation of makeshift residences, restaurants, hotels, campgrounds, and mini stores along the road from Santa Teresa to the EGEMSA train terminal;
- h) The national and regional road development plans (Ollantaytambo, Abra Málaga, Quillabamba, Santa Teresa, Vilcabamba, Choquequirao) that could negatively affect the integrity and authenticity of the Sanctuary.

The instability of governance arrangements and due process demonstrated by the successful completion and use of the illegal Carrilluchayoc road and bridge make it absolutely essential to prevent squatting along the new road, and at the EGEMSA train terminal. Once it occurs it will most likely be impossible to reverse, and all prospects for an orderly development process for this access route will have been lost forever. The prospect of conversion of the current rail bed from EGEMSA to Machu Picchu village into a vehicular access road is the worst possible scenario of all, and must be avoided at all costs.

National plans to develop new road systems, and pave existing routes in the buffer zone of the Sanctuary, increasing vehicular transportation registered between Santa Teresa and EGEMSA/Machu Picchu Village, the increasing number of visitors and the lack of controlled access could make it impossible, in a very short time, to achieve proper management, thereby endangering the Outstanding Universal Values of the property. Should there be a lack of immediate progress in establishing and carrying out the **Participatory Emergency Strategy for Control of the Western Access** to monitor and mitigate the quickly developing pressures on the Sanctuary, the World Heritage Committee may be compelled to consider the inclusion of the site on the List of World Heritage in danger. The other emergency measure required is to develop and implement in the shortest time possible a public information program in several languages to advise visitors and tourism operators of the very real landslide, fire, building failure, and health risks associated with overnight stays at Machu Picchu Village.

**Draft Decision:      31 COM 7B.35**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-07/31.COM/7B.Add.2,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.35**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2007),*
3. *Requests the State Party to submit a single integrated annual report for this mixed site, as of 2007, in one of the working languages of the Convention;*
4. *Takes note of the many advances made by INC and INRENA in implementing the Master Plan but regrets:*
  - a) *the ineffectiveness of the Integrated Sanctuary Management Unit,*
  - b) *the uncontrolled growth of Machu Picchu Village accompanied by an ever-increasing level of risks from landslides, fires, structural failure, health threats, and social crisis*



- c) *the absence of a public use plan and associated analysis of access and risks;*
  - d) *the difficulties in getting budgetary approval for maintenance work on the archaeological structures of the Sanctuary; and*
  - e) *the lack of control of the western access to the site;*
5. *Expresses its deep concern about the consequences of the construction of the Carrilluchayoc bridge and the access road in the buffer and core zone of the Sanctuary and the lack of due process and governance related to this issue, and also requests the State Party, as per Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to submit any project proposal that could affect the values of the site, to be submitted for evaluation to the Advisory Bodies;*
  6. *Urges the State Party to take immediate action to act upon the serious consequences of the recent landslides, and to finalize by **1 February 2008**, and begin implementation of a comprehensive Risk Preparedness Plan with adequate budget, as outlined in the recommendations proposed by the 2007 mission report;*
  7. *Takes note of the positive results of the Cusco Workshop, commends the major stakeholders and national institutions for developing a common vision towards the future and further requests the State Party to submit an official response to the recommendations outlined by the Cusco Workshop;*
  8. *Also urges the State Party to give priority to the reorganization of the Sanctuary Integrated Management Unit and consequently requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **30 September 2007** an updated Annual Operations Plan prepared by the Management Unit;*
  9. *Encourages the State Party to undertake the actions required to develop and implement the above mentioned Participatory Emergency Strategy for Control of the Western Access and to address the concerns and threats outlined in the mission report, and to submit a draft Strategy document by **30 November 2007** to be evaluated by the Advisory Bodies;*
  10. *Invites the State Party to produce and widely distribute by **30 November 2007**, authoritative information for visitors and tour operators regarding the considerable risks associated with overnight stays at Machu Picchu Village;*
  11. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February, 2008**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 Mission report for examination by the Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.*

## **CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

### **ARAB STATES**

#### **FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING DISCUSSION**

#### **55. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)**

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

1979

##### Criteria

(i) (iii) (vi)

##### Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

##### Previous Committee Decisions

Bureau deliberations, notably 1998 (WHC-98/CONF.203/18) and 2001 (WHC-01/CONF.208/3); **30 COM 7B.46**

##### International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 14,000 for technical assistance in 2001 (Thebes and Abu Mena).

##### UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 694,000 from the Japanese Funds-in-Trust 2002-2004 (wall paintings restoration).

##### Previous monitoring missions

ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in 2001 and Hydrology expert mission in 2002. World Heritage Centre missions in July 2006 and May 2007.

##### Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Raise of the underground water level (Luxor, Karnak);
- b) Risks of flooding (Valleys of Kings and Queens);
- c) Absence of a defined protection perimeter for the property and of a buffer zone;
- d) Absence of a comprehensive Management Plan;
- e) Major infrastructure projects taking place or scheduled;
- f) Uncontrolled urban development;
- g) Housing and agricultural encroachment on the West Bank;
- h) Major infrastructure and development projects, in Karnak and Luxor;
- i) Demolitions in the village of Gurnah on the West Bank of the Nile.

### Current conservation issues

Further to disturbing information received from various sources and an exchange of correspondence, the Egyptian authorities invited a World Heritage Centre mission to the property, in the days immediately preceding the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee (Vilnius, July 2006). As the report was not presented in the documents of the session, a summary is given hereafter.

This report first summarizes all perceived threats identified in recent communications from various sources and reported to the Committee in document *WHC-06/30.COM/7B*. It also contains recommendations concerning implementation of the “Master plan for Luxor City 2030” developed by the Governor further to a UNDP study in 2002-2003, that addresses development of the region in which the property is located and includes 32 short-term development projects, many already underway. The Master plan’s objectives are focused on tourism development, meeting the social and economic needs of the population, and protecting antiquities.

The mission report also reviews systematically all issues raised, such as creating an open air plaza cum causeway from the first pylon of the temple of Karnak to the Nile; razing of all buildings and structures in the area (among which the French-Egyptian research centre and its annexes, the stadium, souvenir shops and dwellings, a public garden, ancient stones storage areas, the residential complex along the Nile known as the “French village”); lowering of the present cornice road and its displacement closer to the Nile; constructing a parking lot on the location of the present stadium; building shops along the south side of the plaza, along with a visitor centre.

The mission report noted that the overall aim of an open air plaza in front of the temple of **Karnak** was to correct the haphazard development of secondary facilities that have sprung up over time and to upgrade these through a harmonized design. It highlighted the need for the State Party to organize an international design competition for the entrance to Karnak Temple to encourage high-quality design alternatives which support and promote a new vision on heritage management, and to respect existing archaeological and surviving evidence.

The mission also described reported projects in **Luxor** such as the excavation of the Alley of the Sphinxes in its totality, designed to make evident the past physical connection of the Luxor and Karnak Temples by exposure of the 3-km long ceremonial avenue, which linked them in antiquity. The report commented that while work in these areas has already demonstrated the good physical survival of the avenue, a part of this avenue is covered by the contemporary town and will require demolition of at least 300 residential houses.

Concerning the project to demolish most of the houses spread above ancient tombs in **Gurnah** (Qurna) and to displace its inhabitants to a newly built settlement, the report commented that the proposed new settlement will offer all basic facilities of water, drainage, primary health care and education, as well as a market, currently not available in Gurnah proper. The mission noted that the State Party stressed “the incompatibility and unsustainability of the situation in terms of living conditions of the communities in relation to World Heritage site management” and that “inhabitants would only move on a voluntary basis with adequate compensation”.

ICOMOS reviewed the mission report and made the following remarks:

- a) The information made available demonstrates that while the Master plan is very much about cleaning up, improving image and conditions for tourists, renewal, sanitization etc., it is not about protecting the outstanding universal value of the site. As a result, little attention has been given as to how best to maintain the complex set of historic layers which underlie the Thebes inscription on the List, and that indeed many significant parts of the site are being needlessly discarded.

- b) The demolition of some of the structures near Karnak, the later urban settlements between the two temples and of substantial parts of Gurnah are neither acceptable approaches within contemporary conservation theory (which demands that changes be limited to only those essential to meet critical functional needs, and here, only where this can be done without loss to heritage values), nor respectful of the property's outstanding universal value. Even if some of these places are not what would be described as "antiquities", they should be protected as being indissociably connected to the development of the site, and therefore worthy of the strongest protection efforts. In particular, the loss of Gurnah, whose residents have provided the bulk of the excavation effort at Thebes from the 19th century forward, would involve loss of a place of great importance within the original nomination. Removal of the population of Gurnah, and reduction of the village to a few surviving designated (and empty) historic buildings is an act which goes against all the principles of conservation. ICOMOS would note that in 1998, and then in 2001, the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee had recommended the "launching of a co-operation programme encompassing geological, archaeological and geographical surveys and mapping, anthropological studies, assessment of the historical and cultural landscape qualities of the foothills and of the presence of Gurnah village in the site" and that the Bureau had also recommended "the postponement of any further transfer of the population of Gurnah until these investigations had taken place".
- c) The demolition of structures along the proposed Avenue of Sphinxes linking the Luxor and Karnak temples is an effort to reconstruct past physical relations. However, the *Operational Guidelines* stress that "in relation to authenticity, the reconstruction of archaeological remains or historic buildings or districts is justifiable only in exceptional circumstances".

During its 30th session, the World Heritage Committee notably requested the State Party to provide the details of proposed re-settlement of villagers and of new developments, as well as their visual and environmental impacts, and to ensure that "all architectural designs for new facilities respect the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage property".

The State Party submitted two documents on 26 January 2007, both printed power points presenting a "Comprehensive Development Plan for the City of Luxor – the City of Luxor Master Plan 2030"; and a "List of completed and on-going projects in the archaeological site of Luxor", which describes only one sub-project: "Project to reduce the ground water level at the Temples of Karnak and Luxor." These documents are heavily illustrated but contain little or no text which would justify the planned interventions. In the framework of the *Retrospective Inventory*, the State Party transmitted to the World Heritage Centre a topographical map and a cadastral map representing the five components of the property, thus answering to the request of the Committee. Some clarifications are still expected, before they are presented to the Committee in 2008. In addition, in April 2007, a "Pilot site management plan" for Madinat Habu (one of the temples part of the property, on the West Bank of the Nile) was received by the World Heritage Centre. At the time of preparing this document, the plan has not yet been examined by the Centre or by ICOMOS.

The mission to Cairo (29 April-4 May 2007) requested as an emergency by the Supreme Council of Antiquities was the opportunity to visit rapidly the property in order to assess the work carried out since 2006, that was not reflected in the documents provided by the State Party as mentioned above. The mission noticed the following:

- d) No account was taken of the main recommendations of the 2006 mission, nor of the previous recommendations of the World Heritage Bureau;
- e) A large number of the houses of Gurnah were destroyed without any historic or ethnographic survey and the inhabitants moved to a new village to the South;

- f) No consultation was made regarding the design of the Plaza between the entrance to the Temple of Karnak and the Nile and the new visitors centre and shopping mall were built following questionable architectural criteria;
- g) The project to destroy a portion of the city of Luxor in order to excavate the Alley of the Sphinxes and make it into a sunken pathway is still foreseen;
- h) The destruction of the “French village” close to the Nile is to take place in the coming weeks;
- i) A project to build a mooring for cruise boats and various infrastructures on the West Bank close to the new bridge is foreseen.

The mission had the opportunity to go through the new visitors centre at the entrance of the Valley of the Kings, funded by Japan. It is to note that its limited space, the design of the adjacent shops and the circulation scheme might cause problems when massive amounts of tourists enter at the same time. Another issue is the location of the parking lot at the entrance of the temple of Hatchepsut at Deir el-Bahari that seriously impairs the vision of the temple and should be moved to another location.

The mission expressed its concern regarding those issues, in particular the need to keep in mind, at all stages of planning and design, the outstanding value of the property for which it was inscribed on the World Heritage List, and to maintain the essential balance between the antiquities, the successive layers of history to date and the living communities.

Finally, the mission also visited the remains of the mud-brick village built by Hassan Fathi in the seventies, on the West Bank, in a dreadful state of decay. Those houses are an outstanding testimony of the architect’s achievements and should be restored urgently before they collapse due to lack of maintenance. A pilot project could be launched to this end for the benefit of history of 20th century architecture and serve as a training exercise both for the inhabitants and young architects.

**Draft Decision:      31 COM 7B.55**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-07/31.COM/7B.Add.2,*
2. *Recalling Decision **30 COM 7B.46**, adopted at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006),*
3. *Takes note of the State Party for its efforts to put in place a Master plan to enhance the life of residents and the experience of tourists within the Luxor region;*
4. *Regrets that the State Party did not take into account the previous recommendations of the Bureau to carry out studies and impact assessments in Gurnah and those of the 2006 mission regarding notably the design of the Karnak plaza;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to revise its Master plan 2030 to directly integrate commitment to maintaining the outstanding universal value of the property within all - projects, notably:*
  - a) *To call urgently for an international consultation for the plaza in front of the Karnak temple as well as for the Avenue of the Sphinxes;*
  - b) *to retain part or all of the urban settlement (including 300 residences) along the Avenue of the Sphinxes and eventually consider re-using the “French village” as a visitors or cultural centre;*

- c) *to institute a moratorium on any further demolition at Gurnah and relocation of its population until such time as the studies and impact assessments initially requested are carried out;*
  - d) *to abandon the project of building a landing stage for tourism cruise boats on the Western Bank of the Nile close to the new bridge and to limit all such developments to the Eastern Bank;*
  - e) *to ensure that proper investigations are carried out in the West Bank before the dewatering trench delineation is finalized;*
  - f) *to provide relevant information on projects foreseen within the property;*
6. Urges *the State Party to prepare management plans for Karnak, Luxor and the West Bank and to set up a co-ordinated management instrument;*
7. Requests *that the State Party invites a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission to the property to review the implementation of the above recommendations;*
8. Also requests *the State Party to provide a progress report to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2008 for examination by the Committee at its 32nd session in 2008.*

II. **REVISED STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES, WHICH REPLACE THE REPORTS INCLUDED IN DOCUMENT WHC-07/31.COM/7B:**

**NATURAL PROPERTIES**

**EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

**FOR ADOPTION REQUIRING NO DISCUSSION**

**32. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)**

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

1999

**Criteria**

(ix) (x)

**Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger**

N/A

**Previous Committee Decisions**

**28 COM 14B.15; 28 COM 14B.16**

**International Assistance**

N/A

**UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds**

N/A

**Previous monitoring missions**

N/A

**Main threats identified in previous reports**

- a) Lack of management plan;
- b) weakening of conservation controls;
- c) impacts of proposed tourism infrastructure development;
- d) construction of a road;

**Current conservation issues**

A letter dated 1 June 2007 from the Minister of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation was delivered to the World Heritage Centre by an official delegation from Russia on 4 June 2007. The letter informs that a management plan for the property, as requested by the

Committee at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004), has been elaborated and after its compliance with legal procedures and approval will be submitted to the 31st session of the Committee.

The letter comments on and further clarifies the issue of the plans to construct a number of sporting facilities in the Sochi National Park, in connection with the proposed location of the 2014 Winter Olympics in Sochi. The letter re-iterates the position which the Minister had previously conveyed through a letter to the World Heritage Centre on 1 February 2007 that the planned location of the Olympic facilities in the territory of the Sochi National Park is in compliance with the Federal Programme 2006-2014 for the Development of Sochi as a Mountain Skiing Resort and that the territory of Sochi National Park does not lie within the boundaries of the World Heritage property of the Western Caucasus. Moreover, it states that at present the exact location, extent and nature of the facilities to be developed have not been determined, pending a decision of the International Olympics Committee on the city candidate to host the 2014 Winter Olympics.

The letter of 1 June 2007 also lists a number of measures taken by the Government of the Russian Federation to exclude the possible risks associated with the development of the Sochi City as a Mountain Climate Resort. These mainly include: an independent environmental assessment; allocation of additional budget for nature protection measures; establishment of a special coordination public ecological council to approve all projects; proposed amendment to the Russian Legislation on EIA to involve the public in discussions and decision making processes; and the proposed increase of the Sochi National Park by 21,000 hectares. The letter also extends an invitation to a monitoring mission of international experts to clarify all aspects related to this issue.

**Draft Decision: 31 COM 7B.32 Rev**

*The World Heritage Committee,*

1. *Having examined Document WHC-07/31COM/7B.Add.2,*
2. *Recalling Decisions 28 COM 14B.15 and 28 COM 14B.16, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),*
3. *Notes that the State Party has submitted new detailed information on the state of conservation of the property;*
4. *Welcomes the invitation extended by the State Party to a joint UNESCO – IUCN monitoring mission to the property to assess its state of conservation, for consideration by the 32nd session of the Committee in 2008;*
5. *Decides to postpone the discussion of the state of conservation of the Western Caucasus until its 32nd session in 2008;*
6. *Requests the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2008** a copy of the management plan of the property, including a visitor management plan and a clear policy on tourism development for this area, as requested by the Committee at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004).*



### III. FORMAT FOR THE SUBMISSION OF STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS BY STATES PARTIES

Considering the norms adopted by the Committee at its 27th (UNESCO, 2003) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions (Decisions **27 COM 7B.106** and **29 COM 7C** respectively) for the presentation of the reports on the State of conservation of World Heritage properties,

Considering furthermore the rather important heterogeneity between the state of conservation reports submitted by States Parties, upon request from the World Heritage Committee and the need for those reports to focus on the outstanding universal value having justified the inscription of the properties on the World Heritage List, the threats identified and other specific requests made by the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies suggest that the States Parties be invited to submit from now their State of conservation reports, in French or in English, using a standard format as follows in Paragraph 3 of Draft Decision **31 COM 7B.131**.

**Draft Decision: 31 COM 7B.131**

*The World Heritage Centre,*

1. *Having examined Documents WHC-07/31.COM/7A, WHC-07/31.COM/7A.Add, WHC-07/31.COM/7A.Add.2, WHC-07/31.COM/7B, WHC-07/31.COM/7B.Add, WHC-07/31.COM/7B.Add.2,*
2. *Recalling Decisions 27 COM 7B.106 et 29 COM 7C, adopted at its 27th (UNESCO, 2003) and 29th (Durban, 2005) sessions respectively,*
3. *Invites the States Parties to use the following format for the submission to the World Heritage Centre of their report(s) on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties:*

**Format for preparing a States Parties' Report for World Heritage properties**  
**Designed after the Advisory Bodies / World Heritage Centre meeting**  
**of 25-26 January 2007 <sup>1</sup>**

**Name of World Heritage property (State Party) (Id. number)**

1. **Response from the State Party to the World Heritage Committee's Decision, paragraph per paragraph**

*[Note: this information has to refer to developments over the past year or since the last decision of the Committee for this property]*

<sup>1</sup> This format could be modified following the discussion on Document *WHC-07/31.COM/7.3*, which takes into account the recommendations of the meeting on Benchmarks (2-3 April 2007, Paris)

1. **In case the property is inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger:**
  - a) Corrective measures taken by the State Party in reply to the World Heritage Committee's Decision(s)
  - b) Progress towards the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger
  - c) If needed, please describe the success factors or difficulties in implementing the corrective measures identified  
*[Note: please, provide factual information, including exact dates, figures etc. and provide comments separately]*
  - d) Is the timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures suitable? If not, please propose a justified alternative.
2. **Other current conservation issues identified by the State Party**  
*[Note: conservation issues which are not mentioned in the Decision of the World Heritage Committee or any information request from the World Heritage Centre]*
3. **In conformity with paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, please describe any potential major restorations and/or new construction(s) within the protected area (core zone and buffer zone) that might be envisaged.**