



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

33 COM

Distribution Limited

WHC-09/33.COM/7B

Paris, 11 May 2008

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-third session
Seville, Spain
22-30 June 2009

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. The World Heritage Committee is requested to review the reports on the state of conservation of properties contained in this document. In certain cases, the World Heritage Committee may wish to decide to discuss in detail the state of conservation reports which are submitted for adoption without discussion.

Decision required: The World Heritage Committee may wish to adopt the draft Decision presented at the end of each state of conservation report.

The full reports of reactive monitoring missions requested by the World Heritage Committee are available at the following Web address in their original language:
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/33COM/>

Table of content

I.	INTRODUCTION	6
	ELABORATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS.....	7
	TRENDS IN STATE OF CONSERVATION.....	8
	NEW, CONTINUING AND EMERGING ISSUES.....	9
	Buffer zones	9
	Wind farms	9
	Tourism pressures.....	9
	Mining.....	9
	Invasive species	9
	Inappropriate developments including skyscrapers and other tall buidlings.....	10
	CLIMATE CHANGE AND WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES.....	10
	STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT	12
	GENERAL DECISION ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES	14
II.	REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST	15
	NATURAL PROPERTIES.....	15
	AFRICA	15
	1. Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroun) (N 407)	15
	2. Tai National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 195)	15
	3. Mount Kenya (Kenya) (N 800).....	19
	4. Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal) (N 25).....	19
	5. Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N 1162)	22
	6. Cape Floral Region Protected Areas (South Africa) (N 1007 rev).....	26
	7. Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N 684)	29
	8. Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199).....	33
	9. Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 39).....	38
	10. Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156).....	38
	ARAB STATES.....	40
	11. Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)	40
	ASIA-PACIFIC.....	44
	12. The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) (N 798).....	44
	13. Kaziranga National Park (India) (N 337).....	44
	14. Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340).....	44
	15. Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)	47
	16. Gunung Mulu National Park (Malaysia) (N 1013).....	47
	17. Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120).....	50
	18. Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) (N 653)	50

19.	East Rennell (Solomon Islands) (N 854)	53
20.	Ha Long Bay (Viet Nam) (N 672 bis)	54
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA		58
21.	Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)	58
22.	Waterton Glacier International Peace Park (Canada / United States of America) (N 354 rev)	61
23.	Ilulissat Icefjord (Denmark) (N 1149)	65
24.	Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Białowieża Forest (Belarus / Poland) (N 33-627)	68
25.	Laurisilva of Madeira (Portugal) (N 934)	72
26.	Danube Delta (Romania) (N 588)	75
27.	Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768 rev)	79
28.	Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)	82
29.	Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)	85
30.	Natural System of "Wrangel Island" Reserve (Russian Federation) (N 1023)	85
31.	Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719)	88
32.	Gough and Inaccessible Islands (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (N 740)	90
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN		93
33.	Belize Barrier Reef System (Belize) (N 764)	93
34.	Los Katios National Park (Colombia) (N 1083)	93
35.	Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205 Bis)	96
36.	Alejandro de Humboldt National Park (Cuba) (N 839 rev)	100
37.	Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)	102
38.	Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) (N 1138 rev)	104
39.	Pitons Management Area (St Lucia) (N 1161)	107
MIXED PROPERTIES		111
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA		111
40.	Pyrénées – Mont Perdu (France / Spain) (C/N 773 bis)	111
41.	Ibiza, Biodiversity and Culture (Spain) (C/N 417 rev)	115
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN		116
42.	Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)	116
CULTURAL PROPERTIES		117
AFRICA		117
43.	Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia) (C 18)	117
44.	Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055)	117
45.	Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev)	121
46.	Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599)	121
47.	Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956 bis)	121
48.	Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26)	121

49.	Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape (Republic of South Africa) (C 1265)	122
50.	Robben Island (Republic of South Africa) (C 916)	125
ARAB STATES		128
51.	Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193)	128
52.	Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565)	130
53.	Qal'at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun (Bahrain) (C 1192)	132
54.	Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)	134
55.	Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)	135
56.	Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093)	137
57.	Tyr (Lebanon) (C 299)	140
58.	Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)	140
59.	Ancient Ksour of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750)	140
60.	Ksar of Ait-Ben-Haddou (Morocco) (C 444)	141
61.	Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433)	143
62.	<i>Aflaj</i> Irrigation Systems of Oman (Oman) (C 1207)	146
63.	Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20)	148
ASIA-PACIFIC		152
64.	The Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) (C 322)	152
65.	Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia) (C 1224 rev)	155
66.	Old Town of Lijiang (China) (C 811)	155
67.	Historic Centre of Macao (China) (C 1110)	158
68.	Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C 707 ter)	161
69.	World Heritage properties in Beijing (China)	163
70.	Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India) (C 1101)	166
71.	Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241)	167
72.	Sangiran Early Man Site (Indonesia) (C 593)	170
73.	Prambanan Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C 642)	173
74.	Borobudur Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C 592)	175
75.	Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115)	178
76.	Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (C 870)	181
77.	Town of Luang Prabang (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 479 rev)	184
78.	Melaka and George Town, Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca (Malaysia) (C 1223)	188
79.	Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666 rev)	188
80.	Historical Monuments of Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)	191
81.	Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro (Pakistan) (C 138)	194
82.	Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451)	197
83.	Parthian Fortresses of Nisa (Turkmenistan) (C 1242)	200
84.	Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603 rev)	203
85.	Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam) (C 678)	203

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	207
86. Butrint (Albania) (C 570 bis)	207
87. Historic Centres of Berat and Gjirokastra (Albania) (C 569bis).....	210
88. Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784).....	214
89. Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033).....	218
90. Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786).....	220
91. City of Graz – Historic Centre (Austria) (C 931)	223
92. Fertő / Neusiedlersee Cultural Landscape (Austria/Hungary) (C 772 rev).....	226
93. Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh (Belarus) (C 1196)	228
94. Historic Centre of Brugge (Belgium) (C 996).....	231
95. Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 rev)	231
96. Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 666)	233
97. Historic Centre of Cesky Krumlov (Czech Republic) (C 617).....	237
98. Jelling Mounds, Runic Stones and Church (Denmark) (C 697)	239
99. Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia) (C 822).....	241
100. Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (France) (C 85).....	245
101. Bordeaux, Port of the Moon (France) (C 1256).....	245
102. Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708).....	245
103. Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710).....	249
104. Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066).....	252
105. Old Town of Regensburg with Stadtamhof (Germany) (C 1155)	252
106. Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape (Hungary) (C 1063).....	255
107. Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400 and 400 bis).....	259
108. Rock Drawings in Valcamonica (Italy) (C 94).....	261
109. City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy) (C 712 bis).....	264
110. Historic Centre of Naples (Italy) (C 726).....	266
111. Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia) (C 852)	268
112. Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania) (C 541)	272
113. City of Valletta (Malta) (C 131)	276
114. Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro) (C 125)	279
115. Auschwitz Birkenau	282
German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp (1940-1945) (Poland) (C 31)..	282
116. Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (C 723)	285
117. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544).....	288
118. Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540)	291
119. Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545)	291
120. Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation) (C 1170)	291
121. Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320 bis)	292

122.	Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev)	295
123.	Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev)	298
124.	Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)	298
125.	Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis)	298
126.	L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C 865).....	299
127.	Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)	299
128.	Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom) (C 426)	304
129.	Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom) (C 373)	309
130.	Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150)	311
131.	City of Bath (United Kingdom) (C 428)	316
132.	Old and New Towns of Edinburgh (United Kingdom) (C 728).....	320
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN		324
133.	Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445).....	324
134.	San Agustín Archaeological Park (Colombia) (C 744)	326
135.	Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526)	329
136.	City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2)	332
137.	Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129)	332
138.	Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414)	334
139.	Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412).....	337
140.	Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135).....	341
141.	Archaeological site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panama) (C 790 bis)	341
142.	Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)	341
143.	Chavín Archaeological Site (Peru) (C 330)	344
144.	Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru) (C 700)	346
145.	Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500 bis)	348
146.	Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (C 747)	352
NATURAL PROPERTIES (CONTINUED).....		355
AFRICA (CONTINUED)		355
147.	Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257)	355

I. INTRODUCTION

This document deals with reactive monitoring as it is defined in Paragraph 169 of the *Operational Guidelines*: "The reporting by the World Heritage Centre, other sectors of UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee on the state of conservation of specific World Heritage properties that are under threat". Reactive monitoring is foreseen in the procedures for the inclusion of properties in the List of World Heritage in Danger (Paragraphs 177-191 of the *Operational Guidelines*) and for the removal of properties from the World Heritage List (Paragraphs 192-198 of the *Operational Guidelines*).

The properties to be reported on have been selected, among all those inscribed on the World Heritage List, in consultation between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. In making the selection, the following have been considered:

- Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger (Cf. Documents *WHC-09/33.COM/7A* and *WHC-09/33.COM/7A.Add*);
- Properties for which state-of-conservation reports and/or reactive monitoring missions were requested by the World Heritage Committee at previous sessions;
- Properties which have come under serious threat since the last session of the World Heritage Committee and which require urgent actions;
- Properties where, upon inscription, follow-up was requested by the World Heritage Committee.

As for the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2007), the draft decisions prepared by the World Heritage Centre, jointly with the Advisory Bodies, reflect an attempt, wherever possible, to establish a two yearly reporting cycle for most of the World Heritage properties under consideration. This would reduce the number of state of conservation reports to be examined by the World Heritage Committee (which this year number 177 in total, including 30 on the List of World Heritage in Danger), providing States Parties, among other things, a more realistic timeframe to report on progress achieved on the Decisions by the World Heritage Committee. Exceptions to this approach have been made when special circumstances demanded an annual review.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have also studied the possibility of setting-up a regional review of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties on a regular basis (taking into account the Periodic Reporting process). This would allow the identification and consideration of properties which have never been subjected to the reporting process, or which have not been considered for many years, and the possible "phasing-out" of others, as appropriate.

Finally, it is important to clarify the nature of the different types of missions referred to in the state of conservation reports. Whereas all missions conducted to World Heritage properties and mentioned in the reports should be considered as "official" UNESCO missions, they can be grouped in various categories as follows:

- Reactive monitoring missions requested by the World Heritage Committee;
- Missions conducted within the framework of the Reinforced monitoring mechanism on selected properties;
- Monitoring and advisory missions carried out by UNESCO staff, consultants or experts from the Advisory Bodies in the framework of projects or requested by States Parties;
- Visits to World Heritage properties by UNESCO staff on the occasion of workshops or other events.

ELABORATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS

Once the list of properties subject to a state of conservation report for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its next session has been decided, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies start compiling all information available: state of conservation report submitted by the State Party, information received by NGOs, individuals, press articles, replies by the State Party, mission reports, comments on these by the State Party, etc...

The major source of information is the state of conservation report submitted by the concerned States Parties, before the statutory deadline of 1 February of any given year, following a request by the World Heritage Committee (Paragraph 169 of the *Operational Guidelines*) or a request for information on specific issues by the World Heritage Centre (in the case the property was not subject to a report to the World Heritage Committee previously). This report is the opportunity for a State Party to bring all relevant information to the attention of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, in reply to specific requests by the Committee. States Parties can also (and are encouraged to do so) submit detailed information on development projects to inform the World Heritage Centre, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also receive information from other sources than the State Party (NGOs, press articles, individuals, etc.). In such case, they communicate with the State Party to ascertain the information and get clarification on the specific issue.

The World Heritage Committee also, in some cases, requests a reactive monitoring mission to assess the state of conservation of the property and the status of the threats. Such missions are usually conducted by representatives of both the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Following completion of the fact finding mission, the mission members prepare jointly a report, which is sent to the State Party for comment and correction of eventual factual errors, hence, improving the accuracy of the final state of conservation report.

The preparation of the first drafts of the state of conservation reports should normally be carried out by the Advisory Bodies. However, when the World Heritage Centre has a strong technical engagement with a particular property, or has recently been on mission, it often takes the lead on drafting. The World Heritage Centre also revises all the reports to integrate some elements and ensure consistency in the drafting (see Document *WHC-09/33.COM/5A*).

The first draft is then circulated several times between the relevant Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre until the report is agreed upon and reflects a joint position. It is then integrated into the main document on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties (Documents *WHC-09/33.COM/7A*, *WHC-09/33.COM/7A.Add*, *WHC-09/33.COM/7B* and *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add*), for examination by the World Heritage Committee.

Therefore, in order to ensure accuracy of the state of conservation reports, States Parties have already several “entry points”:

- the State Party’s report on the state of conservation to be submitted by 1 February to the World Heritage Centre,
- the State Party’s reply to World Heritage Centre’s letter(s) regarding specific information received through other sources,
- the information submitted voluntarily by the State Party in application of Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*,
- the information provided by the State Party during a reactive monitoring mission,

- the reply by the State Party to the reactive monitoring mission report.

TRENDS IN STATE OF CONSERVATION

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee discussed general issues related to the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. Through Decision **32 COM 7B.129**, it requested the World Heritage Centre to prepare an analytical summary of the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties discussed identifying trends, for distribution to the Committee members and discussion at the 33rd session in 2009.

Following discussions between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies during their bi-annual meeting (Rome, September 2008), and consultation with the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, an analytical summary has been developed, based on a statistical analysis. The purpose of this preliminary analysis is to give the World Heritage Committee the possibility to see the different conservation processes together and also to encourage partners in World Heritage conservation to join forces in this analysis and in addressing the threats.

The analysis was distributed through Circular Letter CL/WHC-09/03 (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/573/>) to all Committee members. However only one comment has been received which noted that it was an excellent analytical report. It also stated that the main idea of the decision was, on the basis of the statistics and reporting, to generate a reflective statement on the state of conservation of World Heritage that could be adopted by the Committee and used to highlight the issues around the world on a consistent base of terminology. Besides, this data could be built upon to present a report, which could be offered to the public, to ensure credibility and communication. It furthermore suggests that considerations could be given to the reporting of threats by the ICOMOS categories or IUCN biomes rather than UNESCO regions.

Over the years five key factors have been identified:

- 1 Development and Infrastructure
- 2 Other human activities
- 3 Management and Legal Issues
- 4 Natural events and disasters
- 5 Other factors

These may need further redefining or sub grouping, and used as the basis for prioritization of funds and reporting and to guide the Advisory Bodies in their evaluations and the state of conservation of sites.

The analysis of factors is basic to understanding the dynamics of change, and which allows for making better predictions and planning ahead. 'Other human factors' are also critical to understand; changes in human fabric, socio-economic changes in work patterns and life-styles that affect natural and cultural sites.

The analysis also highlighted the issue of selection of properties for state of conservation reporting which is very critical and taken into account for the Draft Decision below. The analysis also underscored the need for enforcement of Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* as a very critical point to inform the World Heritage Committee at an early stage. A further conclusion is that the use of Environment Impact Assessment from the earliest stages of planned development, with active consideration of the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties within these Assessments, would also greatly help to avoid problems that otherwise require the attention of the World Heritage Committee.

NEW, CONTINUING AND EMERGING ISSUES

Buffer zones

The results of the international expert meeting on World Heritage and Buffer Zones (Davos, Switzerland, 10-13 March 2008) requested by Decision **30 COM 9** were presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Decision **32 COM 7.1**). As a follow-up, the proceedings of the international expert meeting was published as World Heritage Papers 25 and disseminated to Permanent Delegations, National Commissions, UNESCO Offices and Advisory Bodies. The publication is available electronically at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/series/25/>.

Wind farms

Discussions between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies which started in 2008 continued on state of conservation cases where wind farms were planned or wind energy projects emerged. A review of relevant studies available is underway.

Tourism pressures

Tourism pressures, and related infrastructure development are noted as significant threat in a number of cultural and natural World Heritage properties, most notably in properties where inscription on the World Heritage List has fed demand and investment in tourism and leisure facilities, and in second homes. There appears to be growing evidence of the importance of ensuring that States Parties are fully prepared for the management of tourism, including verifying that appropriate protective land use planning regimes, and accompanying plans for tourism and public use are in place at the time of inscription, and remain supported and properly resourced. The current joint initiative of the World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies and other partners on World Heritage and tourism (See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/5A*) should consider this area of concern as a key priority in the development of its programme of work.

Mining

Mining again features a significant area of concern within the state of conservation reports prepared this year, and represents a critical threat to a number of properties. The World Heritage Committee has an important role in continuing to ensure that the principle that World Heritage properties should be no-go areas for mining and extractive industries is consistently observed. There has been a useful dialogue during the year involving the World Heritage Centre, IUCN, mining and finance sectors, regarding the possibility to extend the effectiveness of the no go commitment.

Invasive species

Invasive species are noted as another pressure where concerns are growing, and a number of World Heritage properties reported on this year are facing major and growing threats. These are generally from non-indigenous plants, animals and microorganisms that have been deliberately or accidentally introduced to new areas beyond their native ranges, and which then spread beyond cultivation and human care to impact biodiversity. The most

harmful invaders can transform diverse and productive ecosystems into nearly sterile lands and waters with completely different ecosystem processes. The successful prevention and management of invasive species threats is an important part of World Heritage management effectiveness. It is considered that the threat of invasive species is currently under-recognised and so this issue should be a required reporting item for management plans, and more tools and training is needed to alert site managers on invasive species that are likely to be present but not yet at critical level, so that early action could be taken. There are also a number of properties with significant success in managing invasive species within the World Heritage system so there is also a good opportunity for skills transfer between sites on this issue.

Inappropriate developments including skyscrapers and other tall buildings

An ongoing concern, in particular for cities and towns on the World Heritage List is the issue of inappropriate development. This often takes the form of skyscrapers or of buildings of inappropriate scale within the World Heritage property, in the buffer zone, or outside the buffer zone but affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The ongoing work on Historic Urban Landscapes (HUL) is, in part, meant to provide guidance to State Parties in regard to developing integrated planning mechanisms to deal with this problem.

IUCN noted that a number of issues are continued or emerging again after intense discussions at the Committee a couple of years ago, such as mining. The following issues emerged in particular for natural heritage properties in 2009: poaching, tourism development, mining, invasive species, illegal logging, climate change, water management (dams, access) illegal grazing, agricultural encroachment, human/ wildlife conflict and indigenous people's rights issues. It would be valuable for more systematic work to be done on these most pressing threats to natural World Heritage properties, in order to enable the Committee, World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to respond more positively and consistently.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

With a view to assisting States Parties in dealing with the impacts of climate change on World Heritage properties, and following the adoption by the World Heritage Committee, at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006) of the Strategy (Document *WHC-06/30.COM/7.1*) and by the General Assembly of States Parties to the *Convention*, at its 16th session (UNESCO, 2007) of the Policy (Document *WHC-07/16.GA/10*), work is continuing to explore some pilot projects. Currently, projects in Madagascar, Indonesia and Peru are under negotiation with the donors. These project proposals seek to promote biological connectivity and adaptive forest landscape management at specific World Heritage properties to increase their resilience to and reduce risks from climate change impacts.

A regional capacity building workshop for Asia- Pacific on vulnerability assessment of World Heritage properties to disasters and climate change will take place at the World Heritage Institute for Training and Research in Beijing from 7 to 13 December 2009. The workshop will bring together managers of Asian World Cultural Heritage properties at particular risk and will contribute to identifying their main vulnerabilities to disasters and climate change and developing appropriate risk management plans. It will help build capacities on the methodology for identifying and reducing risks related to disasters and climate change, and contribute to UNESCO's inter-sectoral platform on climate change.

Since the 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), two petitions were received on climate change and World Heritage. One (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/climatechange/>) was received in September 2008 from the Australian Climate Justice Program, the Climate Action Network Australia and Friends of the Earth Australia. It was addressed to the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex 1 Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) and states that the obligations under the *World Heritage Convention* and the UNFCCC are consistent with each other. Hence, States must reduce greenhouse gas emissions and meet the targets decided under the UNFCCC and AWG-KP to protect World Heritage. The World Heritage Centre has followed-up this petition with the UNFCCC Secretariat who informed that the petitioners have been advised to re-submit it to the *Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA)*, as it raises a broader and more general concern, which relates to both the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol.

The second petition (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/climatechange/>) to the World Heritage Committee was submitted by Earth Justice (USA) and the Australian Climate Justice Program in January 2009 and concerns the “Role of Black Carbon in Endangering World Heritage Sites Threatened by Glacial Melt and Sea Level Rise”. This petition calls on the World Heritage Committee to take action to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties most vulnerable to global warming – high latitude and altitude glaciers and low-elevation sites threatened by sea level rise – by advancing strategies to reduce emissions of the global warming pollutant black carbon. It states that recent scientific studies identify black carbon as a key climate forcing agent, and suggests that reducing these emissions may be among the most effective near-term strategies for slowing the amplified climate warming experienced at high latitudes. As glaciers melt, sea levels rise, threatening World Heritage properties with coral reefs and coastal lowlands. Because black carbon is a short-lived climate forcing agent, with an atmospheric lifetime of only days or weeks, reducing emissions has an immediate effect and slows global warming in the near term. Without action to slow near-term global warming, it may be impossible to protect many World Heritage properties from damage or destruction caused by climate change.

The petition states further that black carbon is released into the atmosphere during the inefficient burning of fossil fuels, biofuels, and biomass. Because the dark-coloured particles absorb sunlight and when deposited on ice and snow, they reduce the albedo, or reflectivity, of these surfaces, and increase the rate of melting. Black carbon is considered to be the second most powerful contributor to global warming after carbon dioxide, and because of feedback effects on snow, warms the planet three times more than CO₂. The petition lists the following 17 World Heritage properties as being threatened by this phenomenon:

Glacier and Montane properties: Ilulissat Icefjord* (Denmark), Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal), Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas* (China), Swiss Alps Jungfrau-Aletsch (Switzerland), Kilimanjaro National Park (United Republic of Tanzania), Waterton Glacier International Peace Park* (Canada/United States), Huascarán National Park (Peru), Pyrenees – Mont Perdu* (Spain/France).

* The state of conservation of those properties (*) will be examined at the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee (Seville, 2009) and is available in this working document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B* or in *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add*.

Low-lying properties: Great Barrier Reef (Australia), Belize Barrier Reef* (Belize), Tubbataha Reef Marine Park* (Philippines), Aldabra Atoll (Seychelles), Donana National Park (Spain), Komodo National Park (Indonesia), Kakadu National Park (Australia), Sundarbans National Park (India), The Sundarbans* (Bangladesh).

The Petitioners request the World Heritage Committee to take the following actions to address the threats that black carbon poses to World Heritage:

- Request the Advisory Bodies, States Parties and site managers to cooperatively undertake studies to determine the sources of black carbon that are polluting various high latitude and altitude sites and recommend measures that States Parties and site managers could take to reduce emissions from these sources;
- Place the World Heritage properties addressed in this petition on the List of World Heritage in Danger and develop, in consultation with the relevant States Parties, a programme for corrective measures that incorporates the results of the studies described above;
- Coordinate with other United Nations bodies working on climate issues to educate these bodies and States Parties on the impacts that climate change and, in particular, black carbon, are having on World Heritage properties and to encourage them to take steps to mitigate the impacts of black carbon;
- Encourage and fund the transfer of available technologies to States Parties and site managers to help mitigate the impacts of black carbon emissions on World Heritage properties.

The petitioners also mention that the focus of this petition on black carbon distinguishes it from past petitions to list properties due to the general impacts of climate change. Reducing black carbon emissions is an effective near-term mitigation measure and has an immediate cooling effect, which is distinct from the situation of long-lived greenhouse gases which can remain in the atmosphere for centuries. The petition requests the World Heritage Committee to take action that is specific, that does not overlap with the work of other international bodies, and that falls squarely within the World Heritage Committee's mandate under the *Convention*.

The World Heritage Centre has also forwarded a copy of this petition to the Secretariat of the UNFCCC for their comments, as well as to the States Parties whose properties are named in this petition.

STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT

Decision **27 COM 7B.106.3** requested

"...that the reports are categorized as follows:

- a) Reports with recommended decisions which, in the judgment of the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, require discussion by the World Heritage Committee,
- b) Reports which, in the judgment of the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, can be noted without discussion,"

During the coordination meeting between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies (UNESCO Headquarters, 13-16 January 2009), the selection process for the properties to be discussed by the World Heritage Committee has been refined taking into account the procedures and statutory deadlines as set out in the *Operational Guidelines*, the different monitoring tools at the disposal of the Committee and the ever growing number of properties to report on at World Heritage Committee sessions within Agenda item 7B (128 in 2008, 147 in 2009).

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have agreed that the following properties would be brought to the Committee's attention for discussion:

- if the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger is proposed,
- if the property is subject to the Reinforced monitoring mechanism,
- if significant new information regarding the property has been received after the document was issued, requiring a revision of the draft Decision,
- if no consensus has been reached between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies regarding the state of conservation of the property and the way forward, and
- if the State Party has not submitted, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, its report on the state of conservation of the property.

World Heritage Committee members can still decide to discuss in detail the state of conservation reports which are submitted for adoption without discussion, providing a written request is made to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee prior to 15 June 2009.

To facilitate the work of the World Heritage Committee, a standard format has been used for all state of conservation reports. This format has been adapted taking into account Decision **29 COM 7C** as well as Decision **27 COM 7B.106** para 4:

"Invites the World Heritage Centre to present all information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in the following manner:

- a) the report on each property should start on a new page,
- b) the identification number of the property allocated at the time of its nomination should be used in the document,
- c) an index of all properties should also be included,
- d) the decisions should have a standard layout, draft recommendation, and should be concise and operational; "

Therefore, the standard format includes:

- a) Name of the property (State Party) (ID number);
- b) Year of inscription on the World Heritage List;
- c) Inscription criteria;
- d) Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger ;
- e) Previous Committee Decisions;
- f) International Assistance;
- g) UNESCO Extra budgetary Funds ;
- h) Previous monitoring missions ;
- i) Main threats identified in previous reports ;
- j) Illustrative material;
- k) Current conservation issues;
- l) Draft Decision.

The information contained in this document was prepared in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and other UNESCO Divisions and Field Offices.

In this document, the state of conservation reports of World Heritage properties will be presented in English alphabetical order by region, as follows: Africa, Arab States, Asia-Pacific, Europe and North America, and finally Latin America and the Caribbean. For practical and environmental reasons, as in previous years, each report will not start on a new page (147 reports are presented in this document). However, each region will start on a new page.

GENERAL DECISION ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

Draft Decision: 32 COM 7B.148

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Documents WHC-09/33.COM/7B and WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.129**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Acknowledging the increasing number of state of conservation reports and that reviewing these is a key tool for ensuring the effective conservation of World Heritage properties,*
4. *Noting the results of the analytical document on trends provided with Circular Letter CL/WHC-09/03 and the in-depth discussion that took place at the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee;*
5. *Requests the World Heritage Centre to prepare, after consultation with the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, an analytical summary of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties over 5 years for discussion at the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2010;*
6. *Recognizes the efforts on the inclusion of illustrative material in the Working Documents on state of conservation and encourages States Parties to provide the World Heritage Centre, whenever possible, with verified electronic illustrative material which could be included in the web-pages of the World Heritage Centre;*
7. *Takes note of the process being followed to consult States Parties to ensure the accuracy of the state of conservation reports during their preparation, as presented in the introduction of Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B, and also requests the World Heritage Centre to maintain such consultation with States Parties;*
8. *Also takes note of the petition on the Role of Black Carbon in endangering World Heritage properties and urges States Parties having properties in high latitudes and altitudes to take effective measures to identify the sources of and control the generation of black carbon in and around such properties.*

II. REPORTS ON THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

1. Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroun) (N 407)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

2. Taï National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 195)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

Criteria

(vii) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

27 COM 7B.2; 28 COM 15B.3 ; 31 COM 7B.6

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 30,000 for Technical Co-operation; USD 7,500 for Preparatory Assistance; USD 60,154 for Training Assistance

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous Monitoring Missions

June 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

a) Poaching;

- b) Agricultural encroachment;
- c) Artisanal gold mining.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/195>

Current conservation issues

With the political crisis in the country in 2002, fears existed that commercial poaching, agricultural encroachment and artisanal gold mining would increase substantively. In June 2006, following a return of security, a World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission visited the World Heritage properties in Cote d'Ivoire, which concluded that the property was not as heavily impacted by political instability as Comoé National Park or Mont Nimba National Park World Heritage properties, which are both on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to implement the 2006 mission recommendations and the emergency actions.

On 2 February 2009, a report on the state of conservation of the Taï National Park was submitted by the State Party. The report gives a description of the ongoing management activities and collaboration with partner organisations. In particular Wild Chimpanzee Foundation (WCF) and World Wildlife Fund (WWF), local and foreign research institutions, and the German development agencies KfW/GTZ. The World Heritage Centre also received a copy of a report on the ecological monitoring activities in the property, prepared by the management agency OIPR (Office ivoirien des Parcs et Réserve) and the WCS and a copy of the 2008-2012 business plan prepared with assistance of GTZ.

The State Party report notes that despite the continued presence of the above mentioned threats, improvements in control and surveillance have resulted in an increase in most species as demonstrated by the 2008 biomonitoring research.

The progress on the implementation of the following recommendations of the 2006 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission is reported hereunder:

a) Control and surveillance of poaching and improved monitoring data

Although wildlife populations for many species are recovering, poaching is reported to be still prevalent in the property. While the reported occurrence of animal traps has not changed significantly since 2006-2007, numbers of poaching camps and poaching trails are reported to have diminished significantly. The report mentions that poachers mainly target duikers and primates, which constitute 80% of seizures. The State Party patrol activities cover now 76% of the property.

Poaching continues to be a major management concern and the short term actions include strengthening the anti-poaching brigade with new agents, and to strengthen collaboration with judiciary relating to prosecutions. It is also expected that the clarification of the legal boundaries will further facilitate anti-poaching activities.

In two areas inside the property, artisanal gold extraction continues to be a problem. Within the new limits of the national park, 3000 ha are in use for subsistence agriculture by 1200 families.

b) Ecological monitoring

The positive impacts of surveillance and community outreach activities in the property are evident in the results of the Phase III 2008 biomonitoring ecological study, conducted with the technical assistance of WCS. Results show a significant recovery of wildlife populations

in 2006, in particular for duikers and primates: Maxwell Duiker 62 459 (up from 21 335), Diane Monkey 241,060 (up from 122, 550), Red Colobus 232, 480 (up from 64,535), Chimpanzee 516 (up from 479). Elephants figures are down (estimated at 89 down from 180), but this could be explained by the survey set up, as certain inundated areas were not sampled. Increasing encounter rates of Maxwell Duikers in the previously heavily hunted eastern part of the park seem a good indication that hunting pressure has started to diminish. Pygmy hippos, a key species in this property, are also reported to be more common, but no comparison to previous data is provided. Encounter rates for certain species seem low, in particular Bongo and Buffalo, but no further analysis of these data is provided.

The State Party also reported that satellite images showed a good forest cover. However, this analysis is based on 2004 images and therefore, it is recommended to update this analysis based on more recent images.

c) Clarification of the boundaries of the property

The boundaries of the World Heritage property, the National Parks in the area and the Man and Biosphere Reserve, appear to be unclear to the local communities. The State Party has authorised OIPR through Article n°9 of law n°2002-102 relating to the demarcation, management and financing of national parks and natural reserves to redefine the boundaries of several national parks, including Tai. OIPR has submitted revised boundaries for the Tai National Park for adoption to the National Authorities. The new national park includes the N'Zo Faunal Reserve and its buffer zone comprising an area of 536,000 ha, compared to 330,000 ha for the property.

d) Expansion of activities with neighbouring communities: partnership, socio-economic and education

The recovery of certain species of wildlife and the gradual reduction in poaching pressure suggest the success of socio-economic and education activities implemented with neighbouring communities. However, previous reports have noted high population growth and levels of poverty on the periphery of the property. The report notes that a support group for measures with neighbouring communities, 'Cellule d'Appui aux mesures riveraines' (CAM), has been established to manage support in the periphery of the property. It is responsible for developing the project proposals from the neighbouring communities. In 2008, 87 revenue-generating and community micro-projects were financed for a total of 171 070 206 Francs CFA. The State Party further collaborates with NGO's to raise awareness of the local population and authorities on the importance of sustainable management of wildlife resources.

e) International cooperation and sustainable financing

Over the last two decades, the State Party has received assistance from the German development agencies KfW/GTZ and WWF on surveillance and ecotourism, equipment, and capacity-building of park staff. This project will end in September 2009 and it is unclear what international support will be available after this period. The Wild Chimpanzee Foundation continues to assist in wildlife surveys and research and awareness-raising on chimpanzees in particular. The Business Plan of Tai National Park mentions that the State Party has progressively increased funding to the property. For the period 2008-2012 the government funding currently covers only 50% of recurrent costs of the park. However, the State Party established in 2002 the Foundation for Reserves and Parks of Cote d'Ivoire (FPRCI) to provide additional funding and to ensure sustainable financial support for the functional operations of national parks and reserves in Côte d'Ivoire.

f) *Eco-tourism activities*

The reports mentions the creation of a visitor centre inside the park. No information is provided on the recommendation of the 2006 monitoring mission to develop an ecotourism strategy.

The State Party report does not provide information on other recommendations including progress in assessing the feasibility of ecological corridors, and expanding research to include the functioning of the ecosystem.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the progress made by the State Party in addressing threats and management issues in the property. Indications of a recovery of wildlife population are very encouraging. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are recommending to continue the ecological monitoring activities to confirm these trends. Although anti-poaching and other measures seem to be having a positive impact, monitoring results also reveal that animal traps are found all over the property. Hence, while poaching may be reducing, it continues to remain a significant management issue requiring continued vigilance. Pressure on the integrity of the property remains important. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN encourage the State Party to continue efforts to implement the management plan and sustainable financing strategy for the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also welcome the efforts of the State Party to clarify the boundaries and zoning of the property and enlarge the National Park. They recommend the State Party to evaluate, in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN these changes in the boundaries of the property, by proposing an extension, in accordance with the *Operational Guidelines*. If proposed, such an extension would probably best be designed to exclude areas of the previous buffer zone that are under a multiple use regime.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.2

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.6**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Welcomes the progress made by the State Party in addressing threats and management issues in the property, in particular; efforts to involve local communities in the management of the property and the development of income-generating activities within the property as well as the development of a regular ecological monitoring plan to monitor the values and integrity of the property ;
4. Notes with satisfaction the results of the 2008 bio-monitoring which indicate that the recovery of several wildlife species has started;
5. Encourages the State Party to continue its efforts to establish a sustainable funding strategy for the property and calls upon the international community to continue its support for the management of the property;

6. *Urges* the State Party to continue efforts to combat commercial in cooperation with the local communities as well as to implement the other recommendations of the 2006 monitoring mission;
7. *Requests* the State Party, in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to review the opportunity to develop an extension to the property in accordance with the Operational Guidelines to reflect the recent extension of the Tai national park;
8. *Also requests* the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress in curbing poaching and other threats to the property, and outcomes of ecological monitoring, and progress in establishing sustainable financing for the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2012;

3. Mount Kenya (Kenya) (N 800)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

4. Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal) (N 25)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1981

Criteria

(vii) (x)

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

1985-1988 and 2000-2006

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7A.7; 30 COM 7A.11; 31 COM 7B.7

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 278 567 for Emergency assistance, Technical assistance and training

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

September 2000: UNESCO/IUCN/Ramsar mission; April 2004: IUCN participation in multi-stakeholder workshop and May 2005: UNESCO/IUCN monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Invasive species;
- b) Systematic water management system not operational;
- c) Lack of hydrological monitoring;
- d) Salinisation of soils;
- e) Cattle grazing;
- f) Hunting;
- g) Lack of management plan and sustained funding;
- h) Poor management capacity and constant changes in staff;
- i) Poor visitor management.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/fr/list/25>

Current conservation issues

Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2000 as a result of increasing problems with the invasive species *Salvinia molesta*, which was closing all open water bodies in the property and thus threatening the water bird populations. The Action Plan, developed in the context of the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger focuses on three areas: 1) preservation and restoration of the ecological characteristics of the property, 2) development of ecotourism facilities and products, 3) integration of the property within the socio-economic and environmental landscape.

Furthermore, the building of the Dama dam had permanently stopped the salt water from entering the property and changed the hydrology. This further facilitated the spread of invasive species and reduced food availability to the birdlife. The changes to hydrology lead to salinization of soils due to lack of flushing, reduced amplitude in water levels, shrinking of bird colonies of certain species and disappearance of others. The property was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2006, as the *Salvinia* problem was brought under control through biological control and following the initiation of a hydrological management system. The State Party also developed a three-year action plan (2006-2008), which focuses on a) preservation and restoration of the ecological characteristics of the property, b) development of ecotourism facilities and products and c) integration of the property within the socio-economic and environmental landscape. The property currently remains on the Montreux Record of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands due to the impact of other invasive species and the effect on bird populations.

On 27 February 2009, a brief report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides only limited information on progress in the implementation of the 2006- 2008 Action plan. The following points are noted:

- a) *Preserve and restore the ecological characteristic of the property*

Through the support from *Programme de Gestion Intégrée des Ressources marines et Côtières* (GIRMAC), the invasive plants *Tamarix senegalensis* and *Typha australis* have been cleared from Tantale pond and Khar backwater. The support from the GEF (Global

Environment Facility) has allowed clearing of the following marshes: Crocodile, Lamantin, Tieguel, Khoyoye and Petit Djoudj. These activities have led to an increase of open waters, free of vegetation, in ponds and backwaters. The State Party reports increases in fish, improved water circulation, and improved water quality. Grand Lac has seen an increase in water volume which has benefited teals, pintails, lesser and greater flamingo.

The Government of the Netherlands also supported the restoration of white pelican nesting areas and the construction of one nesting area. These activities have resulted in an increase in the nesting population of white pelicans and a reduction in mortality rate.

b) *Develop a visitor welcome centre and new eco-tourism products*

The Government of the Netherlands and the GEF have supported the construction of watch towers in Tantale, Petit Djoudj and Grand Lac, and the improvement of the trail between the command post and the observation post at Flamant. This has improved vehicular circulation, increased the number of visitors at the watchtowers and reduced disturbance and erosion. Signage has also been improved within the property.

c) *Improve the integration of the property in its environment*

The invasive aquatic species project, *Projet de Gestion Intégrée des Végétaux Aquatiques Envahissants (GIVAQUE)* has supported the establishment of five village committees to help combat invasive plants. These committees have been given the responsibility to clear ponds and have access to two boats and GPS. The State Party has also conducted awareness-raising sessions in the villages.

Research coordinated through the biological station has included sampling and modelling in the Gorom and Crocodile canal. The State Party did not provide the research results or copies of the research papers or references.

In addition, GEF has supported the development of income-generating activities through the development of a network of butane gas to combat harvesting of fuel wood. A micro-credit system has been established to support local craft industry. The culture of fodder crops has been established to combat foraging by cattle within the property. GEF has also supported environmental education in the schools neighbouring the property.

The State Party reports that with the support of several projects, equipment has been bought for the property, including boats, a vehicle, and a variety of monitoring equipments. The State Party also reports the recruitment of additional staff for the property since December 2007.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recognize the ongoing work of the State Party and its partners to restore the functioning of the wetlands to support birdlife and to improve the overall management of the property. However, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN regret that the report does not provide a detailed evaluation on progress in the implementation of the 2006-2008 Action plan.

In order to assess the status of the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property and the impact of the Action plan, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the State Party also report to the World Heritage Committee on the trends in resident and migratory bird populations and the hydrology of the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.4

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.7**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the on-going efforts of the State Party to restore the functioning of the wetlands to support birdlife, to improve the overall management of the property and to involve local communities in the management of the property*
4. *Also notes the importance of specific monitoring on the state of conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property; and requests the State Party to take account of this in its monitoring programme of birds and other wildlife, including the trends in key species, as well as the status of key threats;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the status of the Outstanding Universal Value and the conditions of integrity of the property, in particular on the trends in resident and migratory bird populations, the hydrology of the property, as well as on progress in the implementation of the Action Plan, including the on-going ecological restoration and monitoring activities.*

5. Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N 1162)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

Criteria

(viii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 8B.4 ; 32 COM 7B.2

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

April 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

The following threats were identified at the time of inscription of the property on the World Heritage List:

- a) Theft and vandalism;
- b) Pollution of the Vaal River;
- c) Lack of tourism management, particularly access.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1162>

Current conservation issues

At the time of its inscription in 2005, the World Heritage Committee noted that the nominated property requires special management and collaboration with landowners to ensure its integrity and requested the State Party to clearly define the legal boundaries for the three satellite component sites of the serial property. The World Heritage Committee also requested a monitoring mission to evaluate the progress made with the above actions; the mission took place in April 2008. In its decision **32 COM 7B.2**, the World Heritage Committee requested a report to its 33rd session on progress made in implementing the recommendations of the 2008 monitoring mission, and in providing adequate legal protection to the property.

On 29 January 2009, a comprehensive report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre. In this report, the State Party indicates that the legal protection of the property is not yet in place although progress on this is reported. The issue remains the difficulties that have become evident with the application of the World Heritage Convention Act, 1999, which it was understood at the time of inscription would provide protection of the property once it was included on the World Heritage List. The Free State Province Landowners Association requested the delay of the proclamation which was proposed in 2007. In order to address the landowners concerns, the Steering Committee agreed to ensure the legal proclamation of the Vredefort Dome as a "World Heritage Site" by devising a new set of site specific regulations, reflecting the freehold status of majority of the property. It is anticipated that draft regulations will be published in February 2009 for a period of 60 days for the general public to comment. The State Party considers that proclamation will be ready following that process, although the report does not specify a precise timetable for this. A key issue is the specific protection of the geological values of the property and a number of the most important locations in the property, which does not appear to be in place.

Concurrent to the proclamation of the property, the State Party has initiated a process to review the 2007 integrated management plan (IMP) of the Vredefort Dome in order for the Minister to approve it. The first draft of the reviewed IMP was discussed with the concerned stakeholders at a workshop held on 24 January 2009. The State Party expects that the final IMP will be ready for approval by the Minister by April 2009. The report also notes progress regarding management, the funding for a management team of seven staff being in place. Three of the posts have been filled, and a number are currently vacant but presumed to be under recruitment. An on-site office that serves as an interim information centre is in place and staffed by three Information Officers. IUCN considers that the appointment of suitably skilled and effective staff to this team will be a key issue, especially given the challenging stakeholder relations that exist with the property. A specific task of the management team should be the surveillance and protection of sensitive geological localities.

The State Party report notes that no question exists about the exact area that was inscribed on the World Heritage List; however there is agreement by the stakeholders that there is a need to revisit the boundaries of the buffer zone to ensure its alignment to the property. The report provides an annex that describes the boundaries of the buffer zone proposed for the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that any minor boundary modification of the property's buffer zone should be submitted to the World Heritage Committee for a formal approval.

World Heritage properties are also governed by the National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act, No 57 of 2003 and its 2005 Regulations. Thus development in a World Heritage property that is not compliant with any of the relevant legislations together with the *World Heritage Convention* requirements and is therefore an illegal activity and punishable under South African Law. The State Party considers that within the Vredefort Dome, the non-proclaimed status of the property and the fact that 99% of the land in the property is privately owned, makes it difficult to ensure compliance at this stage.

This fact is underlined by a recent audit by the North West provincial Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Environment of compliance that confirmed that almost all developments in the Vredefort Dome are illegal in terms of the Environment Conservation Act, 1989 (ECA). The study continued to state that some of these developments are having such irreplaceable negative impacts on the environment that they ought to cease immediately because they are in breach of the Duty of Care provided for in the National Environmental Management Act, No 107 of 1998 (NEMA). The State Party provides the results of this study which lists 46 different illegal developments which primarily appear to relate to leisure related activities, and which note pollution and waste management as amongst the key areas of concern. No similar assessment of development activity was reported regarding the part of the property in the Free State Province. IUCN has also recently received information suggesting that helicopter flying for tourists has increased dramatically and motorized recreation is also taking place, which may both also have an impact on the qualities and visitor experience of the property.

The landowners from both provinces within which the property is located have been informed in November 2008 that, in the words of the State Party report: *"if the situation continues unabated, government might be forced to recommend that the property be de-listed from the World Heritage List"*. A letter is provided by the State Party as part of its report in which the Deputy Director of Biodiversity and Conservation indicates to the landowners within the property that he is minded to recommend this course of action to the relevant Minister. The State Party further reports that during a meeting that was held on 17 December 2008, the stakeholders recommended that government should write a letter to the World Heritage Centre to request a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to assess the extent of the impact of developments on the values of the property, and also outlines a remedial process that is also envisaged within national legislation.

The report also notes that road infrastructure developments have taken place through Provincial projects, while other projects are at an advanced stage and will be implemented. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that careful consideration is given to these developments and that road construction impacts on the geological values of the property should be carefully considered and that the State Party provides further details of the anticipated development to the World Heritage Centre. A major state-funded exhibition centre for the Vredefort Dome, located just outside the property near the town of Vredefort (Cape Province) is nearing completion.

The report notes the concerns regarding pollution in the Vaal River System and provides extensive details of the water and catchment management plans and activities. There appears to be no doubt that there is extensive planning in place, however there are also

challenges in implementation. In order to address sewage spillage into the Vaal River, numerous meetings were held with the municipality that is considered to be the source of the pollution with Ngwathe Municipality (Free State Province). The municipality has been requested to increase the capacity of their treatment plant and to submit a costed business plan that will assist in determining the magnitude of the problem and the resources needed, although the response and timeline for a response to this request are not noted. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that the concerns regarding many of the illegal developments listed by the State Party relate to sewage and waste disposal. The report also notes that the North West Provincial Government is currently in the process of finalising a Land Use Management Bill (LUMB) for the province, which if accompanied with effective implementation may provide a means to better regulate development in the future. No details are provided regarding land use activities in the Free State Province.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the State Party report indicates that there are causes for concern regarding the Vredefort Dome, which are most clearly underlined by the letter sent to the landowners by the Government. Whilst there are a number of underlying issues, the key points that require attention are the installation of effective legal protection of the property and the establishment of effective governance and implementation of regulation and an urgent finalization of the proclamation of the status of the property. IUCN also remains concerned that the State Party report does not indicate clearly a common level of policy and protection between the two provinces whose territories include the Vredefort Dome. The relationship with the private landowners who own almost all of the property, and their responsibilities to its conservation, appear to be the key factor in determining whether the property can meet the expectations of the protection of integrity, and delivery of effective management set in the *World Heritage Convention*. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that the State Party has requested a further reactive monitoring mission in relation to the illegal developments that have taken place within the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that such a mission could not arbitrate on individual developments, but might be helpful in setting the parameters for this exercise. A mission should however focus on considering the regulations, the completed management plan, the land use management powers of the Management Authority, conservation and protection of specific vulnerable geological sites, the natural landscape, and the provision of appropriate access arrangements to the key sites.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also consider that if the above mentioned issues are not addressed by 2010, this could present a case for possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.5

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.5**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Takes note of the report of the State Party, and both the progress noted and its assessment of the significant challenges facing the property, notably in relation protection and effective management of its values, governance and the relationship with private landowners, and wider threats from illegal development and water pollution;*

4. *Regrets that extensive illegal developments have taken place and have had a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
5. *Urges the State Party to establish effective legal protection of the World Heritage property, as a matter of urgency, including protection of key vulnerable geological localities within the property and their landscape setting, proclamation of the status of the property and to provide adequate resources to implement this legislation effectively;*
6. *Takes note of the wish of the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission to the property to assess the extent of the impact of developments on the values of the property and how this may be remedied ; and invites the mission team to also advise, jointly with the stakeholders, on the development of an action plan to ensure that the property's effective protection and management can be rapidly put in place ;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the recommendations of the 2008 World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission and the further concerns raised above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

6. Cape Floral Region Protected Areas (South Africa) (N 1007 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.5; 31 COM 7B.8

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of financial resources;
- b) Invasive species;
- c) Fires.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1007/documents/>

Current conservation issues

At the time of inscription, IUCN noted that invasive species were the most severe threat to the continued existence of the *Fynbos* ecosystems that characterise this property. At its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006), the World Heritage Centre and IUCN reported on increasing problems with the control and management of invasive species in this property, as a result of a lack of funding to properly manage this threat. The lack of control of invasive species also resulted in an increasing intensity of uncontrolled wild fires. In its decision **31 COM 7B.8**, the World Heritage Committee requested a report to its 33rd session on efforts made in relation to the above threats, together with progress towards establishing a single coordinating authority for the property, the planned extension of the property and information on the budgets allocated to the property.

On 29 January 2009, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party, responding to the information requested in the decision.

a) Establishment of a single management authority

The State Party reports that in line with the World Heritage Convention Act, the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) has been appointed as the single overall management authority for the property. DEAT has decided to delegate part of its authority to the three management agencies in charge of the different components, SANParks, CapeNature and the Eastern Cape Parks Board (ECPB), which continue to ensure the management of the components for which they have the lead responsibility. Coordination will be ensured through a Joint Management Committee, which includes the Chief Executive Officers of these three entities together with a representative of DEAT. A paper describing in detail the functioning of this management structure was annexed to the State Party report.

b) Extension of the property

The State Party further reports that the extension and buffering of the property is underway. Currently, an assessment of protected areas suitable for inclusion within an extended property is being finalized, based on a rigorous set of criteria. The State Party hopes to submit the nomination for the extension to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2010. It is anticipated that the nominated extension will include extensions of existing protected areas, creation of several new protected areas and an extension of buffer zones. These are being considered within a number of landscape initiatives under the Cape Action People and Environment programme (CAPE), which is seeking to create wildlife corridors to increase the connectivity between the components within the property and to improve the long term viability of the protected area estate. This increased connectivity would also further enhance the resilience of the property to climate change.

c) Budgets to combat invasive plants and monitor fire impacts

The State Party report presents detailed information on the budgets allocated to the management of fire and invasive species in the property, confirming a significant additional

allocation from the Provincial Treasury of R23.8million (c. USD 2.5million) in the financial year 2009/10 in addition to the R87.7 million in the 2008/09 budget.

The report notes that while both CapeNature, which is responsible for six of the eight component parts of the property, and Eastern Cape Parks Board (ECPB), in charge of the management of the Baviaanskloof component, have been able to steadily increase their functioning budgets, they remain underfunded. To address this, both agencies have engaged in a process (termed a Business Case Analysis) to demonstrate the specific requirements for additional funding to fulfil their mandates, for presentation to their respective funders. It is hoped that this process will lead to a further substantial increase in funding for both organisations. Cape Nature is also receiving substantial funding through the “Working for Water” programme of the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry. While ECPB is not directly receiving such funding, the “Working for Water” programme is also funding clearing of invasives in Baviaanskloof through the Gamtoos Irrigation Board.

Both organisations also have fire monitoring and management systems in place. While these systems are considered effective given the available resources, the report mentions that they could be further strengthened if a higher budget for these activities were available.

The State Party further reports on efforts to increase the effectiveness of the clearing of alien invasive species in the property by developing a more strategic approach in the selection of areas for clearing, prioritizing catchments to be targeted and prioritizing the alien species to target according to their level of threat.

The report does not make specific mention of any proposals for budget increases for SANParks, which is also managing one component of the property (Table Mountain National Park), although it notes that the fire management budget for this component exceeds R10million per year, and that R8million is dedicated to clearing invasive alien plants. Concern over increased fires in this component has led to commissioning of an update of the fire management programme.

d) Monitoring programmes

In addition to the fire monitoring activities mentioned above, the State Party reports on several other monitoring and evaluation programmes that have been put in place to monitor performance of the management agencies to conserve the biodiversity in their protected area system. However, it is not clear to what extent there is a monitoring process devoted to reporting specifically on the World Heritage property.

The State Party report notes that there are no other serious conservation issues facing the property, but mentions the threat from climate change. IUCN notes that it continues to receive reports of a range of other stresses to the property, in particular on water use and pollution, livestock and infrastructure. However, these are not reported to be of direct concern to the overall values of the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the removal of other stresses from a protected area is a key strategy to maximise its resilience for climate change. Continued attention to minimising the impacts from these and other threats to the property is therefore essential.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.6

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,

2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.8**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Welcomes the efforts of the State Party to improve connectivity amongst the different components of the property, as well as its intention to prepare an extension for the property;
4. Notes the reported progress towards the establishment of an overall management board for the property as well as efforts to increase financial resources for the control of invasive species and address the impacts of wildfires in the property;
5. Encourages the State Party to further continue and enhance its programmes for fire management, control of invasive species, mitigation of climate change impacts;
6. Urges the State Party to ensure appropriate funding for these and other management activities in the property;
7. Requests the State Party, to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on progress made in fire management, control of invasive species, mitigation of climate change impacts as well as the institutional, financial and staffing provision for the conservation of the property.

7. Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N 684)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(vii) (x)

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

1999 – 2004

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.4; 30 COM 7B.6; 31 COM 7B.9

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 116,239 (USD 32,249 for Technical support activities; USD 64,000 as Emergency assistance; and USD 19,990 in 2005 as Technical Cooperation for the implementation of the Annual Operations Plan)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2003: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Mining activities inside the property;
- b) Staffing and budgetary deficiencies;
- c) Degradation of buffer zone;
- d) Impact of tourism and climbing expeditions;
- e) Climate Change.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/684>

Current conservation issues

Rwenzori Mountains National Park was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1999, following the suspension of conservation activities and projects as a result of serious security concerns in the region where the park is located. Following a return of security, a World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission visited the property in 2003. The property was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2004. The World Heritage Committee has continued to follow up the state of conservation of the property in relation to some of the above mentioned threats. At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee recognised the progress of the State Party in improving the integrity of the property and requested further information on the implementation of the management plan, and progress in addressing threats from poaching, illegal logging and mining. The Committee also requested the State Party to monitor the status of the melting glaciers.

On 30 January 2009, a comprehensive report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides an update on management activities, research and work with local communities and partners. The State Party also submitted a report on 04 January 2008. Information from both reports is presented.

The assessment of key conservation issues, including progress in implementing the requests of the World Heritage Committee and addressing the threats identified in previous reports, is as follows:

a) Management

The World Heritage Committee has requested the State Party to report on progress made on the implementation of the management plan and to resolve staffing issues. While important progress on improving park infrastructure was made in recent years, lack of sufficient funding is hampering the completion of the programme. The MacArthur Foundation has funded improvements to residences for staff and the office of the Rwenzori Mountains Conservation and Environmental Management Project funded by WWF. There are six senior staff and 12 rangers housed in the recently renovated staff residences. The property has 74 staff including nine wardens and 60 rangers.

The State Party has progressively increased funding to the property. However Government funding is currently covering only 50 % of recurrent park costs. A financial gap analysis is currently being conducted with support from WWF in view of establishing a sustainable funding strategy. Innovative financing options such as payments for the conservation of water catchment are also being explored. Important investment costs are covered through donor funding, in particular the the Protected Areas Management and Sustainable Use (PAMSU) project with funding from the World Bank and GEF. However the project is ending in June 2009 and it is unclear if further funding is available.

b) Community collaboration

The communities neighbouring the property are participating in boundary maintenance under a collaborative boundary management initiative. Boundary demarcation activities are almost completed. The State Party reports that community groups involved in this initiative are also taking part in natural resource management projects such as forest landscape restoration initiatives adjacent to the park. To reduce the illegal harvesting of resources, a pilot project is also underway with two communities to establish a system of controlled harvesting of some resources such as bamboo, certain vines, medicinal plants and honey in a limited area of the park (within 3km of the boundary). Memoranda of Understanding were signed with the communities and park authorities are monitoring the harvesting programme. If successful, the park management plans to roll out this programme to other communities. WWF's Rwenzori Mountains Conservation and Environmental Management Project has further supported a comprehensive environmental strategy to inform communities of the natural values within the property.

c) Resource conservation and protection

The State Party reported that patrolling effort and coverage increased by 5%. As a result, incidences of illegal activities decreased by 5% compared to the previous year. Patrolling efforts are concentrated on the low altitude areas of the park, which are subject to the highest pressure. Main unlawful activities are illegal resource harvesting (bamboo, medicinal plants, honey), tree felling and poaching. IUCN notes that it would be valuable in future State party reports to refer to figures on arrests and prosecutions, and on the trends in species targeted by poachers.

The management of the property is also collaborating with the neighbouring Virunga National Park World Heritage property in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The two properties have engaged in coordinated patrols under transboundary collaboration initiatives with support of the Wildlife Conservation Society. The property has also conducted training of customs and immigration officials on animals prohibited to be traded to help control wildlife trafficking.

d) Mining

The State party reports that Kilembe Mines Limited has suspended surveying and prospecting activities within their lease in the park pending further consultation with UWA (Uganda Wildlife Authority) on the land use options for their lease. The consultations are not yet concluded..

e) Managing the impact of tourism

The State Party has developed a waste management plan to manage waste from tourism operations and other activities. Although sufficient funding is not available at this time to fully implement the strategy some progress is being made to manage tourism waste.

f) Monitoring

The State Party notes that it monitors the values of the property and is involved in research on elephants, chimpanzee, resource use, and several other topics in collaboration with individuals and institutions. IUCN would welcome details of the findings of these reports. The State Party is also developing an ecological monitoring plan focussing on the values and threats of the property. This plan is reported to be at an advanced stage.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the development of an ecological monitoring plan for the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property, which will lead to an adaptive management response to the threats.

The 2007 Environmental Change Research Centre Report 113 on 'Climate Change and the Aquatic Ecosystems of the Rwenzori Mountains, Uganda' reported on findings from field measurements and satellite mapping. The results identified a continuous trend of recession of the glaciers. At the current rate of loss of 0.7 km³ per decade the glaciers will disappear by 2030. The property managers monitor snow and glacial extent, and climate and water-quality within the property and in rivers outside.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the Outstanding Universal Value of this property is affected by climate change and encourage the State Party to discuss approaches to climate change adaptation with other State Parties which also have Mountain World Heritage properties affected by melting glaciers and changing mountain vegetation zones.

An important point of concern remains the funding of the management activities and the State Party is strongly encouraged to continue its efforts to establish a sustainable financing strategy.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are satisfied by the progress made by the State Party in addressing threats and management issues in the property since its removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2004. However it is of concern that mining leases still remain within the property and the necessary steps are now needed to ensure that these are surrendered. Given the substantial progress achieved it is proposed to not request a further state of conservation report until 2012, although progress should be carefully reviewed in the report on this property in the Periodic Reporting exercise for Africa in 2009-2010, with a view to considering the need for further consideration within Reactive monitoring.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.7

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.9**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the progress made by the State Party in addressing threats and management issues in the property;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to continue its efforts to establish a sustainable financing strategy for the property and calls on the international donor community to continue its support for the management of the property;*
5. *Urges the State Party to take the necessary steps to ensure all licences for mining within the property are eliminated, and that no further mining licenses are issued in relation to the property, in line with the international policy statement of the International Council of Minerals and Metals (ICMM) of not undertaking these activities in World Heritage properties;*
6. *Welcomes the development of an ecological monitoring plan to monitor the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property and requests the State Party to submit a copy to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2010**, together with*

copies of any more specific monitoring reports that have been completed on the values of the property as referred to in the State Party report;

7. *Invites the State Party to exchange experience with other States Parties and experts, including experts of the IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA), working on mountain World Heritage conservation and climate change, to explore appropriate and practical adaptation and mitigation strategies for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property in the long term;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2012, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including confirmation of the permanent elimination of mining concessions, progress on a detailed ecological monitoring report, and on the provision of adequate funding for the management of the property and the other issues noted above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

8. Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.3 ; 31 COM 7B.3 ; 32 COM 7B.3

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2007: World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission; November/December 2008; World Heritage Centre/ IUCN monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Proposed cattle driving route;
- b) Poaching;
- c) Insufficient funding;

- d) Mineral and hydrocarbon prospecting and mining;
- e) Tourism management and development;
- f) Potential and proposed dam development.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/199>

Current conservation issues

On 17 February 2009, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report provides some information on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission as well as some supplementary information requested by the 2008 monitoring mission.

From 23 to 30 November 2008, a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission visited the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008). The mission was a follow up to the earlier mission undertaken in 2007, which, because of logistical constraints, had only been able to visit the part of the property north of the Rufiji river, which is open to photographic tourism. At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee therefore recommended that a further monitoring mission be organized to focus on the area south of the Rufiji river, open to regulated sports hunting. This mission looked into the effectiveness of management of wildlife populations as well as a number of key threats and conservation issues, in particular the on-going uranium prospecting within the Selous Game Reserve (SGR) and in the wildlife corridor, proposed oil and gas exploration and exploitation within the property, and progress towards implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 monitoring mission, especially the recommendation requesting the State Party to reinstate the Revenue Retention Scheme. The mission report and its recommendations are available online (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/33COM/documents/>) The main conclusions and recommendations are summarized below.

On the basis of the information gathered, the mission concluded that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is currently being maintained. However, monitoring of its state of conservation and integrity is being hampered as no Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV) is currently available for the property. To assist the State Party, the mission team prepared a draft SOUV, based on the material available in the Nomination file and the original IUCN evaluation, as well as other relevant scientific data available on the property. This draft is annexed to the mission report and was also presented in a training workshop for periodic reporting in Africa on developing SOUVs, held in Dar es Salaam in early March 2009.

The mission expressed concern regarding a number of on-going or planned activities within the property, which are not compatible with its World Heritage status. These include on-going uranium exploration activities, planned oil and gas exploration, and proposed dams. The mission noted that the State Party had not informed the World Heritage Committee of these activities and had not provided information on their expected impact on the values and integrity of the property, as required under Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The mission was able to visit a uranium exploration concession on the southern boundary of SGR, of which 75 km² is located with the property. The mission concluded that while the on going activities are having a clear impact on the local environment, these impacts are not irreversible and ecological restoration will be possible. The mission also noted that mining is incompatible with inscription on the World Heritage List and that this is a clear policy position of the World Heritage Committee.

During the mission, the team discussed with the State Party whether this conflict between mining and World Heritage could be resolved through a change in the boundaries of the property. Given the relative limited size of the area under consideration compared to the extremely large size of the property, and the possibility to provide similar compensatory habitat through the inclusion of larger additional areas to the property, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that it is for the State Party to evaluate if such a change in boundaries could be proposed. This would require a thorough evaluation of the biological values of the areas involved and a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of the impacts of the mining activity on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The mission team recommended that the optimal boundaries of the World Heritage property should be defined in the context of the overall Selous ecosystem. It will also be necessary for the State Party to demonstrate through a proper EIA process that all mining activities in the immediate vicinity of the property will have no significant impact on its values and integrity of the property.

IUCN notes that the boundaries of World Heritage properties should not be modified with the primary objective of facilitating mining, as this would not be in line with the “No-go” commitment to mining in World Heritage properties.

The mission team was informed that the Government of Tanzania in 2005 and 2006 attributed two exploration concession blocks for oil and gas, to two companies, Dominion Oil and Gas and Heritage Oil. These concession blocks cover almost the entire property (a map is available in the mission report). So far, the Wildlife Division, in charge of the management of the property, has not granted permission to start the exploration activities in the property but continues to be under heavy pressure from the Ministry of Mines and Energy to give the clearance. Earlier oil exploration activities in the 1980s in SGR had a significant negative impact on the integrity and values of the property, with cut lines still clearly visible today. Their implementation also coincided with a sharp increase in poaching and a dramatic decline in wildlife populations, in particular elephants.

The mission also looked into the issue of the Kidunda dam. This dam is planned to meet increasing water demand for the capital Dar-es-Salaam. The mission was informed that the original proposal for a 9 billion m³ dam, which would have permanently inundated an important area of SGR, had been scaled down significantly and that the current proposed design for a 150 million m³ reservoir would result in the permanent flooding of 2 km² of the property. The mission team was able to obtain a copy of the summary of the EIA, which concludes that the impact on property will be limited and that the reservoir will not significantly disrupt wildlife migration routes. The EIA proposes to de-gazette the 2 km² area that will be inundated from SGR. The mission noted that this will require the State Party to request a boundary change of the property. However, the EIA also reported that the current design will fall short of the required 150 million m³, but only have a capacity of 60 million m³. It therefore seems likely that the design will have to be reviewed, with any new design requiring a new EIA. The mission recommends that if the design is to be reviewed, alternative options outside the property should be given priority.

The mission did not receive new information on plans for a hydroelectric dam in Stiegler's Gorge, inside the property. This dam project has been under consideration for a long time but the mission was unable to confirm reports that the project is again under consideration. On the issue of the Tunduru-Songea road, the mission was informed that it is situated 60 km south of the property and therefore will not impact on the property. The mission was also informed that measures have been taken to ensure that the wildlife corridor to the Niassa Game Reserve in Mozambique is maintained, although no detailed assessment of this was done by the mission.

With regard to the question of the effective management of wildlife populations, the mission noted that the hunting industry plays a indispensable role in the management of the property, and its surrounding buffer zones, through the development of infrastructure, patrolling of hunting blocks, provision of information on wildlife and human activities, and the generation of significant amounts of income for the Government of Tanzania, local communities and potentially for the management of the property. The mission considers that the future management of hunting requires a number of improvements to ensure sustainable management of the wildlife resources. The mission further concluded that in spite of the fact that the legal framework for community management of wildlife resources has been created a decade ago, examples of successful community based wildlife management around property remain rare. The mission report includes a number of concrete recommendations on improving wildlife management and monitoring, which are also integrated into the draft decision. The mission reviewed the results of the different wildlife surveys that have taken place since the inscription of the property and noted with concern that, despite the recent increases in the Selous elephant population, significant declines were reported for several other wildlife species during the 2006 aerial survey. However several people met by the mission suggested that this may be related to technical problems with the set up and implementation of the survey, rather than real population declines. The mission team received reports from different stakeholders that poaching pressure is again on the increase, in particular elephant poaching. Survey results clearly show that the elephant population is stable and there is no evidence that the reported poaching incidents are as yet having a negative impact on the overall population. However, it is important for the State Party to react decisively to indications of increasing poaching pressure to avoid a future negative impact on the elephant populations.

While limited information was provided during the mission on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 mission, the State Party report did provide some information on this. The most important impediment to ensure proper management of the property and the implementation of the recommendations continues to be the lack of sufficient funding. This is mainly due to the interruption of the Revenue Retention Scheme since 2004, which ensured a 50% retention of revenue accrued from tourism and hunting. In addition, SGR has been receiving less donor support, in particular as a result of the termination of the GTZ project which supported the rehabilitation of the Reserve. This is resulting in a reduced management capacity of the Wildlife Division, which is lacking human and financial resources, equipment and infrastructure at the time outside pressures seem again on the increase. Senior staff of the Wildlife Division and the Ministry for Natural Resources and Tourism informed the mission that discussions are underway with the Ministry of Finance to restore the Revenue Retention Scheme.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned with the different ongoing and planned activities inside the property which are incompatible with its World Heritage status. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN strongly recommend that the Government of Tanzania makes a clear commitment to stop on-going activities and to not to allow any new proposed developments and to comply with the requirements of the *Operational Guidelines*. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that any decision to allow for oil exploration inside the property, would present a case for possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines*. While satisfied with the assessment of the mission that the Outstanding Universal Value of property continues to be maintained, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned that the capacity of the Wildlife Division to manage the property is decreasing, mainly as a result of insufficient financial resources, at the time when pressures such as poaching are increasing again.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.8

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.3**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes the conclusion of the World Heritage Centre / IUCN monitoring mission that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property appears to be intact but that pressures on the property are again increasing;
4. Expresses its utmost concern about the on-going mineral exploration within the property, as well as planned oil exploration activities and potential dam projects inside the property;
5. Regrets that the State Party did not follow the procedure outlined in Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and urges the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre of all planned activities within and in the vicinity of the property which could impact its Outstanding Universal Value, including dam and mining projects, and provide an Environmental Impact Assessment before taking a decision on these projects;
6. Reiterates its position that mineral exploration, mining, oil exploration and exploitation are incompatible with the World Heritage status, in line with the international policy statement of the International Council of Minerals and Metals (ICMM) of not undertaking these activities in World Heritage properties; and considers that any decision to go forward with the oil exploration inside the property would constitute a clear case for inscribing Selous Game Reserve on the List of World Heritage in Danger;
7. Recalls that any request of change of boundaries of the property should be submitted to the World Heritage Committee, in accordance with paragraphs 163-165 of the Operational Guidelines;
8. Also urges the State Party to implement as soon as possible the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 missions, in particular:
 - a) Reinforce the capacity of the management authority, the Wildlife Division, to manage the property, in particular by increasing its human and financial resources and by reinstating the Revenue Retention Scheme,
 - b) Strengthen the implementation of the General management plan (GMP) and ensure regular and independent evaluations of its implementation,
 - c) Develop a detailed Tourism Strategy for the property, in line with the recommendations and principles outlined in the GMP, with a clear vision for both consumptive and non-consumptive tourism,
 - d) Further optimize the wildlife management in and around the property, by:
 - (i) Developing a transparent system for allocating hunting blocks,
 - (ii) Establishing hunting quotas in a transparent way based on improved scientific and technical information systems,
 - (iii) Improving ecological monitoring systems, including the development of integrated databases that capture and analyse existing information from trophy reports provided by hunting companies, ranger patrol reports, anti-

poaching reports and aerial surveys. Such systems would fill information gaps and provide a better basis for wildlife management,

- (iv) Reinforce efforts to further develop community based wildlife management around the Property and draw upon lessons learned from other African countries who have successfully developed community managed wildlife areas,*
 - (v) Enhance the capacity to carry-out anti-poaching activities;*
- 9. Recommends that the property should be managed within the context of the larger Selous ecosystem and that the State Party considers strategic extensions to the property and designation of a formal buffer zone;*
 - 10. Notes with concern the reported significant declines of several species during the 2006 aerial survey of the Selous ecosystem and also recommends that a new survey is undertaken in 2010, involving technical support from the international conservation community and in particular the IUCN Species Survival Commission;*
 - 11. Requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, to further develop the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of integrity, based on the proposal developed by the 2008 monitoring mission, for examination by the Committee at its 34th session in 2010;*
 - 12. Invites the State Party to organize a workshop with the participation of the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and other stakeholders, to discuss the implementation of the above mentioned recommendations. The State Party may wish to request international assistance from the World Heritage Fund to organize this meeting;*
 - 13. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including information on the status of the mining exploration, planned oil exploration and the Kidunda and Stiegler's Gorge dam and on progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 and 2008 monitoring missions, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34 session in 2010.*

9. Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 39)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission report)

10. Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

ARAB STATES

11. Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.9; 31 COM 7B.12; 32 COM 7B.6

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 35,000 for Technical Cooperation

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

No formal monitoring missions. World Heritage Centre missions in the framework of activities in Mauritania in 2002, 2003 and 2004

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal fishing;
- b) Mechanical shellfish harvesting;
- c) Oil exploitation;
- d) Tourism and increased accessibility due to the new Nouadhibou-Nouakchott road;
- e) Lack of management capacity and resources.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/506>

Current conservation issues

In its Decision **32 COM 7B.6**, the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to submit a report on efforts made in relation to the above threats, together with progress towards establishing an oil spill emergency response plan. On 26 February 2009, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. It included information on surveillance, measures to address marine resource over-exploitation and pollution, fisheries, and progress towards the preparation of an oil spill emergency response plan. However, the State Party did not provide an update on its progress in implementing the following previous decisions of the World Heritage Committee:

- a) Seek 'particularly sensitive sea area' (PSSA) status from the International Maritime Organisation;
- b) Progress on mitigation measures for the new Nouadhibou-Nouakchott road;
- c) Monitoring status of the values of the property.

The State Party continues to improve the management capacity at the property through its close collaboration with the Banc d'Arguin Foundation (FIBA) and is currently developing a new plan to replace the existing 2005-2009 management plan. It is noted that this plan could be developed in coordination with the use of the 'Enhancing Our Heritage' (EoH) management effectiveness tool. IUCN's office for West and Central Africa has begun to engage with the management of the property to carry out EoH. The review of the management of the property also offers an opportunity to incorporate the World Heritage Committee's Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction Strategies (Decisions **31 COM 7.2** and **31 COM 7.3**). In 2004, the State Party developed a National Action Plan for Adaptation to Climate Change, which should be considered during the review of the management plan for the property to help incorporate climate change and disaster risk reduction.

In 2008 a financing fund ('fonds fiduciaire') was created to provide sustainable and regular financing to the property. An annual subsidy of 1 million euros from the EU-RIM 2006-2012 fishing agreement has been accorded in recognition of the role of the property in regenerating marine resources. Of this subsidy 30-50% will be reserved for the financing fund of the property.

As the large size of the property makes surveillance challenging, the State Party is engaging with the French remote sensing agency Maison de la Télédétection (MDT) to explore collaboration on monitoring. In addition, with the support of UNESCO and Centre National d'Etude Spatiale CNES, (the French National Centre for Spatial Studies), a proposal is being considered to aid management and develop geographical information systems to help use satellite imagery for monitoring and management.

The State Party reports that in contrast to the maritime area of the property, the terrestrial area has suffered from degradation, reduced vegetation cover and falling wildlife populations, due in part to climatic conditions in the late twentieth century, decreasing rainfall, as well as due to poaching and wood gathering. Terrestrial surveillance consists of carrying out 4 missions in each sector of the property. With assistance of funding from the Principality of Monaco, the property has established a camel patrolling brigade in areas with the highest illegal activities. No specific monitoring information was presented on habitat or wildlife.

The State Party reports that a doctoral thesis on pastoralism in the property has demonstrated that the property contains varied and representative samples coastal pastoral biotopes. The research highlighted the value of this pastoral resource and has led to the hiring of a pastoral ecologist to prepare a management plan for the terrestrial portion of the property. This work is being undertaken in collaboration with the Centre International de Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement (CIRAD) and the results intend to provide information on pastoralism and nomadic populations within the property.

The managers of the property are also working with the Institut Mauritanien de Recherches Océanographiques et des Pêches (IMROP) to monitor fisheries. The managers of the property and IMROP have formed a working group to discuss adaptive management measures with the national fisheries committee, which is made up of fisheries stakeholders including the Imraguen community. This work has led to an agreement, Service note No. 263, which defines fishing seasons, permitted fishing gear and methods and fishing zones. The note also defines monitoring methods and outlines the procedure for fishing vessel inspections.

To contribute to the sustainable management of resources, on-going research is providing the necessary understanding of ecosystem function and biodiversity within the property. To date, 145 fish species have been identified to be targeted by fishermen by either or both trawling and beach sein. Fishing effort within the property has increased by 2.7 % since 1997 leading to an increase in capture from 411 tons to 2,879 tons in 2007. During this period fishing gear and methods and target species have changed. The targeting of rays and sharks using specialized nets has been prohibited since 2004 but species such as meager/ stone bass have increased in importance. However, bycatch of these rays and sharks still occurs. It should be noted that the State Party has not reported whether it considers the fisheries to be in healthy condition and the yield sustainable.

The State Party has increased its capacity to patrol the marine portion of the property. In 2008 it carried out 390 patrol missions over 2250 hours and inspected 172 vessels. Almost 400 km of mono filament nets were seized and burnt and 44% of the missions were carried out at night, representing a significant increase in night surveillance. This maritime surveillance capacity has been increased through a partnership with 'l'Office Français de la Chasse et de la Faune Sauvage.' As a result of increased patrolling, illegal commercial fishing has been significantly reduced.

The two main sources of risk for oil pollution are West Africa international shipping lane and oil extractive industries. While no oil exploitation is permitted inside the property, concessions have been granted outside and adjacent to the property and exploitation has been in operation offshore in Mauritania since 2006. There is no national capacity to respond to an oil spill. The various private oil exploration and exploitation operators have capacity to respond to a level 1 oil spill, and possibly a level 2 oil spills. However, the State Party does not have the experience, institutions, or means to take responsibility particularly for level 2 or 3 oil spill. Initiatives have been launched to develop action plans (PANGRP and POLMAR); however these action plans have not been completed and would not be available for use in an emergency. Any level 2 or 3 spill would require a rapid emergency response from international agencies with the required capacity to combat such spills. The report notes that due to the offshore aspect of the companies involved in the petroleum industry and the number of actors, the State Party and civil society do not have a good understanding of the players/ actors and the functioning of the petroleum industry.

The State Party further notes that it does not have a disaster management system. The IUCN Panel of experts on petroleum has recommended that the concessions and their sectors in proximity to the property represent a high risk to its integrity. As such; the Panel has recommended that no oil exploration take place in Blocks 7, 8, 9, and 10. These recommendations are supported by oceanographic studies on currents. The State Party also notes that oil exploration outside the national jurisdiction of Mauritania could also threaten the property.

The State Party considers that increased research is needed on the interactions between the Canaries current and the upwelling and oceanographic interrelations to understand the risk from oil spills and appropriate required response. A previously identified option would be to use Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA) as a means to alter the international shipping route as well as to strictly regulate and control that only double-hulled vessels use this shipping route thus reducing risks to the property and ecosystem as a whole. The State Party report did not provide information on steps taken towards designation of PSSA in this region.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recognize the efforts of the State Party to manage and monitor the marine portion of the property and to engage with stakeholders and partners. However, several of the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee, particularly relating to the development of an emergency oil spill response plan and monitoring the status of the values of the property, have not been implemented fully.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note with concern the threats to the terrestrial values of the property and encourage the State Party to engage with other States Parties with properties facing similar climate change threats to discuss management adaptation measures to climate change. Similarly, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recognize the very strong partnerships and progress on management within the property and encourage the State Party to share its experiences with other States Parties with marine World Heritage and habitat for migratory bird species.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.11

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.6**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes the State Party's efforts to manage sustainably the marine resources of the property; and establish its fund to ensure sustainable financing for the property;*
4. *Also notes the significant international support of FIBA and international partners and welcomes the partnerships being developed on remote sensing;*
5. *Urges the State Party to complete the «Plan d'Intervention en cas d'Écoulement d'hydrocarbures et de substance chimiques dangereuses » (POLMAR) and to provide a copy to the World Heritage Centre, as soon as possible and preferably before **1 February 2010**;*
6. *Further notes with concern that threats from ongoing low rainfall, which are contributing to a decline in terrestrial habitat and wildlife; and encourages the State Party to assess adaptation measures to respond to climate change;*
7. *Also encourages the State Party to continue and enhance its efforts against poaching and wood harvesting that have degraded the terrestrial portion of the property, and to establish a thorough terrestrial monitoring programme to include wildlife populations, vegetation cover, and threats to the property;*
8. *Requests the State Party to further its efforts to designate a 'particularly sensitive sea area' (PSSA) in and near the property, in recognition of risks from the international West African shipping lane;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the new management plan to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
10. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in addressing the threats to the terrestrial portion of the property and in implementing the previous decisions.*

ASIA-PACIFIC

12. The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) (N 798)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

13. Kaziranga National Park (India) (N 337)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

14. Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

Criteria

(x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.13; 31 COM 7B.17; 32 COM 7B.13

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 80,000 (Enhancing our Heritage project on management effectiveness assessment). The property has benefited from the UNF funded World Heritage India programme from 2008 (enhance management effectiveness and build staff capacity; increase the involvement of local communities in the management of the property and promote their sustainable development; and raise awareness through communications and advocacy).

Previous monitoring missions

March 2005: World Heritage Centre site visit; March 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Inadequate water supply and competition for water with neighbouring communities;
- b) Poor water (quality and quantity) management;
- c) Invasive species (*Prosopis*, *Eichhornia*, *Paspalum*).

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/340>

Current conservation issues

The property is an artificially created and maintained wetland requiring a guaranteed minimum flow of water so that ecosystem functions can be assured. The property's Outstanding Universal Value relates to the wintering Palearctic migrant waterfowl from Afghanistan, Turkmenistan, China and Siberia, and the large populations of resident breeding birds which depend on this ecosystem to complete their life cycles. Various infrastructure projects have been put in place over the years to divert monsoon floodwaters to the property. However, competing demand for water from communities and agriculture surrounding and upstream from the property is leading to more frequent water shortages to the property, particularly when the monsoon rains are weaker than normal. During a regular monsoon, existing water diversion infrastructure continues to assure sufficient water supply to the property.

The World Heritage Centre received the State Party's report on 11 February. The report provides an update on a) efforts in dealing with the water supply problems, b) eradicating invasive plant species, c) collaborating with local communities, d) monitoring birds and wetlands, e) investing in tourism infrastructure, and f) management and planning activities.

The assessment of key conservation issues, including progress in implementing the requests of the committee and addressing the threats identified in previous reports, is as follows:

a) *Water supply*

At the time of the joint 2008 World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission it was anticipated that the Govardhan Drain project would become operational in time for the arrival of the 2008 monsoon in June. This project would ensure provision of adequate water supply during drought years, and would thus have been in place had the 2008 monsoon rains failed to deliver. According to the State Party, progress on this important project has been delayed: the Planning Commission only approved the project in August 2008 and the budget for works was only approved by the Government of Rajasthan in January 2009. The infrastructure for the diversion of water from the Govardhan Drain to the property is currently estimated to be completed some time in 2009.

The State Party reported that the Dholpur-Bharatpur drinking water supply project is due to be completed in October 2009. This project will provide regular, but limited quantities of water, though without the critical biological components of other water sources (fish fry, nutrients, other). Though the report provides no information on the 2008 water supply situation, separate sources reveal that the 2008 monsoon rains were normal, thus avoiding the consequences of water shortages that would otherwise have occurred due to the incomplete Govardhan Drain project.

b) *Invasive species*

At the time of the 2008 reactive monitoring mission approximately 10 sq km (of a total of 11 sq km) of the invasive plant *Prosopis juliflora* had been removed by local communities through agreements to use the up-rooted plants after their removal, and work was continuing on the removal of last stands. Though widely considered as a conservation success at the national level, the State Party provided no new information on progress in removal of *Prosopis* or on the systematic plan for regular monitoring of its status. Other information sources indicate that a 10 year dedicated workplan was being prepared to ensure continual control of the plant, which was reported to be sprouting again in many areas.

c) *Wildlife monitoring programme*

A bird count was organized on 27 January 2009 which identified 65 of the total 364 species of birds identified in the IUCN Evaluation report. The total count was 33,562 individual birds. However, the State Party did not provide time-series data, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 29th session (Durban, 2005) to be able to assess bird species diversity and population trends. This continued absence of data critical to establishing the state of conservation of the property's Outstanding Universal Value is a barrier to a clear understanding on the level of threat to which it is exposed.

d) *Management and finance*

A draft management plan for the property is reported to have been prepared by the State Party in consultation with stakeholders for the period 2008-2012 but has not been provided.

In recognition of the difficulties that the reduction in the quality of the property's wetland habitats poses to supporting the avian biodiversity values of the property, the World Heritage Centre/ IUCN/UNF Enhancing Our Heritage project completed in 2007 on management effectiveness assessment identified satellite wetlands outside the boundaries of the property that are used by both migratory and resident waterbirds. These wetlands play an important support role in assuring the property's integrity, and the World Heritage Committee recommended in Decision **32 COM 7B.13**, following the recommendations of the 2008 World Heritage Centre / IUCN mission, that more attention be given to this issue. The State Party report does not comment on this matter.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that the property remains in a delicate state of conservation and is particularly fragile given its very small size. Several years of lower than normal water supply have resulted in important ecosystem changes as reported in previous state of conservation reports. Whilst the average 2008 monsoon has reduced the immediate threat to the property, the possibility of further weak monsoon rains and the absence of the necessary water diversion infrastructure means that there is a sustained threat to the property. Changes have already resulted to the property and there is a significant concern over the continued conservation of the integrity of the property, and its capacity to maintain its Outstanding Universal Value. As long as the infrastructure necessary to maintain regular and adequate water supply to the property is not in place, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN believe that the property faces an ascertained danger and should therefore be considered for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in line with the relevant provisions of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.14

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.13**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Regrets that the prescribed water supply measures have not yet been completed and urges the State Party to ensure that the infrastructure requirements necessary to ensure the needs of the property for water supply are completed in 2009;
4. Reiterates its request for the State Party to conduct a detailed study of the trends in the biodiversity values of the property including time series data;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including on the establishment of adequate water supplies, a detailed ecological monitoring report, and the other issues above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

15. Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

16. Gunung Mulu National Park (Malaysia) (N 1013)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2000

Criteria

(vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

26 COM 21B.15

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1013>

Current conservation issues

In June 2008, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN were informed that the State Government of Sarawak may have planned some hydropower projects (2008-2020) in the rainforests of Borneo in Malaysia. The issues of concern include the development of dams that could flood a portion of the property, and the marginalisation of indigenous communities and their land rights within and adjacent to the property. The information was brought to the attention of IUCN and the World Heritage Centre by NGOs, IUCN's network of experts, and online media sources. On 25 June 2008, the Director of the World Heritage Centre requested the Malaysian authorities to clarify the situation and provide further information. No response has been received from the State Party at the time of drafting this report.

a) Dam development

NGOs provided reports in June 2008 of hydro-power development in Sarawak that would flood areas of rainforest including areas within the property which would also affect the traditional lands of indigenous people. Media reports from "The Star" newspaper, dated 24 July 2008, stated that construction of the Tuoh dam could flood the Gunung Mulu World Heritage Site. The reports also stated that the State Government of Sarawak was not required to undergo Federal Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and therefore no public consultation would take place.

b) Indigenous community marginalisation

The World Heritage Committee, at its 25th (Helsinki, 2001) and 26th (Budapest, 2002) sessions recommended that the State Party give due consideration to the involvement of indigenous peoples and other local communities in planning and implementing decisions regarding the extension of the property, and to seek their full co-operation in its management.

Reports received by IUCN in May 2008, indicate conflict between indigenous Berawan people and both management of the property and tourism developers. Examples of this conflict include lack of compensation for traditional land rights obtained for construction and expansion of hotel development e.g. the Royal Mulu Resort, on land which has traditionally belonged to the Berawan people. Apparently little progress has been made in dispute resolution and there has been no government investigation of the claims of the indigenous peoples to compensation or efforts to stop tourism development in lands adjacent to the property. Reports received also claim that participation as tourist guides and other aspects of sharing in the benefits of tourism and World Heritage designation are not available to the

indigenous groups. If these reports were confirmed, this lack of engagement of local communities could threaten the effectiveness of management and impact the integrity of the property.

In line with the World Heritage Strategic Objectives, and in particular to 'Enhance the role of communities in the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*' (Decision **31 COM 13B**) and Paragraph 117 of the *Operational Guidelines*, 'States Parties should [implement effective management] in close collaboration with property managers, the agency with management authority and other partners, and stakeholders in property management.' Furthermore, as per Paragraph 119 of the *Operational Guidelines* on sustainable use within the property, these should be 'ecologically and culturally sustainable.' The World Heritage Centre and IUCN find the potential flooding of the property by dam development to represent a potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property. These activities would also threaten the local communities and sustainable use of the property going against the strategic objectives of the *Convention* and the maintenance of its integrity.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN encourage the State Party to respond to these concerns and clarify the status of these dams and projects.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.16

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **26 COM 21B.15**, adopted at its 26th session (Budapest, 2002),
3. Takes note of the reports of on-going conflict of land rights within and adjacent to the property which, if not urgently resolved, could threaten the effectiveness in managing the property and impact its integrity;
4. Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed on the above allegations concerning unresolved claims of traditional land use as well as on ways in which the State Party and the management authority of the property have been engaging with community leaders to effectively resolve conflicts surrounding land rights and benefit sharing from tourism;
5. Also requests the State Party, in line with the provisions under paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to provide information on development of dams in the region surrounding the property and to carry out an assessment of potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property;
6. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a progress report on the above issues, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

17. Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

18. Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) (N 653)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1993

Criteria

(vii) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.13; 30 COM 7B.16; 31 COM 7B.20

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 118,800 for Preparatory, Training and Technical Assistance.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

December 2007: World Heritage Centre mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Over-exploitation of marine resources;
- b) Illegal and destructive fishing;
- c) Oil exploration

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/653>

Current conservation issues

This state of conservation report was requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) in relation to the above threats. The concerns of the World Heritage Committee related in particular to the management and protection of the property which was subject to insufficient funding for effective management and enforcement against illegal fishing. The World Heritage Committee also requested the State Party to submit a re-nomination to extend the property to include the expanded National Park. This re-nomination

has been evaluated by IUCN and will be examined by the World Heritage Committee during its 33rd session in 2009 (see Document WHC-09/33.COM/8B).

On 9 February 2009, a report on the state of conservation of the existing, unextended property was submitted by the State Party. This describes the ongoing management operations and progress in implementing the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee. Ecological information was provided in the above-mentioned nomination dossier for extension of the property and in supplementary documentation provided by the State Party during the subsequent IUCN evaluation. Based on a review of this material and the IUCN evaluation mission, a number of key issues are identified.

a) Legal protection

The property is entirely a no-take fishing zone. The Tubbataha Protected areas Bill, which will delineate a buffer zone to the property, has received its second reading in Congress and the Tubbataha Management Office is working closely with partners to communicate its importance. The 10 nautical mile buffer zone proposed in the Bill will help to mitigate risks from any exploration or exploitation in the oil concession area adjacent to the property. A new map showing the boundaries of the oil concession area is expected from the Department of Energy.

Shipping vessel traffic is high around Tubbataha. There is a risk of shipping causing damage to the reefs through collision, pollution or introduction of marine invasive species. There are already several shipwrecks. Designation as a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA) would offer added protection and increased awareness of the vulnerability of the property to marine traffic. Discussions are underway with the Coastguard service to promote the Sulu Sea for designation as PSSA.

b) Illegal fishing

Illegal fishing continues to affect the property but there are signs of more effective management of this threat. In the period March 2006 to December 2008 the site management carried out 38 arrests involving 314 fishers. One of these incidents involving Chinese nationals has already been reported to the World Heritage Committee, although the court cases continue. Most illegal fishers are Philippine nationals and many target the top shell *Trochus* for the international market. Costs for enforcement increased from PHP80,000 (USD 1,660) in 2006 to PHP 500,000 (USD 10,300) in 2008. This increase in costs diverts funds away from other management and monitoring activities. There is a need to allocate more funding to education about benefits of the property and to raise awareness to prevent illegal fishing. Micro-credit activities are already underway in Caganyancillo, which has had the benefit that no illegal fishers have recently been apprehended from there. That the majority of illegal fishers are from Roxas suggests that targeting education and livelihood activities there could reduce illegal fishing overall in the property. Research by Conservation International - Philippines has identified the installation of fish aggregating devices outside but near to the boundary of the property. These devices can attract fish to leave the reserve where they can be caught, may disturb migratory species especially marine mammals and have been documented to lose their moorings and damage the reef inside the property. Preventing this could be a specific requirement of a buffer zone for the property.

The Palawan provincial government has concluded a memorandum of agreement with the management authority for the property and this guarantees that regular funding will be provided annually, which should help to reduce the difficulty in obtaining sufficient annual funds. Progress towards increasing an Endowment Fund is being made and will require more international assistance. WWF Philippines and Conservation International continue to help the property in terms of research and contributions, including most recently, the provision of more vessels to aid patrolling.

Funding and training for monitoring is limited and relies largely on partner organizations, particularly WWF Philippines and visiting researchers with help from volunteers. To date this research has identified on-going risks to the property from coral bleaching related to El Niño Southern Oscillation climatic phenomenon, physical damage from increased storm frequency, and crown-of-thorn starfish outbreaks. The most recent coral surveys for the property indicate hard coral cover ranging from 27% to 62% with the highest levels of cover in deeper reef areas. There has been a slight increase in cover between 2004 and 2008. Resilience to these threats would be enhanced if other stresses were reduced on the property, such as illegal fishing.

Initial seabird monitoring results based on minimum counts of breeding adult seabirds suggest declines in the period 1981-2006, including 83% for brown booby, 18% for great crested tern, 67% for sooty tern, 87% for brown noddy. In contrast, there have been significant increases in adult breeding counts of red-footed booby and black noddy. Rangers stationed in the property are conducting monthly bird monitoring and ad-hoc marine mammal recording. Observations suggest that the red-footed booby and black noddy may be out-competing other species. Erosion of Bird islet is also occurring, and further monitoring of sediment processes on the sand islets is recommended.

Total fish biomass indicates a statistically significant positive trend since 1998. Biomass of commercial fish species has also increased in the same period, however the April 2008 field study noted relatively few tuna and mackerel, which may be attributed to the impacts of fishing pressures in the wider region. Large marine species such as shark, turtle, napoleon wrasse and bumphead parrotfish all suggest positive trends over time, indicating a healthy reef system.

Plastic debris is a source of concern and increasingly evident within the property. Lightweight plastics affect surface waters within the property, materials wash up on beaches are used by birds when nesting. Dead wildlife has been found with ingested plastic. Plastic materials also become caught on the reef itself. These materials are likely to be a combination of land-based pollutants washing off from land and also from the heavy vessel traffic passing through the Sulu Sea.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that significant progress has been achieved by the State Party with its partners to implement the recommendations of the Committee and progress towards sustainable financing should continue. However illegal fishing continues to pose a threat to the integrity of the property and the oil exploration activities near to the property should also be closely monitored by the State Party. Continued collaboration with conservation organizations and research institutions to monitoring and better understand the role of Tubbataha in the Sulu Sea marine ecosystem is also important. The importance of marine conservation to food security and livelihoods should also be communicated to communities in the region by increasing understanding of the role of a no-take protected area in providing source of fish and decapods larvae to the eastern coast of Palawan, enriching fisheries in the area.

The World Heritage property of Tubbataha was mentioned within a petition drawing attention on the impact of black carbon on World Heritage properties around the world, which was addressed to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN in January 2009. This issue is addressed within the introduction of Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B*. A letter was sent by the World Heritage Centre to the State Party in March 2009 to inform it of this petition.

The World Heritage Centre draws the attention of the World Heritage Committee and the State Party to the fact that, in the event that the extension of the nominated property is agreed by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session (see Document *WHC-09/33.COM/8B*), the Decision noted below (**33 COM 7B.18**) would be superseded by the

extension of the property, and therefore would need to be read in conjunction with the Decision regarding the extension of the property (**33 COM 8B.3**).

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.18

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.20**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes the efforts of the State Party in the management of the property and the strong commitment of NGOs to providing financial assistance, research and monitoring and capacity-building activities to support the property;
4. Welcomes the inter-agency cooperation at the Provincial and National levels to support the property and encourages these stakeholders to continue this work particularly towards improving enforcement and halting illegal fishing activities, assessing relevance of designation of Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA) for the region surrounding the property, and ensuring sustainable financing;
5. Regrets that illegal fishing continues to affect the property, and urges the State Party to continue to seek ways to increase compliance, particularly among fishermen from Roxas;
6. Requests the State Party to put in place a programme of ecological monitoring of the property, particularly the effect of climatic events on sea surface temperature and coral bleaching, storm frequency and other factors that could be related to climate change;
7. Also requests the State Party to develop a tourism strategy in collaboration with stakeholders and fishing community to ensure that increased tourism does not impact the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress in reducing illegal fishing activities, provision of adequate funding for the management of the property and the other issues noted above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

19. East Rennell (Solomon Islands) (N 854)

See Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

20. Ha Long Bay (Viet Nam) (N 672 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994; extended in 2000

Criteria

(vii) (viii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

27 COM 7B.13; 28 COM 15B.13; 30 COM 7B.17

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property (up to 2008): USD 152,987 for management planning support, equipment and training.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property (recently): USD 100,000 under the Youth Volunteers for Cultural Heritage Preservation project (2003-2006); USD 519,000 for Cua Van Floating Cultural Centre, a component of the Ha Long Ecomuseum (funded by the Government of Norway, for the period of 2003-2006).

Previous monitoring missions

January 2003 and December 2006: UNESCO/IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Population growth;
- b) Increased tourism pressure and development;
- c) Urban and industrial development;
- d) Lack of financial and technical resources;
- e) Absence of an integrated planning approach.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/672>

Current conservation issues

This report has been prepared in response to the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **31COM 7B.23**. The World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to provide information on the state of conservation of the property, focusing in particular on the extent and effectiveness of implementation of the existing policies and plans as well as the capacity building project, and any direct or indirect impacts of the construction of the new coastal highway. The decision also requested the State Party to withdraw permission granted to operate jet-skis within the property, and to reconsider and cancel the plans to develop a tourism resort on Lam Bo Island and major infrastructure in the Cua Van

floating village. The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property which was received by the World Heritage Centre on 10 February 2009.

The State Party reports that the Quang Ninh Provincial People's Committee approved a series of investment priority projects on 29 April 2008 that respond to the approved Master Plan to 2020 for management, conservation and promotion of Ha Long Bay. Although detail is in general not provided on the projects, nor specific budgets, these appear to include a range of actions that are positive including capacity building, education, scientific surveys and the restoration of coral reefs. Some other projects listed include improvements to boating channels, dredging and improvements to tourism sites.

The State Party reports on actions in relation to a number of activities. It notes that 2,214 people currently live in three floating villages within the property. The State Party has recognised the historical existence of fishermen, as well as the need to minimise growth of their settlements. The State Party also notes that inadequate waste management systems, low levels of awareness and illegal settlement remain challenges. Challenges with aquaculture include the continued need for action against illegal floating farms, and the State Party reports that there is over-exploitation of marine resources. Continued regulation is reported on in relation to coal production and processing.

427 tourism boats are reported as operating within the property, which are all subject to regulated waste water and solid waste collection. The quality of these vessels is said to be improving. The report also notes a series of actions to enhance environmental protection in the property, which include a significant investment in monitoring equipment, waste treatment and awareness raising campaigns and strengthened enforcement.

The report notes that the institutional strengthening project, carried out with support of the World Heritage Fund, will be finalised in October 2009, and has been implemented in partnership with the country offices of UNESCO and IUCN.

In relation to the requests of the World Heritage Committee, the State Party indicates that it has issued a law banning jet-ski operation in the property since July 2007. The State Party also cancelled the construction on Lom Bo Island, although it notes that a study of the values of this island is still being pursued, which could lead to eco-tourism development. It also reports that no further infrastructure has been constructed at Cua Van Floating Centre.

The report also mentions three significant developments which are understood to be located outside the property, but could affect its values: the construction of a highway in Ha Long City, which includes significant coastal defences, the Cam Pha Cement Plant and the Cal Lan Port, where an expanded port with dredged channels has come into operation.

The report of the State Party provides very few details of any of these developments and no specific information on their impacts.

The State Party report also includes an analysis of the achievements and shortcomings of the management of the property, and indicates commitments to the implementation of a range of conservation and management activities. The challenges noted by the State Party include slower progress than desired, limited effectiveness of restoration activity and difficulties with enforcement. The report attributes these shortcomings to the combination of the large socio-economic challenges, the variety of actors, the rapid economic growth of the area, lack of comprehensive legal and management tools, and a need for further management capacity.

In the view of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, the State Party report provides a good indication of both significant progress, and substantial challenges that will be part of the long term management of this property. The State Party is making concerted efforts to address these challenges, however these efforts will need to be sustained and increased in future. The banning of jet-skis and the cancellation of the Lom Bo development are positive, although it is important that even eco-tourism development on Lom Bo that is currently being assessed is not permitted, unless it has been confirmed that it will not impact on the values

of the property. The location of the Cua Van Cultural Centre remains problematic, due to the sensitive location in a flooded doline, and in principle this could be better located in a less sensitive place. However it is welcome that there has been no reported further development of the infrastructure since the last report on the property.

In these circumstances the property would seem to be an ideal candidate for a concerted application of a “management effectiveness programme”, coupled with a coordinated investment of financial support from the State Party and international partners, in order to assist the management of the property to move to a higher level, and to further enhance the capacity of the Ha Long Bay Management Board. The regulation of boat traffic remains a key issue and the replacement of diesel engine boats is also seen as a key priority. It is also increasingly questioned whether Ha Long Bay is providing the world-class tourism experience it should represent, and more careful attention to the quality of the experience offered to visitors and the management of public use and interpretation is required.

The values of the property will also remain under significant pressure from economic development activities, and the continued issues of pollution and waste management. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider in particular that the impacts of adjacent development are underestimated and given insufficient attention in the State Party report, and the rapidly growing amount of land filling to the north of the property is of significant concern and is beginning to reduce the quality of experience of Ha Long Bay, and threatening its Outstanding Universal Value. The routine application of Environmental Impact Assessment, to international standards of best practice, of all significant developments is urgently required, which could influence the decisions taken by the various bodies who regulate and manage some key pressures on the property. Finally the integration of the management of the property into a broader programme of Integrated Coastal Zone Management, linking the work of Quang Ninh Province and Hai Phong City would also be of benefit.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that, in the context of establishing effective wider protection for the property and stronger coastal conservation and management, there might also be the possibility to argue for greater international recognition of coasts, seas and islands through either the UNESCO Biosphere programme, or possibly through the eventual extension of the World Heritage property.

The ongoing partnership between the State Party with UNESCO and IUCN in the management of the property could provide a focus for a more concerted programme of support through the World Heritage Committee. Given the high profile of Ha Long Bay, the property could provide a focus for training and development of good practice within the wider region. At present however the range of concerns and pressures mean that the property is not yet living up to this potential.

Regular updates and increased monitoring of the activities adjacent to and within the property appears to be an essential requirement to enable the World Heritage Committee to remain informed on the state of conservation of the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.20

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **26 COM 21B.10**, adopted at its 26th session (Budapest, 2002),*

3. *Notes the progress made by the State Party in the management of the property, including the banning of jet-skis and the cancellation of the tourism project on Lam Bo;*
4. *Takes note of the need to continue to protect the values of Lam Bo from tourism development, and to ensure that revised plans for eco tourism activities are not implemented unless supported by a thorough and objective environmental assessment;*
5. *Recommends that the future of the Cua Van cultural centre be carefully assessed, and a plan developed to ensure its sustainable operation in an appropriate location, including consideration to the relocation of the Cua Van Cultural Centre to a less sensitive location in the buffer zone of the property;*
6. *Expresses its strong concern that the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property remain under pressure due to tourism, fishing and other activities within its boundaries, and from major economic development projects and landfill activities in the areas surrounding the property;*
7. *Requests the State Party to ensure that no development having a significant direct or indirect impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property take place, and to:*
 - a) *Strictly enforce the protective legislation for the property, and to ensure all developments that could impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property are subject to rigorous Environment Impact Assessment to internationally accepted standards of best practice which consider the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property*
 - b) *Further reinforce the Ha Long Bay Management Board and in particular to enhance its capacity through additional staff and financial resources in relation to:*
 - (i) *the monitoring of impacts on the property,*
 - (ii) *the regulation of use,*
 - (iii) *the regulation of threats from outside the property including development and landfill projects, waste, fisheries, and the management of visitors;*
8. *Recommends that the State Party carries out a management effectiveness assessment for the property, considering the model provided by the UNESCO/IUCN/UNF Enhancing Our Heritage methodology, and to also put in place a three year programme to implement the outcomes of this assessment;*
9. *Also recommends that the State Party consider requesting International Assistance to support the assessment and enhancement of the management effectiveness of the property;*
10. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the recommendations set out above, and especially to provide information on the landfill and other major developments taking place outside the boundaries of the property, and the assessments that have been made on their impacts, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

21. Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1983

Criteria

(vii) (viii) (ix)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.21; 29 COM 7B.23; 31 COM 7B.27

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 15,000 for Preparatory Assistance

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2002, 2004: Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring missions

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Developments in the Bansko ski zone
- b) Lack of effective management mechanisms
- c) Boundary issues
- d) Illegal logging

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/225>

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/32COM/documents/>
(Document *WHC-08/32.COM/INF.8B2*)

Current conservation issues

This state of conservation report follows up on issues that were not considered at the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee for procedural reasons, as the extension of the property was withdrawn by the State Party. This report is also based on further information received from the State Party on 28 January 2009 in response to a letter from the World Heritage Centre.

Pirin National Park (PNP) has had a long history of discussion by the World Heritage Committee in relation to concerns regarding the impacts of ski development adjacent to and

within the property. An extension was put forward for consideration to the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee (Quebec City, 2008) addressed to the key conservation issues already identified within the property. The extension was recommended by IUCN for approval following the full IUCN evaluation process. Eventually the proposed extension was withdrawn by the State Party, and this also prevented the state of conservation issues noted within the existing property from being discussed. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have agreed that, as a matter of procedure, in future all properties with state of conservation issues that are also nominated for extension, be considered by the World Heritage Committee under both the Agenda items on Nominations (item 8B) and state of conservation (item 7B). The situation is further complicated as the State Party has resubmitted the previously withdrawn extension following further community consultation, and this extension now re-enters the IUCN evaluation process and will be presented for the consideration of the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

In September 2008, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN received a letter from a coalition of 11 national and international NGOs drawing attention to a number of their concerns regarding PNP. These included *inter alia*, exclusion of territories from the World Heritage property that have been subject to ski development, a new authorization of ski development in violation of the current management plan, changes to the management plan by the consultative committee to the PNP that would facilitate ski development, a lack of enforcement and a reduction in the budget of PNP.

The State Party responded by letter from the Ministry of Environment and Water (MoEW) addressing the different points in detail. The exclusion of areas was considered in IUCN's 2008 evaluation of the withdrawn extension. IUCN found that there were areas that had indeed been developed for skiing, creating a significant impact on the values of the existing property. Now that the extension proposal has been reinstated, the question of these excluded areas should again be considered by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

In relation to the authorization of new development, the MoEW notes that an approval was recommended by the Regional Governor of Blagoevgrad in relation to a proposed development of a ski and golf complex by a private organization, the Balkanstroy Company, which would affect PNP and potentially be a critical impact to its values. The MoEW asserts that this development is not permissible considering the legal protection of the national park, and European legislation. The MoEW also states that there was no ongoing construction within the property at the time of the letter, although it is not clear that there is no possibility of such construction. IUCN noted in its 2008 evaluation that past development had taken place in the property beyond legal permissions, and is concerned that this matter is addressed as a key issue by the State Party. IUCN also considered that continued further development of ski facilities or extension of the tourism zones within the existing property would adversely affect its Outstanding Universal Value and integrity, and would lead to a situation where deletion of the property from the World Heritage List would need to be considered.

The MoEW also confirms that the consultative committee to PNP recommended a decision to alter the Park management plan in favor of further ski development. Such a decision would clearly not be in the interests of the conservation of PNP and would likely result in further loss of the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of this property. However, the State Party report asserts that no process to amend the management plan in such a way has been undertaken, and that the consultative committee does not have an executive role in this matter.

The MoEW notes that there has been a reduction in State funding for the PNP Directorate but points to a significant increase in funds from other sources. The detailed impact of these changes is not clear, thus it would be essential to understand clearly the level and use of existing and new funds to make sure that essential tasks related to the planning, management, environmental and enforcement of planning laws are properly resourced.

The summary view of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN is that there remains a significant cause for concern regarding the continued pressure for even greater ski development in PNP. Whilst the stated intention of the State Party to resist this appears clear, the reality on the ground cannot be assessed. The key points that need to be verified include the following requirements:

- That the legal protection of PNP and the authority of the MoEW to implement this protection are both clear and effectively applied;
- That the spatial limits for ski development are clearly defined, have not been extended within the boundaries of PNP, and will be respected in the future;
- That land use planning, Environmental Impact Assessment is used consistently for decisions taking in relation to all proposals for development and activities within and outside the boundaries of PNP;
- That these responsibilities are shared with, are translated to all other levels of national, regional and local governance that might impact on the Park, and that the interests of PNP are also represented in decision taking on developments that could impact on it but are located outside its boundaries;
- That there is sufficient and increased capacity of the MoEW to implement its role effectively and this work is adequately resourced. In this regard the recent decrease in core budget for PNP should be reinstated to fully ensure the effective functioning of the protection regimes for the property.

These matters should be addressed as an intrinsic part of the forthcoming IUCN evaluation mission to the property, and this mission should provide the basis for both an evaluation of the extension, and as a state of conservation report on the existing property, which should both be considered by the World Heritage Committee at the 34th session in 2010.

Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies recommend that a state of conservation report on (unextended) properties should always be prepared, when those properties are both evaluated for an extension and examined by the World Heritage Committee for issues affecting the existing unextended property. This process would ensure that the withdrawal of the extension does not prevent the existing state of conservation issues faced by the property from being discussed by the World Heritage Committee.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.21

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.27**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Also recalling that the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property have been repeatedly and significantly impacted by the development of ski facilities and extension of tourism zones, to the extent that the property may be considered for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger,*

4. Notes that the State Party has resubmitted a proposed extension for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010;
5. Considers that continued ski development is a critical threat to the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property;
6. Strongly urges the State Party to ensure that no further development of ski facilities or extension of the tourism zones takes place within the property, and to ensure all necessary steps to provide for rigorous enforcement of protection and planning requirements within Pirin National Park, and in relation to developments that could affect it located outside its boundaries;
7. Requests IUCN, in carrying out its evaluation of the proposed extension of the property, to also consider the state of conservation of the existing property, and to review and advise whether the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property, as currently inscribed on the World Heritage List, have been negatively affected by the recent development;
8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, with particular reference to its effective protection from inappropriate development and human use within and beyond its boundaries, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

22. Waterton Glacier International Peace Park (Canada / United States of America) (N 354 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995

Criteria

(vii) (ix)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

19 COM VIII.1 A.1

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/354>

Current conservation issues

This state of conservation report is presented by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN following the receipt of extensive correspondence relating to the potential impact of proposed mining development in the Elk and Flathead Valleys of southeast British Columbia, Canada. This property has also received considerable attention relating to the threat of climate change to its integrity and values. This is the first report to be presented to the World Heritage Committee since the property was inscribed in 1995.

On 9 April 2009, the State Party of the United States of America responded to the World Heritage Centre. No response has been received from the State Party of Canada at the time of finalising this report.

a) Mining

It should be noted that concerns surrounding the potential impact of mining were already identified in the Periodic Report submitted by the State Party in 2004. On 1 May 2008, the State Party of Canada clarified that the government of British Columbia would not allow coalbed methane gas exploration by BP in Flathead Valley. Regarding the coal mining by Cline Corporation, the State Party informed the World Heritage Centre that the Comprehensive Study required under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act had yet to be completed and that a draft scoping study would be released for public consultation later in 2008.

The letter of the State Party of the United States of America notes, inter alia, that risks to the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property from the potential for mining, gas or oil production in the Canadian portion of the Flathead Valley would 'continue to exist indefinitely unless these lands are protected from resource development.' The State Party of the United State of America noted earlier findings of scientists and land managers that extraction operations in the upper Flathead Basin 'could not be fully mitigated and would result in some level of impairment or degradation' of the property. The impacts expected included 'loss of fisheries, water quality, biodiversity, wildlife habitat and species connectivity.'

The State Party of the United State of America also draws attention to the analysis of the International Joint Commission (IJC) which examined a previous mining proposal in the Flathead River Basin in 1988. The IJC was 'particularly cognizant of the potential risk of unusual events such as the failure of waste dumps and settling ponds' and considered that these represented 'an unacceptable risk' to the river basin.

The State Party of the United State of America reports that a baseline study in the Flathead Basin and comparative study will be completed in 2012 between the Flathead River and the Elk River, and considers that this study should be concluded 'before any development activities move to the approval or permitting stage. The Outstanding Universal Value and the ecological integrity of Waterton-glacier International Peace Park as recognized by the World Heritage Committee must be assured before any development is authorized.'

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note similar concerns have been received by non-governmental organisations in the United States of America and in Canada, including calls for the property to be added to the List of World Heritage in Danger. On 26 June 2008, a coalition of NGOs petitioned the World Heritage Committee to include the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The petitioners raised concern over the proposed coal open-pit mining and the coalbed methane extraction. The petition described potential impacts from open-pit mining to include reduced air quality, increased noise pollution affecting behaviour of migratory wildlife, reduced water quality from possible leaching and spillage of mine tailings and from settling ponds. Reduced water quality was asserted to pose a particular risk to threatened and endangered fish.

On 26 January 2009 the Flathead Basin Commission submitted a petition to the World Heritage Centre to add Waterton-Glacier International Glacier International Peace Park to the List of World Heritage in Danger. This petition was further supported by the Montana Chapter of the American Fisheries Society. The petition notes the potential serious adverse impacts to the property and adjacent ecosystem from industrial energy development and mining proposals in the headwaters of the Flathead River. The petition also notes that exploration programmes for gold, copper and phosphate were conducted in 2008 and additional work is planned for 2009.

b) Climate Change

Concerns over the impact of climate change on the property were identified in Section II of the last cycle of Periodic Reporting on the property. This stated that the 'park glaciers have shrunk dramatically over the past century; and that the park's tree line is creeping higher in elevation; that the alpine tundra zone is shrinking, and that subalpine meadows are filling in with tree species.' The States Parties have an established climate monitoring programme that stated in the Periodic Report to 'help clarify the impacts of climate change on the park and thus help prompt action by States Parties to slow or reverse this global problem.'

In 2006, the International Environmental Law Project of Lewis and Clark Law School, Oregon, led a group of NGOs to submit a petition to the World Heritage Committee for inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger as a result of Climate Change. On 29 January 2009, the NGOs Earthjustice and the Australian Climate Justice Program submitted a petition, entitled "The Role of Black Carbon in Endangering World Heritage Sites Threatened by Glacial Melt and Sea Level Rise" to the World Heritage Committee. The petition 'calls on the World Heritage Committee to take action to protect the Outstanding Universal Values of World Heritage Sites most vulnerable to global warming.' Properties protecting glaciers were highlighted in particular, including Waterton Glacier International Peace Park. The World Heritage Centre transmitted a copy of the 2009 Earth Justice and Australian Climate Justice Program Black Carbon petition to the States Parties whose properties were mentioned within it for comment.

The 2006 'Petition to the World Heritage Committee requesting inclusion of Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger as a result of climate change and for protective measures and actions' noted evidence that:

"Average summer temperatures have increased 1.66°C between 1910 and 1980, and precipitation levels have decreased by as much as twenty percent in the area around Waterton-Glacier. Second the loss of more than eighty percent of the park's glaciers is the result of climate change. Since 1850, the area covered by glaciers in the park has decreased by seventy-three percent and continues to decrease." (Executive Summary, 2006)

The 2006 response from the State Party of the United States of America to this petition was that Waterton-Glacier did not warrant addition to the List of World Heritage in Danger, although they acknowledged that the most appropriate role for the World Heritage Committee on the issue of climate change was 'to share and collect information on how to measure and

predict impact of climate change and provide examples of management action that could be taken to mitigate the impacts of climate change so to ensure the ongoing conservation of the Outstanding Universal Values of the World Heritage Sites.’

The 2009 Black Carbon Petition notes that only 27 glaciers, out of the 150 recorded in 1850, remain and these continue to retreat. However, the petition also notes that there has been limited research on the role of deposition of black carbon (in essence soot originating from human energy use) on glaciers and associated precipitation and melt-water. Research in the western United States of America has indicated that soot on snow increases air temperature above the snow by up to 1.2 degrees Fahrenheit.

IUCN notes that monitoring of climate, glaciers and tree-line height show that the ecosystems of the property are responding to climatic change. Adaptive management measures should be taken by the States Parties to optimise the ability of the ecosystem and resident wildlife to adapt to changing condition. Resilience should be maintained by ensuring ecosystem connectivity and genetic diversity and reducing threats and pressures that could increase vulnerability to these rapid changes. Pressures that can reduce the ability for ecosystems to adapt include pollution and habitat fragmentation.

c) Other threats

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that several other threats to the property are also discussed in the 2009 Flathead Basin Petition citing danger from mining. This petition, citing the 2000 report from the Panel on the Ecological Integrity of Canada’s National Parks and the 1980 study by the US National Park Service, identify the following threats: ‘cumulative impacts from proposed highway expansion, conversion of working ranch and forest lands to recreation, commercial and residential developments, clearcut logging, a growing number of low-level sightseeing air tours, invasion of non-native species, and potential extraction of coal, oil and gas resources.’ The petition further discusses the impact of these threats to include ‘fragmented, degraded, and destroyed habitat’ and ‘severe limitation on the movement of wide-ranging species like bears, wolves, deer, and elk,’ and effects of invasive species and degraded water quality on aquatic ecosystems.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the any resource extraction or development in the Canadian headwaters area of the Flathead River poses a potential threat to the property which requires assessment before any license is granted. Though the mining and exploration activities are planned for areas outside the boundaries of the World Heritage property it will be important that the associated infrastructure are planned and developed in a way that ensure no risk to the values of the property, including water quality. The consideration of whether the environmental risk from such proposals could be accepted at all should be addressed within the assessment process. In view of the transboundary nature of the World Heritage property it is also considered essential that there is thorough consultation between both States Parties regarding these assessments. The States Parties are therefore encouraged to increase consultation and collaboration to ensure that the property is protected from development threats. The States Parties are also encouraged to continue and extend their collaboration to implement management that will increase the resilience of the property and conserve its ecosystems and the wildlife populations in the face of climate change

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.22

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **29 COM 11A**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005) on the Periodic Report for North America in which it noted continued excellent cooperation between the States Parties of Canada and the United States of America,
3. Notes the concerns of the State Party of the United States of America regarding the threat to the property from current and planned development and mining activities within the Elk and Flathead Valleys;
4. Also notes the high level of public concern regarding the protection of the property from threats from both mining and climate change;
5. Urges the State Party of Canada not to permit any development or other resource extraction in the upper Flathead River basin until adequate baseline and comparative research has been completed and considered jointly with the State Party of the United States of America;
6. Requests the State Party of Canada to work closely and in consultation with the State Party of the United States of America to take all necessary steps to assess and prevent threats from mining exploration or other activities located outside its boundaries on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property, and in particular to assure the continued quantity and quality of water supplies;
7. Also requests the two States Parties to collaborate on the monitoring of climate change and the development of adaptive management strategies to maximise the resilience of the property to climate change, considering the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property;
8. Further requests the States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a joint report on the environmental impact assessments for mining proposals, progress in developing climate change adaptation strategies for the management of the property, taking into account the broader ecosystem, together with a state of conservation report, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

23. Ilulissat Icefjord (Denmark) (N 1149)

Year of Inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(vii) (viii)

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 14B.8; 31 COM 7B.28

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Tourism impacts;
- b) Hunting and fishing

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1149>

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/arctic/>

<http://www.earthjustice.org/library/references/unesco-black-carbon-petition.pdf>

Current conservation issues

At the time of inscription of this property by the World Heritage Committee at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004), the Committee recommended the State Party to review the protection and management of the property, particularly in relation to hunting, fishing, and tourism activities and to submit a report on progress achieved for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007). Subsequently, a report was submitted and the request addressed. At its 31st session the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party (Decision **31 COM 7B.28**) to provide copies of the revised management plan and new Monitoring Plan, to continue improving and monitoring tourism management to reduce its impact on the property and to implement restrictions on hunting.

In response to the above requests, the State Party provided the report of the Environmental and Nature Agency, Greenland Home Rule, on 12 February 2009 to the World Heritage Centre. The management plan 2009-2014 for the property was also submitted and transmitted to IUCN for review.

The report notes that a comprehensive monitoring plan for the property has been prepared by the Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland (GEUS) and that, a practical framework to implement this is currently being formulated by the Greenland Home Rule and Qaasuitsup Kommunia (former Municipality of Ilulissat). Measures have also been taken to improve and monitor tourism management, including a review of helicopter use in relation to routes, frequency, landing sites and capacity, and the establishment of a wooden pathway to the Sermermiut archaeological site. The report also notes that an Executive Order of 15 June 2007 on the protection of Ilulissat Icefjord endorsed by the Parliament of Greenland, has improved the situation as cruise ships are now not permitted within the property and that anchoring and laying up boats are also prohibited. The quota on halibut fisheries has been reduced (to 8,800 metric tonnes in 2009). These levels are considered to be sustainable by the State Party.

The Executive Order of 2007 also permits traffic only on designated paths from 1 April to 31 October, prohibits vessels above 1,000 gross registered tons and restricts use of tents and

open fires to a maximum of 24 hours in one place. Furthermore, a steering committee has been established with representatives from the Greenland Home Rule, the Heritage Agency of Denmark and the Municipality of Ilulissat Icefjord to improve the management and for the implementation of the management plan.

The management plan submitted aims to minimize threats to the property and ensure sustainable activities including tourism, hunting and fishing and sustainable land use. It also aims to raise awareness about the property.

Concerning pressures from human activities, a doubling in the number of visitors is reported (from 18,000 in 2006 to 35,000 in 2008). It is noted that tourism pressure such as physical damage to the property from increasing visitor numbers, and noise from motorised vehicles, vessels and helicopters remains the important threats to the property and that it is being addressed through the revised management plan. The monitoring plan focuses on the values of the World Heritage property and on the areas experiencing the greatest human impacts.

The report concludes that the assessment of the values of the property in relation to the relevant criteria is adequate, that the site has maintained its integrity since its inscription and that the management has been improved by enhancing legal protection, establishing a steering committee, improving financial resources and finalizing the management plan. The property does not have a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value according to the agreed format for such statements at the present time. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the existing Statement will be updated through the periodic reporting process.

On 29 January 2009, the NGOs Earthjustice and the Australian Climate Justice Program submitted a petition, entitled “The Role of Black Carbon in Endangering World Heritage Sites Threatened by Glacial Melt and Sea Level Rise” to the World Heritage Committee. The petition ‘calls on the World Heritage Committee to take action to protect the Outstanding Universal Values of World Heritage Sites most vulnerable to global warming.’ Properties protecting glaciers were highlighted in particular. The petition suggests mitigation strategies to reduce the production of black carbon- particularly from ship fuel and diesel. IUCN notes that the State Party recognizes the threat to the property from Climate Change in its management plan. The State Party notes that monitoring of climate, glaciers and permafrost areas show that the property is responding to climatic change. IUCN recommends that the State Party develop adaptive management measures to optimise the ability of the ecosystem and resident wildlife to adapt to changing condition. Resilience would be enhanced by ensuring ecosystem connectivity and reducing threats and pressures that could increase vulnerability to climate change.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the enhanced collaboration among Arctic States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*, indigenous peoples and Arctic communities as a follow-up to the “World Heritage and the Arctic” expert meeting (Narvik, Norway, December 2007) and the UNESCO International Expert Meeting on Climate Change and Arctic Sustainable Development: scientific, social, cultural and educational challenges” (Monaco, 3-6 March 2009) and encourage the State Party of Denmark to share the management plan with other stakeholders in the region to promote the sharing of best practice in the management of fragile properties in the Arctic.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.23

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,

2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.28**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes the improved legal protection through the Executive Order of 15 June 2007 and the completion of the management plan 2009-2014 in 2008 and requests the national, regional and local authorities to ensure their implementation;
4. Requests the State Party to collaborate with other States Parties whose World Heritage properties contain glaciers to monitor the impacts on those properties of global climate change, and to develop adaptive management strategies to ensure the long-term protection of the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the properties in response to climate and other environmental change.

24. Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Białowieża Forest (Belarus / Poland) (N 33-627)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979, extension 1992

Criteria

(vii)

Years of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.20; 31 COM 7B.30; 32 COM 7B.20

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1999; March 2004: UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission; October 2008: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal logging;
- b) Excess commercial logging;
- c) Bark beetle infestation of forest;
- d) Alterations of the hydrological regime;
- e) Border fence impeding mammal movements;
- f) Lack of transboundary cooperation;

- g) Ambiguity regarding the boundaries of the property.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/33>

Current conservation issues

In 2006, the World Heritage Committee noted with concern that little progress had been made in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2004 joint UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property, and the need for clarification of the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone (Decision **30 COM 7B.20**). These concerns were repeated by the World Heritage Committee in 2007 (Decision **31 COM 7B.30**). In 2008, the World Heritage Committee noted with concern that part of the property within Belarus had not been managed in a way compatible with its World Heritage status thus potentially affecting the integrity of the property. A further World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission was requested to assess the state of conservation of the property. This mission took place from 20 to 26 October 2008 and met with national and site based authorities on both sides of the international border. The mission report (available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/33/documents/>) provides detailed conclusions and recommendations.

The World Heritage Centre received the state of conservation report from the State Party of Belarus on 21 February 2009, followed by an additional report on progress achieved after the reactive monitoring mission, received on 3 March 2009. The reports indicate that a management plan for the Belovezhskaya Pushcha National Park is to be approved in early 2009, which will consider the issues raised in the mission report, such as the improvement of the hydrological flows and control of the invasive red oak. The State Party also submitted the text of the 2006 cooperation agreement between the two national park authorities, as requested by the World Heritage Committee (**31 COM 7B.30**). The State Party indicated that a study was underway on the need for wildlife corridors, as part of a larger effort to reach an agreement at the national level for the opening up of some portions of the contiguous fence that separates the Polish and Belarus portions of the property. Opening up portions of the fence would reduce fragmentation within the large mammal populations of the property.

The State Party of Poland submitted a separate state of conservation report to the World Heritage Centre, received on 5 February 2009. The report indicates that a task force was currently drafting management principles for the Białowieża forest (which includes and surrounds the existing property) in order to encourage the transition from current forest management practices to an approach which would have a greater nature conservation focus. The results of this task force would form the basis of a possible extension of the property to include areas outside the National Park. The report also refers to a draft high level agreement between the two national governments which would provide the framework for an international body focusing on the property. The report refers to the 2006 cooperation agreement and further emphasizes the efforts to date in ensuring effective cooperation at the site management level, focussing particularly on measures to facilitate the movement of park staff between the two countries.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the property is only inscribed under criterion (vii) and that the States Parties of Belarus and Poland are preparing a re-nomination and extension, which would seek to clarify the boundaries and consider the application of criteria (ix) and (x). The intention is to submit the re-nomination dossier to the World Heritage Centre by 30 September 2009 for a preliminary review.

The mission noted several issues warranting particular attention. The issues of concern include fragmentation of the property by the fencing in Belarus (of particular concern for movement and genetics of large mammal populations) and several networks of vehicular trails, the presence of invasive red oak, and overgrazing of flora by deer and bison. In

addition, an area of 82,371 ha within the boundaries of the property in Belarus is not managed in a way compatible with its World Heritage status.

The IUCN Evaluation report of 1979 noted the size of the nominated property in Belarus as approximately 87,600 ha. The area of the inscribed property is noted in the IUCN Evaluation report on the extension of the property of 1992 as 92,923 ha including 5,316 ha in Poland and 87,607 ha in Belarus. The correct figures for the size of the property have been clarified to be 87,606 ha in Belarus and 5,069 ha in Poland during the joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission. Thus the accurate total area of the property is established as 92,675 ha.

Within the Belarus portion of the property, the mission confirmed that the State Party has been managing the property under the assumption that only a 5,235 ha area, adjacent to the international boundary had been inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1992. Logging activities, which are incompatible with maintaining the property's Outstanding Universal Value and integrity, had been permitted to take place within parts of the actual inscribed boundaries of the property. These logging activities largely ceased in 2004 and most of the property in Belarus has been managed as a strict protection zone since this time. However, it is anticipated that these issues will be considered further within the overall proposed re-nomination and extension of the property.

The mission noted the widespread presence of the alien red oak (*Quercus rubra*) which could pose a displacement risk to the native pedunculate or English oak (*Quercus robur*), though the Belarus State Party report indicates that this issue will be dealt with in the management plan to be adopted. The mission confirmed that the contiguous border fence lies entirely in the control of Belarus authorities. It presents an insurmountable barrier to the movement of larger mammals (bison, wolf and deer). Though it is not considered an urgent threat to the property's Outstanding Universal Value, the mission considers it important to ensure the transboundary movement of fauna over the longer term to ensure the integrity of its wildlife populations. A fairly dense network of forest vehicular access trails was observed, posing a potential barrier to the movement of flora and fauna, or as a means for introduction and/or dispersal of alien species. The mission was informed of overgrazing pressures resulting from a number of grazing animals (bison, deer) in excess of the property's natural carrying capacity despite on-going control efforts. Winter feeding stations are installed to offset these pressures.

The Polish portion of the property, consisting of 5,069 ha within a larger 10,500 ha Polish national park, is in a good state of conservation and appears effectively managed. Tourism is well regulated and presents no risk to the property. The remaining lands of the national park have been under strict conservation regime since 2004 and are currently being considered as part of the re-nomination that is under preparation. The mission considered these lands as having the potential for inclusion into the current property. The national park rests within a much larger forest which is managed by the State Forest Enterprise. However, there is a patchwork approach to conservation in this area, which includes logging, tourism activities and aggressive control measures regarding the naturally occurring spruce beetle. This management does not take into consideration the larger ecosystem processes of the forest. In addition, a lack of coordination between the State Forest Enterprise and the management objectives of the property increases the longer term risk to its integrity, particularly in light of the potential impacts of climate change. A cooperation agreement between the two national park authorities was signed in 2006, though is limited in scope due to the lack of a larger transboundary cooperation agreement at the ministerial level. The Polish State Party reports progress in developing a bi-national framework.

The mission report recommends the States Parties to jointly:

1. Prepare a joint re-nomination focusing on natural criteria (ix) and/or (x) to ensure a review of existing boundaries and inclusion of strict nature reserves to enhance the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property;

2. Develop a joint management framework for the property to define common overall conservation vision and objectives, joint management activities (such as monitoring, research, communications, including strategies to address those issues raised by the World Heritage Committee), and a work plan;
3. Develop and implement an integrated management strategy for the whole forest complex within which the property is located, ensuring connectivity with neighbouring, related ecosystem components;
4. Ensure the participation of National Park Management in Landscape Level Management Processes to ensure the maintenance of the outstanding universal value and integrity of the property;
5. Reduce, through a clear time-bound plan, the total length of the network of forest roads and trails and encourage cooperation between the Polish and Belarusian components of the property to achieve this;
6. Restore natural processes in drained marshes and bogs such as encouraging the role of resident beavers as well as human-based support by direct management activities; and
7. Facilitate transboundary movement of wildlife, particularly large ungulates, across the fence separating both sides of the property to support the establishment of property-wide populations of various ungulate species.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.24

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.20**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes the report of the 2008 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission, and notes with concern that an area of 82,371 ha within the property in Belarus has not been managed in a way compatible with its Outstanding Universal Value and integrity;*
4. *Also notes that there are a number of threats to the property including fragmentation of resulting from fencing of the border and vehicular trails and impacts of invasive red oak, and overgrazing of flora by deer and bison ;*
5. *Welcomes the expressed intent on behalf of both States Parties to jointly prepare a re-nomination for the transboundary property in accordance with Paragraph 166 of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Requests the States Parties to implement the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission, and to:*
 - a) *Develop a joint management framework for the property to define common overall conservation vision and objectives, joint management activities (such as monitoring, research, communications, including strategies to address those issues raised by the World Heritage Committee), and a work plan,*
 - b) *Develop and implement an integrated management strategy for the whole forest complex and within which the property is located, ensuring connectivity with neighbouring, related ecosystem components,*

- c) *Ensure the participation of National Park Management in landscape level Management Processes to ensure the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property,*
 - d) *Reduce, through a clear time-bound plan, the total length of the network of forest roads and trails and encourage cooperation between the Polish and Belarusian components of the property to achieve this,*
 - e) *Restore natural processes in drained marshes and bogs such as encouraging the role of resident beavers as well as human-based support by direct management activities,*
 - f) *Facilitate trans-boundary movement of wildlife, particularly large ungulates, across the fence separating both sides of the property to support the establishment of property-wide populations of various ungulate species,*
7. ***Also requests** the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in addressing the above mentioned issues.*

25. Laurisilva of Madeira (Portugal) (N 934)

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

N/A

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/934>

Current conservation issues

Following a letter by the World Heritage Centre of 19 November 2008, which requested information related to NGO reports on infrastructure development, the State Party provided a detailed response which was received by the World Heritage Centre on 19 February 2009. This provides information on a cable car project at the World Heritage property of the Laurisilva of Madeira prepared by the local authorities.

The report included a summary of the “integrated project for the valorisation of the area of Rabaçal”, as the cable car project is part of a broader initiative for conservation and sustainable use including eco-tourism. This project was entrusted to the Association for the Promotion of the Development of the Western Area (Sociedade Promotora de Desenvolvimento de Zona Oeste) as a part of the implementation of the Plan of the Autonomous Region of Madeira and the guidance by the Regional Plan for Environmental Policies. The report outlined the administrative framework, and the project orientations including architectural and material solutions. The project covers a small area at the outskirts of the World Heritage property. The proposal includes three stations (station A, B, C), two sections of cable car of 705 and 674m in length requiring four towers and four transport cabins for passengers (6,8 sqm) and cargo. The design aims to integrate each of the stations into the landscape. The intermediate station (station B) is to be implanted on an existing platform at Sítio do Rabaçal, and the lowest station was designed with a special shape following the terrain and using local stone material. Of the three stations, only one will be located within the boundaries of the property in an area which is a starting point for tourist activities (e.g. site visit, hiking, trekking, climbing, canyoeing). It currently lacks control of carrying capacity and support infrastructure and services (information, car parking, safety instructions). Station C is located in the vicinity of a dangerous water course where accidents occurred in the past. The project aims to improve the spatial organization and it also states that it will create the necessary infrastructure for environmental education, training and safety instructions.

The State Party reports that the project was prepared taking into account demanding environmental principles to reduce any potential negative impacts on the environment. It has also had to fulfil regional, national and European norms (e.g. European Union Evaluation Procedure of Environmental Impact) and has been subject to environmental evaluation procedures (PAI). The State Party notes that a favourable “Declaration of Environmental Impact” was obtained. It further notes that public consultation on environmental impacts were held and meetings with stakeholders concerned by the project. It seems that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property was not fully taken into account in the environmental and risk assessments including increased tourism pressure and potential increase in invasive species.

The report also suggests that the cable car will enhance the monitoring of the property, in particular surveillance of the forest through control points. It also states that it will enhance the access, infrastructure and visitor facilities required for the World Heritage property allowing access for about 500 tourists per day (April-October) and a total estimate of c.90,000 per year. It is also proposed to create an Interpretation Centre by improving the existing Casa de Abrigo do Rabaçal and to orient visitors (auditorium, library, shop, support services), and provide facilities for coordination and management.

The State Party report concludes that the cable car construction is only one of the actions undertaken to develop sustainable use of the property and the use of the natural resources, which also includes the reduction of car circulation and transport vans. The State Party also provided a copy of the Environmental Impact Study (EIA) dated February 2008.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the detailed report but note that while environmental impact procedures were carried out to international standards, no direct mention is made to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and the protection of the key values and integrity of the property. The principal values of concern are those related to the inscription of the property under criteria (ix) and (x) related to ecosystems and threatened species. It should also be noted that the construction was commenced in early 2009. The State Party reacted rapidly to the request of the World Heritage Centre for information on the project providing all material available, and also invited a site visit to the property. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that a reactive monitoring mission may not be necessary at this stage if an additional rapid assessment including potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property is carried out.

IUCN also notes that a petition regarding to stop the construction of the cable car has been developed online, in November 2008, by the Association of the Friends for the National Park of Funchal, a local conservation NGO. This petition was reported online in the national media, for example the national newspaper *Diario de Noticias*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note reports that the endemic Laurisilva pigeon are being culled. A response to these concerns was received from the State Party on 3 February 2009. The response satisfactorily demonstrated that the population of Laurisilva pigeon was not threatened by culling in agricultural areas and that there was no impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.25

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Acknowledges the detailed report and environmental impact assessment (EIA) according to international standards provided by the State Party on the cable car project of three stations at the World Heritage property of which one station is located within the inscribed property;*
3. *Notes with concern that the EIA did not directly consider the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property as a key consideration in its evaluation of the project;*
4. *Requests that the State Party carry out a rapid assessment of the possible impacts of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property, and to take these fully into account at each implementation phase of the project;*
5. *Also notes the information on improving the interpretation, education facilities and visitor information at the property, including an interpretation centre to be created in line with the decision adopted at its 23rd session (Marrakesh 1999);*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, an updated report on the completion of the cable car project, the rapid assessment on impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property, as well as the implementation of the interpretation centre and the monitoring system for the property, for review by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN.*

26. Danube Delta (Romania) (N 588)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1991

Criteria

(vii) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.18; 30 COM 7B.24; 32 COM 7B.21

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 30,000 for a training seminar (1999).

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

October 2003: UNESCO (MAB) / Ramsar joint mission; July 2008: RAMSAR mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Accidental cyanide pollution from mining;
- b) Deepwater navigation waterway through the Bystroe mouth of the Danube River;
- c) Construction of petrol terminal at Gjugjurlesti (last report).

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/588>

http://www.ramsar.org/mtg/mtg_danube_conference2006a.pdf

Current conservation issues

On 21 February 2009, the Governor of the Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve (DDBR) Authority via the Permanent Delegation of Romania to UNESCO provided a response to the World Heritage Centre on the key issues of Decision **32 COM 7B.21**. This report was an addition to the Annual Report for 2008 for Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve sent on 18 February 2009. The report noted:

a) European Union projects

It noted that one of the objectives of the management plan of DDBR for the next period would be to harmonize and better coordinate them. It specifically refers to the Ecological Reconstruction Programme for 2009 in the Danube Delta consisting of ecological restoration

in aquatic complexes, agricultural and fish-farming polders, as well as forestation works and projects for strengthening the institutional capacity.

b) Implementation of the agreed actions of the 2006 Odessa Conference

The Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority is in the process of implementing the Master Plan – support for sustainable development in the Danube Delta. Several projects for cross border cooperation in the Danube Delta Transboundary Biosphere Reserve were already implemented. A common monitoring programme for the Danube Delta, including specialists from both sides of the Danube Delta has been elaborated and implementation of the joint monitoring programme started in 2008. Concerning the cooperation with the States Parties of Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova, the report mentions that cooperation actions with the Ukrainian Authority of the Danube Delta (Danube Biosphere Reserve) have been carried out, but no progress was yet achieved in the cooperation with Republic of Moldova, despite several initiatives of the Ministry of Environment from Romania to organize meetings of the three partners and towards the implementation of the June 2000 Agreement between the three Environment Ministries (Romania, Ukraine and Republic of Moldova).

c) Adoption and implementation of the navigation rules

The report refers to the Order of the Ministry of Environment 111 of 30 January 2007 to prevent negative impacts of the development of navigation channels. Concerning the guidelines on architecture and building activities in the Danube Delta, the report presents the Decision of the Romanian Government 1516 dated 19 November 2008, for the Framework Regulation for Urban Planning in the Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve, the first guidelines for building activities in the Danube Delta and for the protection of the local landscape and cultural heritage. The report also refers to the Tourism Master Plan and the mechanism for transboundary cooperation on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of projects affecting the Delta, and specifically the deep navigation canal built by the Ukraine through the Northern part of the Danube Delta (Bystroe Arm). The EIA procedure has started, in accordance with the Espoo Convention and will continue during 2009.

In response to Decision **32 COM 7B.21**, the State Party of Ukraine provided a detailed report on the situation with regards to the navigation waterway dated 12 February 2009 which was also shared with the State Party of Romania. The document sets out the process followed for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) study for the Danube-Black Sea Navigation Route in Ukraine. It also reports that the results of the EIA process completed for the Navigation Route Project showed no indication that any significant transboundary impacts are likely to arise as a result of the proposed activity.

The EIA materials produced as part of the Detailed Design documentation package for the Phase 1 and Full-Scale Project were reviewed by the Inquiry Commission established under the Espoo Convention (on EIA in relation to transboundary developments), and the Commission concluded that the development and operation of the navigation route as proposed may give rise to transboundary impacts and the proposed project should be therefore subject to procedures defined in the Espoo Convention.

The report also provided recent data and materials collected through additional surveys undertaken since 2005 in order to facilitate an assessment of potential transboundary effects of the navigation route that have been recognized as likely significant by the Inquiry Commission.

In line with the provisions of the Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, the Statements of Environmental Consequences were published at each stage of the design development process; full texts of the EIA Reports produced for both phases of the Danube-

Black Sea Navigation Route Project (Phase 1 and Full-Scale Project) were made available on the official website of the project (the Delta Pilot State Company). From 2003 to 2006, four public hearing events were organized and held in various towns within the Lower Danube Basin and in 2007, public consultation meetings were held in Vylkove and Tulcea for the representatives of the Ukrainian and Romanian public to discuss potential environmental impacts of the Danube -

Black Sea Navigation Route Restoration Project in the Ukrainian part of the Danube Delta.

The State Party report further noted that international consultations and meetings were convened at various stages of the project. The report states that official resolutions adopted at these meetings did not indicate any non-compliance with respect to national and international environmental law.

As a conclusion to the Danube Delta International Seminar on “Culture and Tourism, a factor of Sustainable Development” (20 – 26 September 2008), UNESCO and the Romanian Authorities decided jointly to launch the project “Integrated Culture and Tourism Strategy for Sustainable Development in the Danube Delta. The overall project goal is to elaborate and implement a development strategy based on an integrated approach using heritage safeguarding and conservation and to promote sustainable tourism in support of the objectives of the Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Master Plan as well as the Millennium Development Goals of the United Nations.

On 20 March 2009, the World Heritage Centre received a copy of correspondence to the State Party of Ukraine from the Executive Secretary of the United National Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), which is the implementing committee of the UNECE Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment. This letter raised a series of concerns of the Espoo Convention implementing committee to the State Party of Ukraine regarding the development of the Danube-Black Sea Deep-water Navigation Canal. The implementing committee further noted that the State Party of Ukraine was requested to submit a statement by 15 April 2009 confirming the previous decision of the Meeting of Parties to “a) demonstrate that all works, including operation and maintenance, on Phase I have stopped; and (b) show, separately for Phase I and for Phase II, that the Convention is being applied fully to the Project.” Regarding the environmental impact assessment, the implementing committee also noted that the summary and findings did not fulfil the technical requirements of the Espoo Convention and requested further explanation from the State Party of Ukraine to the Working Group on Environmental Impact Assessment, planned to meet from 11 to 13 May 2009.

IUCN notes the recommendations of the Ramsar mission which took place in July 2008. The implementation of the Ramsar mission recommendations would greatly contribute to the reduction of threats to the property, and improved management. These recommendations include:

Recommendation 1: ‘To implement a Joint Declaration to work towards a River Basin management plan for the Danube Delta supporting Sustainable Development in the Region;’

Recommendation 4: ‘Ukraine to report on provisions made for any damage to the ecological character of the Ramsar sites in Ukraine, Romania and Moldova and other wetlands caused by the works which have already been carried out or will be carried out;’ and

Recommendation 5: ‘Ukraine to briefly report to the Ramsar Secretariat on its cooperation with relevant international organizations and the governments of Romania and Moldova on a programme of international monitoring of the ecological character of the Ramsar sites in the Danube Delta region, in line with the Ramsar Convention’s guidance on wetland monitoring (Ramsar Wise Use Handbook 1).’

IUCN notes that the state of conservation of the property should be indicated through monitoring of wildlife population trends. While the State Party has reported on presence of certain species no population data were provided for either birds or fish and therefore it is not possible to comment on the status of the biodiversity values and integrity of the property. The implementation of an ecological monitoring programme, Recommendation 5 of the 2008 Ramsar Secretariat mission, would greatly contribute to monitoring the state of conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.26

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.21**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party of the Republic of Moldova did not provide a report as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th and 32nd sessions;*
4. *Welcomes the progress made with exchange of information and cooperation between the States Parties of Romania and Ukraine concerning the Danube Delta ecosystem;*
5. *Encourages the harmonization and coordination of all European Union projects in the River Basin of the Danube and requests that this be taken into account in the revision and update of the management plan for the World Heritage property as well as considerations of any impacts on its Outstanding Universal Value and integrity;*
6. *Notes the recommendations of the 2008 Ramsar mission to the Danube Delta region and the relevance of the recommendations of this mission to the maintenance of the integrity and protection of the property, and also requests the States Parties to collaborate as recommended by the Ramsar Secretariat;*
7. *Also notes that the State Party of Romania has already implemented recommendations and agreed actions of the Odessa Conference of 2006, and encourages the States Parties of Romania and Ukraine to invite the authorities of the Republic of Moldova to participate in this cooperation;*
8. *Further notes that the State Party of Romania adopted Rules for navigation in the Danube Delta and Guidelines on architecture and building activities in the Danube Delta and also regrets that a tourism master plan has not been submitted as requested;*
9. *Further requests the State Party of Romania to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, an update report on the state of conservation of the property, including a report on the status and impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property of the relevant development projects affecting the Delta and especially those related to dredging and navigation, a copy of the River Basin management plan for the Danube Delta and the tourism plan for the property, for review by IUCN and the World Heritage Centre.*

27. Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1998

Criteria

(ix)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.19; 31 COM 7B.25; 32 COM 7B.22

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2001: UNESCO/UNDP mission; 2007: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Impacts of a road project across the property;
- b) Gas pipeline construction plans.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/768>

Current conservation issues

This report was requested by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **32 COM 7B.22** at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), in relation to the threat from the planned gas pipeline development.

The State Party report, received on 30 January 2009, outlines progress achieved on the conservation and management of the three protected areas included within this serial property. It is reported that in the Altai Reserve patrolling has been strengthened by increasing the number of staff to 43 and better equipping them for field work and communications. A check point has also been established to better control vehicular transit through the property. A fire fighting and control station has been established and is fully operational. A system to monitor ecological impacts from tourism has been put in place, as pressures from visitors are increasing.

A management plan for the Katunskiy Reserve and Ukok Quiet Zone National Park was developed in 2008 to guide management actions for the period 2009-2013; however no information is provided in the report on the status of implementation of this plan. In the Katunskiy Reserve and Belukha National Park, a series of studies initiated in 2007 on

impacts from climate change to biodiversity has continued, while studies are also underway to assess the impacts from pollution on the rivers and glaciers within the property.

In relation to the implementation of recommendations from the 2007 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission, the State Party reported the following progress:

- Plans to construct a gas pipeline that could eventually cross the World Heritage property have been stopped because the project's documentation was not ready to be submitted to State Ecological Environmental Assessment. However from the State Party report it is not clear whether or not there is a definitive decision to stop this project, or whether the issue could be re-opened once all technical documentation is available for the State Ecological Environmental Assessment.
- A common strategy for the development and management of the Golden Mountains of Altai World Heritage property has been developed and specific management plans (2009-2013) for its 3 component parts were developed in 2008. However, as noted above, no information has been provided on overall management framework for the property as a whole, or on the status of implementation of this strategy and the specific management plans.
- Tourism and Visitors Plans for the Katunskiy Reserve and Belukha National Park were prepared and an Environmental Tourism Information Centre for the Altai Republic was established with support from a UNDP/GEF project. Agreements with local communities and authorities have been developed to promote and guide public involvement in tourism and monitoring activities. However there is no information on the status of implementation of the Tourism and Visitor Plans.
- A draft Federal Law "On the Protection of the Teletskoye Lake" was approved in November 2008 by the Altai Republic and submitted to the Russian Federation for final approval, but the outcome has not been reported.
- Collaboration has been actively promoted between the Katunskiy Reserve (Russian Federation) and Katon-Karagayskiy National Park (Republic of Kazakhstan) as a practical step towards the establishment of transboundary cooperation between Russia, Kazakhstan, Mongolia and China on the management of the Altai Mountains.

Apart from these positive developments, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN also received some reports on illegal activities occurring in the area. In this context, in January 2009, the World Heritage Centre requested clarification from the State Party on the reported crash of a helicopter that had been chartered by officials of the Government of the Altai Republic in the Ulandryk Canyon, near the Mongolian border. It was reported that seven people were tragically killed and two injured in this accident and that carcasses of Altai mountain sheep (Argali), a protected species according to Russian Law, were found in the helicopter wreckage, indicating that the helicopter had been involved in illegal hunting. No response to the World Heritage Centre's request had been received at the time of the preparation of this report. Whilst this one-off incident received a high level of media attention, there are also several other reports noting increasing illegal hunting activities within the property, including helicopter hunting, that have been received by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN.

Reports received also note that despite the increase in the number of staff dealing with patrolling and control activities, these staff do not have permission to take action against violators. Thus regulations in relation to most violations and illegal activities even if detected remain unenforceable. This problem also contributes to the increasing number of illegal activities associated with growing tourist activities, which are especially affecting the Belukha National Park.

Whilst the State Party reported that works connected with construction of the "Altai" gas pipeline through the territory of the Ukok Quiet Zone National Park have been stopped, reports

from the media indicate that the exploration works in the framework of the “Altai” gas pipeline construction project will be continued in 2009 and no decision to reconsider this project has been made. In addition, it has been reported that there is the potential threat to Teletskoye Lake linked to the development of mining activities to exploit the Pyzhinskoye coal deposit that is located in the upper streams of the rivers Pyzha and Bolshoy Tchiri that flow into the lake. (<http://www.sibcrisis.ru/?p=729>).

NGOs and experts also note that there is increasing interest in tourism development in the Ukok Quiet Zone National Park, and if tourism development is to proceed, the possibility of a highway construction via the Ukok plateau still exists (<http://www.regnum.ru/news/1116248.html>), which could lead to impacts on the values and integrity of the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.27

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.22**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes the progress reported in the state of conservation report submitted by the State Party in enhancing the management of the property and in responding to the recommendations of the 2007 World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission;*
4. *Notes with concern that the proposed Altai gas pipeline remains a threat to the property and requests unequivocal confirmation on the decision to abandon the development of this project or any variant of it that could imply crossing the property;*
5. *Urges the State Party to take effective measures to stop the illegal hunting and other illegal activities, whether or not linked to tourism development, which are affecting or could potentially affect the values and integrity of the property;*
6. *Requests the State Party to provide clarification on existing or proposed plans for tourism development in the Ukok Quiet Zone National Park that could lead to the construction of a highway via the Ukok plateau;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010** a report on the state of conservation in order to clarify the issues noted above, as well as on further progress achieved in implementing the recommendations of the 2007 World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission.*

28. Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.18; 31 COM 7B.31; 32 COM 7B.24

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 63,528 for Preparatory Assistance and Training

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1998: World Heritage Centre monitoring mission; 2001: UNESCO / IUCN reactive monitoring mission; 2005: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring missions

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of adequate management regime;
- b) Uncertain legal protection;
- c) Pollution;
- d) Illegal timber harvesting;
- e) Gas and oil pipeline project across the World Heritage property;
- f) Illegal construction on the Lake shore;
- g) Illegal sale of land;
- h) Tourism development.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/754>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee requested a report on progress of the review of legal provisions relevant to the protection of the property, legal and administrative frameworks to regulate tourism and town-planning, and the remaining recommendations of the 2005 mission. Issues of particular concern included the status of funding for management and monitoring of the property, and exemptions and amendments made to laws and regulations on activities, which could be incompatible with the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property. On 30 January 2009, a report on the state of conservation of the property was received from the State Party.

The State Party reports that the federal law '*On the protection of Baikal Lake*' is the most important legal document in regulating the economic activity and management on the Baikal natural territory and the property. This report does not indicate if the State Party has harmonized laws potentially inconsistent with the protection of the property. The State Party reports that the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology has prepared a draft resolution entitled '*On amendment of the list of categories of activities prohibited in central ecological zone of the Baikal natural territory*'. Under this draft amendment, the mining of metal ores, including the Kholodninskoye complex, is prohibited. However, no information is reported on the prohibition of other activities incompatible with the protection of the property.

The report also describes progress made to ensure adequate funding for the management and monitoring of the property, noting that in 2008, 482.4 million roubles (c. USD 14 million) were allocated from federal and republican budgets for nature conservation measures within the "Program of Buryat Republic social and economic development for 2008-2010 and for the period until 2017".

The State Party reports that the laws of Buryat Republic 210-1 '*On tourism*' and the resolution dated 23.10.2006, and No. 340 '*On approval of the republican purpose-oriented program "Tourism development in Buryat Republic during 2007-2010"*' were amended in 2008. In addition, the resolution No. 474 '*On registration of travel entities in the territory of Buryat Republic*' was enacted. The report does not specify how these laws will aid the protection of the property. The report also notes that tourism was declared one of the strategic directions of social and economic development of the republic by law No. 2595-II of 09.11.2007 "*On social and economic development program of the republic during 2008-2010 and for the period till 2017 year*". Furthermore, the 'Travel Agency', an executive agency of governmental authorities, responsible for planning tourism development on the territory of the Buryat republic, was created under a governmental resolution dated 22.10.2007 No. 329. There is no information on the establishment of a comprehensive strategy or plan for sustainable tourism or on what activities have been implemented to ensure sustainable tourism and the protection of the property.

The report also mentions that the draft of land-use planning for the Buryat Republic would be completed by December 2008. Drafts of land-use planning layout for the Kaban, Pribaikal, Severobaikalsk districts, located within the limits of the World Heritage property, would be completed in 2008, while that of Barguzin district is expected for March 2009. In addition, it is proposed that master plans for settlements located within those districts will be developed in 2009. No information is given on how such measures will contribute to halting or removing illegal constructions on the shores of the lake, identified as one of the main threats to the values and integrity of the property.

The State Party further notes that there are problems of locally generated pollution in the Baikal inshore area. High concentrations of sewage-related bacteria are reported near the settlements and ports during summer, particularly in the waste discharge area of the Baikal pulp and paper mill. The report mentions that a closed system of water consumption within the pulp and paper mill was put into operation in September 2008, which is expected to completely stop the industrial waste discharge into the lake. Other reports mention the closure of the mill. The State Party is requested to confirm the status of the Baikal pulp and paper and that all discharge has been halted.

Also regarding pollution, the State Party report notes that 72 unauthorized dumps were removed from the lake shores in 2008. The report does not include any information on the pollution load in the Selenga River. An article published in the Journal of Geographical Sciences in August 2008 on the '*Seasonal and spatial distribution of heavy metals in the Selenga River Delta*' indicates that the presence of heavy metals in the water of this river and

its delta show seasonal variations but that lead, zinc, copper, iron and manganese concentrations exceed the Maximum Allowed Concentrations for waters suitable for fisheries.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also received a letter, dated 25 November 2008, from local NGOs on the potential threats to the integrity of Lake Baikal posed by plans to lower the level of Lake Baikal thus increasing the permitted fluctuations in lake level by 0.86m to more than 2m far greater than the natural range in fluctuations. This proposal was put forward by the Russian Ministry of Energy. IUCN notes that no Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out to assess the potential impacts of such water level fluctuations to the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that there has been progress made in implementing the World Heritage Committee's decisions but regret that some of the recommendations made by the 2005 monitoring mission have yet to be addressed, or cannot be assessed from the information provided by the State Party's report. In particular, the State Party did not provide any information on progress in adopting the management plan (Complex Scheme for the Protection and Use of Natural Resources in Baikal Natural Territory). Similarly, despite some steps taken towards addressing tourism pressures, there is no clear information on the development of a comprehensive tourism strategy for the property. There is also no reference to efforts made to enhance patrolling activities to reduce the level of illegal hunting including of Baikal Seals, nor on measures taken to halt illegal constructions on the shores of the Lake.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN support the efforts made by the State Party towards reducing pollution in Lake Baikal, in allocating funds for the management of the property and starting to develop regulations for tourism and town-planning. However, the integrity of the property continues to be affected by pollution, and inconsistencies in legal regulations for the protection of the property have not been fully addressed.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.28

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.24**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Welcomes the measures taken by the State Party to strengthen the management of the property, to confirm the operating budget and to reduce locally-generated pollution in Lake Baikal, and in particular, to finalise the closed water system within the Baikalsk pulp and paper mill;*
4. *Notes with concern that measures to halt illegal constructions on the shores still appear to be ineffective, that ongoing problems of local pollution in the Baikal inshore water area persist and that the contents of heavy metals in the water of the Selenga River and its delta exceed the maximum allowed concentrations;*
5. *Requests the State Party to further enhance its efforts in relation to the conservation of the property, including the following actions:*
 - a) *Clarify the effectiveness and strengthen, if necessary, the legal provisions relevant to the protection of the property, including on the draft resolution 'On*

amendment of the list of categories of activities prohibited in central ecological zone of the Baikal natural territory',

- b) Rapidly establish enhanced town-planning and land-use regulations to prevent illegal development in the property, and increase its control over such development,*
 - c) Develop and implement a comprehensive tourism strategy for the property,*
 - d) Enhance the regulation and monitoring of pollution in Lake Baikal;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to provide detailed information on the proposal to lower the water level of the lake and its possible impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property addressing the points above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

29. Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

30. Natural System of "Wrangel Island" Reserve (Russian Federation) (N 1023)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 14B.14; 32 COM 7B.26

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

Lack of management plan

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1023>

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/arctic/>

Current conservation issues

This state of conservation report was requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Québec City, 2008) in relation to the implementation of the recommendation to establish a management plan as requested at the time of the inscription of the property at its 28th Session (Suzhou, 2004). The World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to take the necessary steps to complete the management plan for the property as soon as possible, and send it to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review, before the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee in 2009.

The State Party submitted a report on the conservation of the property on 30 January 2009, and annexed a copy of a newly completed “Wrangel Island Nature Reserve Mid-Term management plan for 2009-13”.

IUCN has carried out, with expert advice from its network, a brief technical desk review of the submitted plan and finds it to be a substantive piece of work with sound objectives. It is also welcomed that the plan is linked to a broader sustainable development plan for the region and that the cultural heritage of the area is incorporated within the plan. The plan provides a reasonably complete action plan which addresses many of the key issues considered critical for the property. It is also welcomed that the need for increased inspectors/enforcement officers is noted. In terms of content two issues for further attention are priorities within the further development of the management plan:

- An embryonic tourism plan is provided and it is recommended that a more thorough plan should be prepared with the assistance of international experts, to both consider the opportunities for ecotourism and cultural tourism whilst avoiding disturbance to its natural and cultural values; and
- Increased attention to climate change as well as; monitoring and planning a response to its impacts will be required.

Climate change impacts on northern Russia’s ecosystem, including islands, is now an urgent issue and is probably the most serious threat to the values of Wrangel Island at the present time, with increasing evidence that the rate and scale of change may be greater than even relatively recent predictions. Wrangel Island would also benefit from a more comprehensive monitoring plan, considering climate change, and which should not only be based solely on indicator species, but also potential changes due to climate change, such as shifts in species composition. Such monitoring should be integrated with international efforts on monitoring within the Arctic. The World Heritage Centre further encourages the State Party to take into account the recommendations of the expert meeting on “World Heritage and the Arctic” (Narvik, Norway, 2007) (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/arctic/>), as well as the outcome of the UNESCO International Expert Meeting on Climate Change and Arctic Sustainable Development: scientific, social, cultural and educational challenges” (Monaco, 3-6 March 2009).

Provision of adequate and increased federal funding for the implementation of the management plan is essential. Federal and other budget support is indicated within the plan, however the State Party report also indicates that the plan is subject to the approval of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology, thus it is not clear whether the plan is approved or the necessary funding to implement it is in place. The State Party report also notes the urgent problems faced by the reserve related to modernisation in general, and the replacement of vehicles to be better adapted to the vulnerable soil of tundra communities. A further key priority is the enhancement of surveillance staff, and provision for monitoring.

The property's potential to act as a model for climate change monitoring and assessment of wider importance in the Arctic Region might also provide a basis for attracting external funding to this. It is recommended that verification of the adequacy of levels of finance to implement the plan can be addressed through correspondence between the World Heritage Centre and the State Party.

Based on a review of the plan and regional assessments, very little has changed structurally at the property since 2002, although there will have been an escalation in changes to the ecosystem due to climate change. Given this situation and that the action plan is not yet implemented, the property does not appear to warrant a mission by the World Heritage Centre and/or IUCN at this stage. It would however be valuable to request further information on a number of points and to request a further consideration of the state of conservation of the property at a future date. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend, unless there are newly emerging conservation issues, that a three year period is allowed before a further report regarding the implementation of the management plan and the response to the other points above is assessed.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.30

The World Heritage Committee:

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.26**, adopted at its 32d session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes that the State Party has prepared and submitted a management plan for the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004); and encourages the State Party to ensure its implementation to strengthen the integrity, protection and management of the property;*
4. *Requests the State Party to confirm to the World Heritage Centre that the necessary ministerial approval and adequate finance are in place for the implementation of the management plan, including in relation to infrastructure, increased security and inspection officers and an effective monitoring system, considering climate change impacts on the property;*
5. *Also encourages the State Party to further develop and implement an effective plan for public use within the property;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including a report on the status of its ecosystems and including an assessment of the impacts of climate change, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.*

31. Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995

Criteria

(vii) (ix)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

21 COM VII.41; 22 COM VII.27

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Proposed gold mining;
- b) Boundary issues.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/719>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN received information regarding a reported proposal to excise an area in the centre of the Yugyd Va National Park (area 1.9 million hectares, one of two component parts of this serial property) for development. Decision No 11/309911 by the Head of the Inta Urban District Municipality dated 28 November 2008 appears to allocate an area of the national park to a project named "Chudnoye" with an area of about 19,900 square kilometers". This project is understood to relate to a gold mining prospect.

The World Heritage Centre wrote to the State Party on 22 January 2009 to request a state of conservation report on the property, and to seek further information on this proposal. At the time of the preparation of this document no reply was received.

These issues have previously been considered by the World Heritage Committee. At its 21st extraordinary session (Naples, 1997), the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee expressed its serious concerns over proposed gold mining projects in this property and requested detailed information, including details of any environmental impact studies. At the 22nd session of the World Heritage Committee (Kyoto, 1998), the Observer Delegation of the Russian Federation confirmed that all gold mining activities had been halted and that the areas concerned were under rehabilitation.

Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the allocation of an area for mining within a World Heritage property is contrary to the no-go commitment for mining in World Heritage properties, recognizing that mining activities are incompatible with the objectives of World Heritage listing. This commitment is recognised by leading organizations within the extractive industries and also forms the principal policy position of the World Heritage Committee regarding this issue. Proceeding with such an activity would create the situation where the property could be considered for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.31

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **22 COM VII.27**, adopted at its 22nd session (Kyoto, 1998),*
3. *Expresses its serious concern that a decision to create an enclave for mining activities within the Yugyd Va National Park component of the Virgin Komi Forests appears to have been taken, and considers that such a development could threaten the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property;*
4. *Regrets that the State Party did not comply with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines and has not informed the World Heritage Centre of any intention to authorize activities which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to make a clear and unequivocal commitment to eliminate any mining concessions and enclaves granted within the boundaries of the property as inscribed on the World Heritage List;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including the confirmation of the removal of any permissions or plans to locate extractive industries within the boundaries of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

32. Gough and Inaccessible Islands (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (N 740)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995, 2004

Criteria

(vii) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

24 COM VIII.27; 28 COM 14B.17; 32 COM 7B.27

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

Substantial threat to the important seabird colonies from invasive species (mice)

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/740>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN noted, in the state of conservation report on invasive species impacts on Henderson Island (United Kingdom) presented to the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee, that information was received on a similar issue of a substantial threat to seabird colonies from invasive species on Gough Island, part of another World Heritage property in the United Kingdom, Gough and Inaccessible Islands.

Therefore, the State Party provided a report on the state of conservation of the property to the World Heritage Centre, dated 1 February 2009. The State Party reports that globally important seabird colonies on Gough Island are currently under threat from two invasive species: a) rodents, descendants of house mice brought in from ships in the 19th century, which pose a particular threat to the islands birdlife through predation of eggs and chicks; and b) invasion of an alien groundcover, procumbent pearlwort, *Sagina procumbens*, first discovered in the 1990s and established on the cliffs around the weather base on Gough Island. Dense mats of this invasive plant form on disturbed ground and compete strongly with existing vegetation.

The Government of the United Kingdom is supporting the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) through a Joint Overseas Territories Environment Programme (OTEP) to

investigate the feasibility of rodent eradication. This programme has also provided a grant to the Government of Tristan da Cunha for *Sagina procumbens* eradication. The RSPB published a feasibility study for the eradication of house mice from Gough Island in May 2008.

The State Party provided limited information on the impact of invasive species on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property. However, research on the island by the RSPB, University of Cape Town and other institutions indicates serious decline of several bird species. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species has revised the conservation status of several declining bird species including the endangered Northern Rockhopper Penguins, and critically endangered Tristan Albatross, and Gough Bunting. Surveys of Gough Bunting in 2007 suggest that the population is 400-500 pairs.

The United Kingdom Overseas Territory (UKOT) Conservation Forum research findings indicate that the mice are responsible for breeding failures of the Tristan Albatross and Atlantic Petrel. The Conservation Forum also reports additional threats to the bird populations within the property from longline fishing activities in the region, with significant impact on at least five species of the property's seabirds, including the critically endangered Tristan Albatross. The State Party reports that the UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) has provided an officer who is locally based in the Falkland Islands to provide additional support, as part of UK's commitment under the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACPA).

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall that the World Heritage Bureau in 2000 had reviewed the situation of Gough Island and noted information that the invasive species *Sagina* had been eradicated, and that the Bureau invited the State Party to keep the future situation of the property under close review. IUCN notes that the eradication and management of invasive species requires on-going, continuous efforts and regular monitoring with sufficient funding to support necessary research and control programmes. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN encourage the State Party to work with all agencies concerned to coordinate urgent action in the eradication of invasive species and management of future invasive species outbreaks and to share their experiences with other States Parties.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.32

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **28 COM 14B.17** and **32 COM 7B.27** adopted at its 28th (Suzhou, 2004) and 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the ongoing research efforts taking place at the property;*
4. *Notes with concern the threats to the property by invasive species and the decline in conservation status of Northern Rockhopper Penguins, Tristan Albatross and Gough Bunting;*
5. *Requests the State Party to ensure continuous programmes of eradication of *Sagina* for at least the next three years, and to eradicate mice within five years; and urges the*

State Party to make sufficient funds available for the rapid implementation of projects for the eradication of the introduced species;

6. *Also requests the State Party to support research to identify the causes of bird population declines and identify conservation measures to reverse these declines; including an assessment of possible management interventions to address seabird population declines caused by long line fishing;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the status of the eradication programme and an assessment of the status of and threats to the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property, for review by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN.*

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

33. Belize Barrier Reef System (Belize) (N 764)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission)

34. Los Katios National Park (Colombia) (N 1083)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

23 COM X.28; 26 COM 25.2.3; 32 COM 7B.34

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 43,000 for natural heritage Technical Co-operation in 2002 used for the preparation of a management plan

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Armed conflict;
- b) Illegal extraction of natural resources;
- c) Lack of control of management agency.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1023>

Current conservation issues

Since the time of this inscription of this property in 1994 there have threats to its integrity due to increased deforestation in the region surrounding the property and potential threats

associated to the construction of a proposed road through Los Katios and El Darien National Parks. There were also reported impacts on wetlands within the property from forest fires linked to the reconversion of lands outside the property as well as reported impacts to the Park's integrity from armed conflicts. However verification of the impacts of these threats was not possible on-site as the monitoring mission proposed to the property in the year 2000 could not be implemented for security problems. At the end of 2008, the State Party consulted the World Heritage Centre and IUCN on the procedure for requesting inclusion of Los Katios National Park in the List of World Heritage in Danger. This property is facing a number of challenges and threats which require to be dealt at the national level but that also need international attention and support. Further to this consultation, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report on this property which notes the following issues as of key concern:

a) Illegal extraction of timber

This is the most pressing problem occurring both inside and in the surroundings of the property and its solution requires the involvement of a number of other institutions and is therefore beyond the sole institutional responsibility of the Parks Authority. Addressing this major threat requires inter-institutional cooperation to support and enhance the on-going efforts of the Parks Authority in community awareness and co-management and increasing patrolling activities.

b) Impacts from the resettlement within the property of the Wounaan Indigenous Peoples community

This community used to live within the area that was declared as National Park but was relocated outside of it. However in 2004, the Wounaan returned and settled again within the park boundaries. The area of settlement is reported to be reducing the ecological connectivity within the park and impacting negatively on its values due to agricultural, hunting and fisheries activities.

c) Fishing and hunting

Overfishing including through illegal techniques such as the use of poisonous substances, is affecting wetlands within the park and its periphery. Illegal hunting is also reported to be affecting the populations of key species within the park.

d) Reduction of natural habitats

Reduction of natural habitats by their conversion to shifting agriculture and cattle raising is taking place at an increasing rate. These practices are also associated to intentional forest fires that are result in significant impacts on the extent and quality of natural forests within the property.

e) Pollution

Pollution to the wetlands and water bodies is reported as occurring within the park from solid waste and waste waters from settlements.

f) Potential impacts from planned mega-projects

It is reported that due to the location of the property mid-way from the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, its territory has been included in a number of planned large infrastructural projects such as:

- The Pan-American Highway which could increase fragmentation of existing ecosystems, as some of the options under discussion are proposed to cross the property, and also increase pressures on the use of the property's resources, as it will be better linked to existing towns and settlements;

- Inter-Oceanic canal Atrato-Truandó which reported as potentially affecting important centres of endemism and concentrations of wildlife, a number of them within the property;
- Inter-Oceanic Railway which could potentially have similar impacts to those foreseen for the Inter-Oceanic Canal as some of the proposed options for its route could cross the property;
- Electric powerline proposals between Colombia and Panama which will promote new economic activities in the region thus increasing the pressures on the park's surroundings associated to the development of new settlements and associated supporting infrastructure;
- Hydroelectric Power Project of Tilupo. This is a large project promoted by the Colombian Institute for Electric Energy that could affect and disrupt the hydrological regime essential for maintaining key ecosystems within the park.

As noted above, the Parks Authority of Colombia is implementing a number of targeted management activities to address the existing and potential challenges. However, the report considers that these will not be sufficient if inter-institutional cooperation at national and regional levels is not in place for the protection and management of the property.

The State Party has formally confirmed a request for the property to be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger by letter to the World Heritage Centre dated 29 January 2009, and also requested a mission to the property. The expected results of this are noted as:

- International recognition of the problem of the illegal timber trade affecting the property, and its international nature;
- Mobilisation of international assistance and in particular financial assistance from the international community, including international and multilateral donors;
- Frequent follow up with the support of UNESCO and its contributing institutions.

Based on the report of the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the property meets the requirements for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger as set out in the *Operational Guidelines*, and note that this has been requested by the State Party. A mission is required to evaluate the threats to the property, and to develop the required corrective measures and timeframe for their implementation, the Desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to be approved by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.36

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.34**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes with extreme concern the existing and potential threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as described in the state of conservation report submitted by the State Party;*

4. Takes note that the State Party has requested inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to encourage national and international assistance and support required to address the threats affecting this property;
5. **Decides to inscribe Los Katios National Park (Colombia) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**
6. Requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of integrity, and a proposal for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010;
7. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the threats facing the property, to advise the State Party regarding the points noted in Paragraph 6 above and to identify the necessary corrective measures and the timeframe for their implementation;
8. Invites the international community to make their utmost efforts to support the State Party to effectively address the existing and potential threats to this property;
9. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and progress in effectively addressing the threats to the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010;

35. Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205 Bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1983, extension 1990

Criteria

(vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.32; 31 COM 7B.36; 32 COM 7B.35

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

February 2008: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Construction of hydroelectric dams near the property in Panama and associated effects (greater human presence near the property, interruption of aquatic species migratory corridor);
- b) Encroachment (settlements, cattle ranching).

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/205>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre received the report from the State Party of Costa Rica on 27 February 2009. The State Party explains that concerns raised over the presence of cattle in the property are negligible on the Pacific side, but are a growing issue on the Caribbean slopes, due to the advancing agricultural frontier, promoted by indigenous groups and other settlers and in part originating in Panama. The State Party of Costa Rica also reports that NGO efforts, notably by The Nature Conservancy (TNC) focused on improving governance among the indigenous groups in question appear to be helping reverse the encroachment within the property.

The report also notes that 5.6% of the land within the property is under uncertain ownership. Indigenous territories are included within the property, in two zones of the Caribbean slopes (the Island, and the Telire sector) totaling 6,700 hectares. Though only traditional indigenous and sustainable uses are permitted in these areas, the report indicates that more work is required to ensure a long term arrangement to secure effective management. On the Pacific side, 4,500 hectares of the property are claimed by private landowners (All but 125 hectares of this area is undisturbed at present, and regenerating as natural forests), though no clear legal title exists. The State Party of Costa Rica provides a detailed action plan on the proposed steps to take in addressing these issues.

The number of full-time management staff has increased from 7 to 10 park rangers in 2009, with an additional 3 support staff providing administrative support. The State Party of Costa Rica indicates that it is consolidating cooperative agreements with local NGOs, who provide additional complementary support to management of the property. The management plan recently developed calls for 36 park rangers on the Pacific slopes alone, and the State Party of Costa Rica recognizes the need to secure stable financing as a priority.

The State Party of Costa Rica describes the many structures in place at different levels that provide national and transboundary coordination frameworks for policies and action related to the conservation of the property, including a Biosphere Reserve Management Committee for the Pacific sector. There is recognition that on-going lack of coordination between these structures results in lost opportunities and wasted effort. The State Party of Costa Rica has demonstrated a good grasp of the inefficiencies and proposes practical actions to help overcome them, namely by incorporating existing structures, where appropriate, into two local management councils (Pacific and Caribbean) and one national council. The latter is anticipated to be empowered to participate in the bi-national commission meetings with Panama. Changes to current transboundary frameworks for cooperation between Panama and Costa Rica along the boundary are being considered, which would allow for greater participation of civil society.

The State Party of Costa Rica notes that of the 80 potential sites for hydroelectric power identified in a national assessment, eight lie within the property, though these are not the subject of further consideration at this time. Two applications for mining concessions within

the property (Caribbean side) have been submitted to the authorities. Similarly, past oil exploration permits have been granted in parts of the property, but were abandoned for various reasons. Currently, no activities are underway. In regards to forestry, a 4,000 ha concession, granted several years ago, was withdrawn via expropriation procedures. These procedures have not yet been finalized. The State Party of Costa Rica indicates that it will undertake a detailed analysis of these development proposals and carry out a process for addressing them in 2009.

The State Party of Costa Rica describes the various ecological monitoring initiatives in place, relying on a number of NGOs and reports on partial results of these initiatives. It notes that hunting is part of indigenous and settler practices, and these often rely on wild meat for sustenance, though no organized trade is reported. Though no action is reported in regards to the 2008 World Heritage Committee decision on monitoring, the State Party recognizes the need to re-orient some of the work so that the request of the World Heritage Committee may be implemented.

The World Heritage Centre received the State Party of Panama's report on 24 March 2009. Responses to the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee are generic in nature, providing little detail. The report states that there is improved dealing with the presence of cattle in the property, pointing to the creation of a farmers' group to this effect, indicating that a 5 year strategic plan was developed in 2008 to ensure sustainable development in the region. Besides the absence of any information on how this plan proposes to address the issue, the World Heritage Centre has learned that there is no financing for its implementation and no action has taken place since the plan's finalization.

There is no information on any mitigation measures related to aquatic species affected by the construction of the hydroelectric dam on the Changuinola River, beyond describing legal requirements related to environmental impacts and stating that mitigation measures identified by the authorities would reduce the impact on these species. Reference is made to several Environmental Impact Studies, but these are not provided by the State Party. The State Party indicates that monitoring of the species concerned will take place regularly and results will be used to adjust the mitigation measures. Given that the life cycle of the concerned species require that they migrate between salt waters and oxygen rich freshwater streams, and that the dam will create an insurmountable barrier, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN are concerned that monitoring after the dam is constructed will indicate that the species have disappeared altogether. The Changuinola watershed comprises the vast majority of waterways within the property and the placing of migratory barriers on this system will likely result in the loss of 5 aquatic species within 80% of the property's waterways.

The report describes efforts underway to reduce illegal fishing, focusing on environmental education. It cites existing legislation designed to reduce water pollution from agricultural run-off, though does not provide any detail on the water quality in the Changuinola estuary, nor what particular measures are being implemented to reverse current levels of pollution.

Similarly, the report indicates that the construction company is responsible for human resettlement efforts and will be monitored by the national authorities. The report states that park ranger numbers have increased from 9 to 14 between 2007 and 2008, and that regular land air based monitoring activities are taking place. It states that cooperation with local communities has improved, but provides no details. A multi-stakeholder management committee is being implemented for the Amistad Biosphere Reserve. Ecological monitoring is supported by the Darwin Initiative and is expected to establish baseline biological indicators.

The State Party of Panama report did not consider a number of requests of the World Heritage Committee, in particular:

- i) There is no reference to longer term hydro-electric plans that may affect the property;
- ii) No information is provided on efforts to strengthen bi-national coordination efforts

iii) No assessment is made of the effectiveness of institutional follow-up on the reporting of environmental crimes.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider the detailed level of analysis that appears to have taken place in Costa Rica in response to the World Heritage Committee decision in 2008 is encouraging. Detailed descriptions of the current situation for each of the pertinent points raised by the World Heritage Committee is provided, followed by clear recommendations on how to deal with the issues. Though little effective progress is reported on the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's requests, the report provides a good framework from which action can be initiated and future monitoring of its implementation can be effectively carried out and indicates that action on many of these issues is beginning in 2009. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are satisfied that the process outlined in Costa Rica, would contribute significantly to dealing with the various conservation challenges noted by the World Heritage Committee in 2008, and also note that a number of actions are currently being implemented. However, progress in Panama has been limited and therefore the state of conservation of this transboundary property is still threatened and additional efforts are required by the State Party of Panama

The report from the State Party of Panama, though addressing several of the points raised by the World Heritage Committee, contains little clear information on what precisely is being done in response to the decision of the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session and nor does it provide any clear indication on what future plans may be. In particular, the State Party should ensure that:

- a) The aquatic species of the Changuinola river watershed, which is the main watershed of the property, are not extirpated by the construction of the hydroelectric dam through the implementation of effective mitigation measures. Additional measures dealing with illegal fishing and water pollution at the river estuary, are required as per decision **32 COM 7B.35**;
- b) The presence of cattle within the property is monitored quantitatively, to ensure that progress from the efforts described in the report for dealing with this issue can be measured;
- c) The displacement of human settlements due to dam construction does not negatively impact on the property's Outstanding Universal Value;
- d) The actual numbers of park management staff dedicated to the property, and detailed descriptions of co-management arrangements with NGOs or other groups is provided, so that the management presence can be adequately monitored;
- e) The management committee for the Biosphere Reserve is activated and given a clear mandate, with clear reporting obligations.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.35

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.35**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes the State Party's report on the setting out of proposed follow-up actions relating to the World Heritage Committee's previous decisions, and urges it to implement these actions, namely:*

- a) *Ensure that tenure and permitted lands uses for all lands within the property boundaries are clarified and communicated to relevant stakeholders,*
 - b) *Formulate and implement the strategy for long term funding of park rangers,*
 - c) *Strengthen the National Commission for the Management of La Amistad International Park and expand its scope of responsibilities, including ensuring participation of civil society,*
 - d) *Establish with greater detail, the status of various extractive industry and other infrastructure development proposals potentially affecting the property to inform decision-making regarding the conservation of the property,*
 - e) *Redirect current monitoring initiatives so that information pertaining to indicators of the property's Outstanding Universal value can be better tracked,*
 - f) *Monitor land use changes within the property to identify and deal with incursions,*
 - g) *Provide information on the detailed analysis of all development proposals within the property and the procedure for addressing the threat to the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property;*
4. Notes with concern that the state of conservation report for the State Party of Panama lacks sufficient detail to be considered as a full response to issues raised in decision **32 COM 7B.35**;
 5. Reiterates its request to the State Party of Panama to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report containing full technical details, on the progress made in regards to the identification and implementation of mitigation measures in relation to the need to maintain the migratory corridors of the Changuinola and Bonyic rivers for the affected aquatic species for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010;
 6. Also reiterates its request to the States Parties to develop jointly, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of integrity, to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010;
 7. Requests the States Parties of Costa Rica and Panama to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a joint report, describing in detail progress made on the items set out in the World Heritage Committee decision **32 COM 7B.35**, and, for the State Party of Costa Rica, on items 3.a) to 3.g) above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

36. Alejandro de Humboldt National Park (Cuba) (N 839 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2001

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.37; 32 COM 7B.36

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

Potential impacts from mining activities

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/839>

Current conservation issues

In response to the World Heritage Committee's Decision **32 COM 7B.36**, the State Party submitted on 27 January 2009 a state of conservation report on this property. The report notes that a new management plan for the term 2009-2013 has been prepared and implementation initiated. The property benefits from a specialized and well-trained management unit, comprising 65 staff working on the implementation of the management plan. A number of international projects, financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), WWF-Canada and other international NGOs are contributing to management activities such as programmes against fires; control and eradication of exotic species, reforestation and environmental education of key actors and communities residing inside or in the buffer areas of the Park. At the same time infrastructures and equipment to support effective management have been strengthened.

The report also notes that the property was affected in September 2008 by hurricane "Ike" which affected forest areas throughout several sectors of the park; however the damage caused has not created serious or irreversible impacts to the values and integrity of the property, and the property has recovered from hurricanes in the past through natural processes. It is noted that apart from the damage caused by the hurricane, there are no other conservation problems in the property. The report further notes that no mining exploration or exploitation activities are occurring within the property.

Despite reassurances in regards to management capacity and effectiveness, corroborated in part from reports IUCN has received from other sources, the fact remains that the State Party has not addressed the central issue raised by the World Heritage Committee (Decision **32 COM 7B.36**), namely: "to make a clear and unequivocal commitment to close down the mining concessions granted within the boundaries of the property, or those in its periphery that could affect the property". A letter to this effect was sent to the State Party on 1 April 2009. The on-going existence of mining concessions in the property represents, in the view

of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, an expression of intent to mine these areas in the future. If not clearly addressed by the State Party, the continued existence of mining concessions must be considered as a potential threat to the property, as per Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.36

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.36**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes the progress achieved by the State Party in enhancing the management of the property, including the support for effective management capacity for the property;*
4. *Also welcomes the support provided by the GEF, WWF Canada and other international NGOs towards management activities and programmes that are under implementation in the context of the new management plan for 2009-2013;*
5. *Notes with concern that the State Party has not confirmed its commitment to close down the mining concessions granted within the boundaries of the property, or those in its periphery that could affect the property, as specifically requested by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **32 COM 7B.36**, and the continued existence of which represents a potential danger to the property, as per Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines; these activities, if undertaken, would lead to the loss of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to make a clear and unequivocal commitment to eliminate the mining concessions granted within the boundaries of the property or those in its periphery that could seriously and irreversibly affect its Outstanding Universal Value and integrity if activated;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on the specific actions undertaken regarding the issues above mentioned.*

37. Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

Criteria

(vii) (viii) (ix) (x)

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

1996-2007

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7A.15; 31 COM 7A.13; 32 COM 7B.38

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 190,025 for Technical cooperation and training.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 80,000 (in addition to approximately USD 100,000 of in-kind technical assistance) under the management effectiveness assessment “Enhancing our Heritage” project

Previous monitoring missions

1995 and 2000: IUCN monitoring missions; 2003 and 2006: World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring missions

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal settlements;
- b) Illegal livestock grazing and agricultural intrusions;
- c) Illegal logging;
- d) Poaching;
- e) Invasive exotic species;
- f) Management deficiencies;
- g) Potential impacts from hydroelectric development project Patuca II.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/196>

Current conservation issues

The property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger due to the presence of unauthorized settlements within its boundaries, illegal logging and the threat from an advancing agricultural frontier. To the west and south, the property is bordered by new settlements established by small scale farmers and ranchers looking for lands, and to the east by indigenous communities. The northern part of the property borders on the Caribbean and harbours several small indigenous settlements, though an increasing number of colonists are arriving here as well. The absence of orderly land allocation structures has resulted in a thriving informal land market, further exacerbating deforestation. Important efforts have been made to establish a formal cadastre, with the support of German development assistance and significant progress has been made. Vigorous presence of the military on the property boundaries, along with the passing of clear laws removing loopholes that had been used to legalize timber obtained from the property have been closed. These developments were the basis for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2007.

The World Heritage Centre sent a letter communicating Decision **32 COM 7B.38** to the State Party on 21 August, 2008 along with a follow-up letter on 1 February 2009. Further email

and telephone communications took place in February and March 2009 in an effort to communicate the urgency of responding to the World Heritage Committee's request.

No report has been received from the State Party.

This property, having only recently been removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, is the source of on-going unsolicited reports to the World Heritage Centre and to IUCN from field level observers which indicate that on-going management issues remain to be addressed, in particular:

- a) The advance of the agricultural frontier into the property boundaries;
- b) Important illegal seasonal commercial fisheries in the rivers and iii) hunting of mammals such as tapir, peccary and paca.

A further report from Global Witness entitled "Illegal Logging in the Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve" raises further concerns over the integrity of the property. In the absence of the state of conservation report from the State Party, these field reports raise serious issues over the implementation of the 2006 monitoring mission recommendations.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.37

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.38**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party has not provided a state of conservation report for the property, as requested in Decision **32 COM 7B.38**;*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on further progress achieved on the implementation of the recommendations made by the 2006 monitoring mission, including a response to the report on illegal logging by Global Witness, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

38. Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) (N 1138 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 8B.13

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD350,000 (Management planning, installation of mooring buoys for diving boats, working with local communities, capacity building, public use planning, improved stakeholder understanding of legal protection measures)

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/1138>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre was informed by the NGO community of a change to the legal protection of the Special Zone of Marine Protection (SZMP) in 2008, leaving it vulnerable to industrial tuna fishing activities. Following an exchange of correspondence between the State Party and the World Heritage Centre, and subsequent to an intensive public relations campaign by Panamanian civil society, the changes affecting the property were reversed in April 2009.

The World Heritage Centre participated in the final evaluation of the 5 year Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape project in Panama City, in April 2009, during which time it had the opportunity to review in greater detail the current state of conservation of the property in the presence of representatives from the National Environmental Agency (ANAM) and the National Fisheries Agency (ARAP), responsible for the management of the National Park and the Special Zone respectively, and of several national and international conservation NGOs. The participants acknowledged the successful participatory development of the recently adopted Coiba National Park management plan, along with the establishment of the multi-stakeholder management committee for the Park. Participants also noted that the property was gaining institutional recognition, pointing particularly to new site based research being financed by the national science and technology agency.

The most immediate concern raised by participants was the on-going presence of a herd of wild cattle, remaining after the island prison was closed in 2007. Their population (estimated at 3,000) is growing, and is the cause of increasing trampling of native vegetation, deforestation, and significant soil erosion. Under the typical heavy rains in this area, soil is washed into the sea, resulting in important nutrient loading and siltation, both highly detrimental to the coral reef ecosystems in surrounding waters. There is a jurisdictional conflict between government departments in regards to the responsibility over dealing with the removal of these animals. Their continued presence on the island is severely impacting the property's Outstanding Universal Value for both terrestrial and marine ecosystems. If this

problem is not resolved soon, the level of impact will likely grow to the point of becoming an ascertained danger to the property.

The World Heritage Centre also learned of several large proposals for the development of marinas and luxury residential hubs along the coast opposite the property. Though none has yet been approved, given the past trends of intensive coastal zone development throughout the Pacific Coast of neighbouring Costa Rica, and increasingly in Panama, the Coastal area opposite the property is highly likely to be developed in the foreseeable future. Given its proximity to the property (less than 5 km in some cases), the risk posed by such development could be very important if not properly managed. Risks would arise from a variety of sources, including among others: i) nutrient and other pollutants loading into the waters during the construction phase, and from eventual waste water reaching the sea; ii) high use pressure from pleasure craft and sports fishing in the National Park and Special Zone; iii) potential for fuel spills and iv) increased pressures to develop tourist infrastructure within the property to complement those developed in mainland. To safeguard the property's Outstanding Universal Value and its conditions of integrity against such possibilities, the State Party should carry out an environmental impact assessment on the whole of the development potential for the coastal zone. Based on its results, it would be in the position to establish if any development should take place or not. In the latter case, the assessment would provide technical justification for the imposition of strict limits on the nature and/or extent of development, insisting, for example, on setbacks from the coastal zone, and on best practices for waste water treatment and solid waste management. The State Party is also encouraged to develop innovative financing mechanism that would support effective monitoring and control activities within the property necessary in light of eventual increased pressures arising from coastal development.

The meeting participants were also concerned with the continued absence of a management plan for the Special Zone of Marine Protection. In its absence, fishing activities are poorly regulated and open to practices that are contrary to conservation of the property's Outstanding Universal Value and its integrity. A draft management plan had been proposed, but rejected by the Special Zone management committee as being too permissive. The final version must ensure that the values for which the property was inscribed onto the World Heritage List are effectively protected in perpetuity.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.38

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **29 COM 8B.13**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),*
3. *Notes that the State Party has recently adopted the Coiba National Park management plan, as recommended in Decision **29 COM 8B.13**;*
4. *Urges the State Party to finalize the management plan for the Special Zone of Marine Protection portion of the property and to ensure its effective implementation, and reminds the State Party of the recommendation made by IUCN in its evaluation of the nomination, whereby commercial fisheries need careful management, and that a clear fisheries monitoring system be implemented;*

5. Notes with concern the continued and growing presence of cattle on the property, which are the source of increasing damage to its Outstanding Universal Value, and strongly urges the State Party to ensure its complete removal as a priority matter;
6. Also notes with concern the growing potential for coastal development on the shores opposite the property, and requests the State Party to develop and implement a coastal zone development and conservation policy with the purpose of ensuring that cumulative development impacts to the property's Outstanding Universal value and its integrity are foreseen and effectively averted;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including on progress made on removing cattle from the property, on finalizing and implementing a management plan for the Special Zone of Marine Protection and establishing a formal policy on development and conservation of the coastal zone opposite the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

39. Pitons Management Area (St Lucia) (N 1161)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(vii) (viii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

38 COM 14B.11 ; 31 COM 7B.42; 32 COM 7B.40

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

Development pressures associated with tourism and housing

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1161>

Current conservation issues

A state of conservation report on this property was requested by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **32 COM 7B.40** referred to above, in which, *inter alia*, the World Heritage Committee noted with concern that development continues to affect the integrity of the property, which if not urgently addressed is likely to lead to significant loss of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The State Party provided its report on the state of conservation of this property on 10 February 2009, in which it reaffirms its commitment to protecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and comprises a short review of progress since the last decision of the World Heritage Committee, together with three annexes listing outstanding planning applications in the Pitons Management Area (PMA), a proposed design guide for development within the PMA, and a further annex which outlines an initiative of St Lucia to “define and establish the boundaries of the PMA”.

The State Party reports that the Soufrière Region Integrated Development Plan (IDP) has been adopted by St Lucia Cabinet of Ministers, although the date of this decision and its official text are not provided. The outline of this plan was reported to the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session: it proposes a series of development policy areas, within and around the property, against which specific development control policies would be applied. The World Heritage Committee in its last decision noted the need for the State Party to reflect further on the recommendations of the IDP as drafted in order to ensure that the anticipated levels of development that might result from this strategy do not prejudice the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property. The adopted IDP does not appear to have considered this issue and there remains a concern regarding the appropriateness of its policies in relation to the values of the property.

The State Party report does not make it clear how the IDP will be implemented through St Lucia’s planning processes, as was also requested in the decision adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2008 and nor has the requested baseline on land use within the property requested by the World Heritage Committee been provided. Thus there is no guarantee that the IDP adopted is in keeping with the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and in the view of IUCN there is a significant concern that, in potentially permitting a range of new built development within a natural World Heritage property, it may not be appropriate. These concerns are heightened by both Annex 2 on Building Design Guidelines, and Annex 3 regarding critical actions required to implement development standards, which both imply that the legal and institutional measures to protect the property are not in place, may facilitate inappropriate development and contain a number of specific points which require clarification. These two annexes also raise a range of detailed concerns that require attention.

This situation is of particular concern, as the State Party also reports that the adoption of the IDP lifted the moratorium on a number of development applications that have been put forward for decision. The report notes that five developments of up to 600 acres (over 240ha) in size have been approved, and lists a number of applications that are yet to be considered. The total area of applications listed in the report of the State Party is estimated at 500ha. Since the total size of this property is less than 3000ha, these developments cover a significant extent of the property, possibly up to 15%. This may create a significant impact on the property. However, the report provides no details of the nature of the developments foreseen within these applications thus further information is needed to adequately assess their potential impact.

The report also notes the “Mignucci Development” which went ahead despite the moratorium and has generated national and international concern. The report does not provide specific

details, but this development is understood to comprise a substantial private villa. The State Party report notes that the development impacted negatively on the aesthetics of the PMA. The report suggests the development is “well located in Policy Area 4 of the IDP where certain types of development are permitted”, however it is clear from the adopted policy in the IDP for this area, that this development does not meet the policies of the IDP. The State Party report also mentions measures that have been sought to mitigate this damage, although detail on their impact is lacking.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain very concerned that the level of development anticipated within the PMA is setting inappropriate precedents for development within a property inscribed for its natural values under the *World Heritage Convention*. This concern is heightened by the lack of information regarding the new planning system, the capacity and resource requirements to operate this, the rapid approval of several developments within the World Heritage property with unknown impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the substantial number of undetermined applications, and the fact that a new development took place contrary to the policies of the recently adopted IDP. The expectations of Paragraph 172 the *Operational Guidelines* are that States Parties will inform the World Heritage Centre on developments that could affect the values of a World Heritage property. The state of conservation report considered by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session also noted that “Any further development within the PMA not strictly conforming to an agreed planning policy should be regarded as providing a clear basis to recommend inscription of the property in the List of World Heritage in Danger”. It is clear that this situation has now arisen, but also that the possibility of further development incompatible with the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is likely.

The State Party report also notes a proposal to “define and establish the boundaries of the PMA”. It is not clear what this exercise is intended to achieve, since the boundaries of the property are already clearly established, and is therefore of concern

The report finally notes a way forward for the property, which emphasizes the establishment of a more autonomous Pitons Management Area World Heritage Site Authority. Little detail is provided on this initiative but it is mainly noted that this will enable better marketing of the PMA as a World Heritage property, and seeking of financial support from the World Heritage Centre to improve the tourism product of the PMA. A number of concerns raised previously about the lack of effectiveness of the management of the property were raised and, according to information received by IUCN remain of significant concern within the conservation community of St Lucia and the Caribbean. These include:

- Adequacy of the skills and expertise within the management authority;
- The need for increased capacity and attention to conservation and regulatory tasks to ensure inappropriate development does not impact on the PMA;
- The need for increasing substantially the level of consultation and engagement with the community and stakeholders, including within the community of Soufrière in the management of the property;
- The provision of adequate sustainable finance the management of the PMA;
- Lack of an effective monitoring plan for the property with clear indicators and sources of verification.

Given this situation the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the creation of an autonomous unit is premature, and that the emphasis on tourism and marketing should be regarded as a low priority and not be pursued until the effective protection, planning and management of the property has been put in place.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.39

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.40**, adopted at its 32nd (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Takes note of the activities reported in the State Party's report on the state of conservation of the property but also notes that this does not address many of the key points of Decision **32 COM 7B.40**, nor include detailed baseline information on current land use within the property and a description of the development application and review process as previously requested by the World Heritage Committee;
4. Expresses its serious concern that the State Party has not complied with all the requests expressed by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **32 COM 7B.40**, and that:
 - a) The Integrated Development Plan (IDP) for the property was approved without further reflection on the level of development foreseen, and that this may lead to a level of development that is incompatible with the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property,
 - b) The moratorium on approval of developments within the property has been lifted without such an assessment of the IDP and without clear legal systems of planning advice being in place,
 - c) A significant development has taken place that does not conform to the requirements of the IDP, and which is acknowledged to have damaged the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
5. Regrets that a range of critical issues are in evidence that pose a threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and that a number of threats to its integrity exist in relation to the protection, planning and management of the property, and the apparent reconsideration of the boundaries of the property;
6. Requests the State Party to urgently re-establish and maintain a moratorium on development decisions within or affecting the property, to allow a reconsideration by the State Party of the level of development foreseen in the IDP and for effective systems for protection and management of the property to be put in place, and to complete the previously requested baseline assessment of land use in the property;
7. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess its current and Desired state of conservation and the effectiveness of its protection, planning and management, including from development within and outside its boundaries;
8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to respond to the concerns listed above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

MIXED PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

40. Pyrénées – Mont Perdu (France / Spain) (C/N 773 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997 ; extension in 1999

Criteria

(iii) (iv) (v) (vii) (viii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.33 ; 31 COM 7B.44; 32 COM 7B.42

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1998: UNESCO visit; 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Impacts of the Gavarnie Festival (France);
- b) Insufficient support for agroastoralism;
- c) Inefficient transboundary cooperation;

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/773>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee, in Decision **32 COM 7B.42**, requested the State Party of France to take the necessary steps to relocate the Gavarnie Festival in line with its previous commitments and past decisions of the World Heritage Committee, it also requested the two States Parties to provide a report on the World Heritage property, to enhance the coordination of the management of the transboundary property, and to raise the profile of the agropastoralism and its role in sustaining the cultural landscape. The States Parties were urged to request inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The State Party of France submitted a state of conservation report for its part of the property on 30 January 2009, addressing points raised in the Decision, and including some discussion of cross-border structures. A round table was held at the initiative of a local association on 30 January 2009 and details of its discussion were also supplied to the World Heritage Centre.

The State Party of Spain submitted its state of conservation report on 25 March 2009 laying out its viewpoints on the Gavarnie Festival, support given to agropastoralism, transboundary management coordination as well as the finalization and implementation of the preliminary management plan. It further emphasizes its readiness to implement the recommendations made by the joint mission and the requests by the World Heritage Committee.

Gavarnie Festival

The key issue raised by the World Heritage Committee related to the continued decision to not relocate the Gavarnie Festival has not occurred, despite the commitment from the State Party of France at the time of the inscription of the property. The report of the State Party of France, disputes the past conclusions of the World Heritage Committee and Advisory Bodies regarding the Festival. It restates the position of local communities, which consider the festival essential to their economic needs, that a relocation of the Festival would spell the demise of the event, that the impacts are temporary and limited to the aesthetics of the property and not its physical or biological environment. The report also argues that the proposal to relocate the property is attracting increasing opposition from the communities within the property. It suggests that the committee for management and monitoring reviews the issue of the Festival including its content, as well as its organization and impacts.

The State Party of Spain underlines in its report that it shares the concern of the World Heritage Committee regarding the impact of the Gavarnie Festival. The State Party of Spain however points out that it is not in a position to take any decision on the issue given that the Festival is located on French territory and thus under the sovereignty of the State Party of France.

The World Heritage Centre, and the Advisory Bodies however note that the position of the World Heritage Committee is very clear regarding the Festival, in that its sensitivity of its location, the duration of disturbance in addition to the event itself, the presence of alternative locations, and the previous undertakings of the State Party of France lead clearly to the conclusion that the Gavarnie Festival is incompatible with the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and notably criterion (vii). This was recognized in the most recent decision of the World Heritage Committee that urged the States Parties to request inclusion of the property of the List of World Heritage in Danger. The State Party of France has not made that request, but notes in its report that it considers that the World Heritage Committee's request should be considered in the light of the other progress within the property, and taking account of the particular local circumstances.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the location of the Gavarnie Festival remains unsatisfactory, noting that its incompatibility with the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property has been recognized by the World Heritage Committee. Whilst every property has to be considered in relation to the particular situation it faces, there is also a need to retain a high and consistent standard in relation to the expectations as set out in the *Operational Guidelines*. It is also noted that, as the Festival receives a subvention from public funds, then the public authorities could make a clear commitment to fund the Festival in an alternative location, and thereby remove some of the stated risk to its viability if it were to be moved. In a this situation, there is a clash of objectives between the priorities of the State Party and the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, in relation to the requirements set out in the *Operational Guidelines* and the past decisions of the World Heritage Committee.

Management and transboundary cooperation

The State Party of France also reported on the establishment of a 21-person World Heritage management and monitoring committee for the French part of the property, and with the intention to enlarge this through invitation to representatives of the Spanish part of the property. In relation to the wider transboundary cooperation, the report of the State Party of France sets out a number of the different areas of cooperation with Spanish authorities. It also emphasizes that local communities, are seen as the foundation for future cooperation regarding the property, and notes the economic challenges faced by these communities, and notes a number of cooperative projects that have and are in place. It notes there is a specific budget of 15,000 Euros allocated to a training programme on World Heritage for the local population. While modestly funded, this initiative should be welcome. The most significant development in relation to the request of the World Heritage Committee appears to be the establishment, for the first time, of a management committee under the aegis of the Conseil Général des Hautes Pyrénées to which it is noted Spanish authorities will be invited. It is also noted that this committee will be charged to develop the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property requested in Decision **32 COM 7B.42**.

The report of the State Party of France does not provide any clear information on the status of the interim management plan.

The State Party of Spain underlines that the statutes of the National Park of Ordesa y Monte Perdido, which forms the Spanish part of the transboundary property, clearly stipulate the transboundary cooperation with the French National Park as a priority. This regulation is complemented by the Chart on the cooperation of the two National Parks in Spain and France, which will be renewed shortly. The State Party of Spain reports that these two documents constitute the basis for regular meetings and several activities that have been jointly implemented by the partners such as interpretation and signage of the property, exchange of best practices in visitor management and information exchange of scientific data. The State Party of Spain further reports that it foresees participating as an observer in the forthcoming session of the above-mentioned French management and monitoring committee.

In view of the finalization and implementation of the preliminary management plan, the State Party of Spain informs that the management of the Spanish part of the property is ensured through the Master Plan on Use and Management of the National Park of Ordesa and Monte Perdido (PRUG: Plan Rector de Uso y Gestion), and that in addition a coordination committee of all authorities involved in the province of Aragon (Spain) will be put in place shortly to enhance the outreach of the activities carried out so far.

The assessment of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies is that this represents little progress in relation to transboundary cooperation. The initiative of the French authority, to which the State Party of Spain is invited, does not necessarily mean that this is a proposal that has been developed jointly and set up on an "equal partners basis". With Spanish participation not yet fully agreed there is a need to wait to confirm that the proposal becomes fully operational, however in principle it would be better that this proposal is reconsidered and instead a joint transboundary management body established, under independent or rotating chairpersonship, and with a membership that is designed by both French and Spanish authorities. Such a structure would also enable the preparation of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value reflecting the interests of both States Parties.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies emphasize that a key concern with the property has been the lack of clear cooperative arrangements for the management of the property as a whole, as noted above.

Agropastoralism

The State Party of France notes a range of measures in place. They refer to the introduction in 2007 of a plan supporting the mountain economy, with a substantial budget of 29.8 million

Euros over 5 years for the region, including the property. 90 applications were financed throughout the region during 2008, including support for restoration of mountain refuges for shepherds, costs of shepherding and the management of mountain pastures. Although the report does not report specifically on the property, nor elaborate on the strategy and its conservation objectives, it appears likely that this initiative is benefiting the property. However, it is not possible to reach a firm conclusion on this. The report also notes that in October 2008, a regional recognition (AOC - Appellation d'Origine Contrôlée) was approved for sheep reared in Barèges-Gavarnie, reported as having already resulting in an increase in market price of 50% over the price of non-AOC meat.

The State Party of Spain reports that support to the agropastoral sector in the Spanish part of the property has been significantly increased over the last years, as foreseen in the PRUG. Activities such as the rehabilitation of shelters, research on the impact of visitor behaviour in the Park and on agropastoral traditions have been carried out. It is further reported that the subsidies attributed by the Spanish State to the National Park of Ordesa y Monte Perdido represent 21.6% of the annual subsidies to the agropastoral sector.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that there has been a positive response on the request of the World Heritage Committee in relation to initiatives in France, but there remains no clear evidence of an overall strategy in this regard for the property as a whole.

Other issues

In relation to other recommendations of the 2007 reactive monitoring mission to the property, it is also noted that no further action is reported on the removal of impacts from the Troumouse road, or on an anticipated workshop that was to be organized by the States Parties. A tunnel across the Pyrénées is reported as a joint project in the report although this has no seeming function in relation to the conservation of the property and its relationship and impacts are not noted.

In conclusion, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that it is essential that the World Heritage Committee adopt a position that is credible and consistent with the *Operational Guidelines*, and that also enables the management of this property. Considering the situation of this transboundary property an alternative strategy to the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger could be to request a further period of cooperation between the two States Parties, in particular to (a) set in place the required joint management and (b) to assess the means by which the Festival could be relocated in such a way to retain the property on the World Heritage List, and (c) to jointly report progress made to a future session of the World Heritage Committee. If this process does not resolve the issue of the Festival, the World Heritage Committee could consider other options to address the incompatibility between its management, its Outstanding Universal Value and integrity, as well as appropriate sustainable use linked to the values of the site.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.40

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.42**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),

3. *Notes the actions taken by the State Party of France in relation to the increased support for agropastoralism but regrets the lack of strategy and clear links to conservation of the cultural landscape features;*
4. *Requests the two States Parties to establish, on a joint and mutually agreed basis, a management and monitoring body for the property, including national natural and cultural focal points for World Heritage;*
5. *Also regrets that the State Party of France considers the Gavarnie Festival within the inscribed property should continue, despite the consideration by the World Heritage Committee that it represents an ascertained danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, as defined by Paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Strongly urges the State Party of France to take the necessary steps to relocate the Festival in line with its previous commitments and past decisions of the World Heritage Committee; as well as to close the upper section of the Troumouse road;*
7. *Also requests both States Parties in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to organize a transboundary workshop to draft a joint vision and management planning structure for the property as a whole, and to consider the finalization of the interim management plan for the property, as discussed during the July 2007 reactive monitoring mission to the property;*
8. *Finally requests the States Parties to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a joint report on progress in addressing the above recommendations and including the relocation of the Gavarnie Festival, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, when, **in the absence of substantial progress the World Heritage Committee may consider to start the process for the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger***

41. Ibiza, Biodiversity and Culture (Spain) (C/N 417 rev)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late information about potential threat)

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

42. Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Application of the Reinforced monitoring mechanism)

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

43. Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia) (C 18)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

44. Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2001

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.41; 31 COM 7B.50; 32 COM 7B.48

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 6,932: Technical Assistance for the rehabilitation of the Lamu Waterfront, in 2004.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2004: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of action plan for delivering the management plan;
- b) Lack of risk preparedness, especially in the case of fire;
- c) Lack of adequate sewerage and waste disposal and overall infrastructure;
- d) Uncontrolled development;
- e) Lack of resources;
- f) Urban and industrial development pressure, including possible new port and of oil exploration;

g) Inadequate buffer zone.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1055>

Current conservation issues

Since 2001, the World Heritage Committee has examined the state of conservation of Lamu at every session, related to persistent threats identified above, and the lack of adequate structures or resources to address these threats in a systematic way and long-term way. At the last session, the larger issues of oil exploration and nearby port development were addressed. The State Party was asked to report back to the World Heritage Committee in 2010. However, in the light of the concerns expressed by the State Party about extensive developments on the Shella sand dunes which are likely to have an adverse impact on water resources as well as the integrity of the property, this report has been drafted.

On 1 February 2009, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report gives a brief overview of progress with the main issues identified at the 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), details of conservation work at individual buildings and details of a donor conference.

a) Uncontrolled development

In spite of efforts by the National Museum of Kenya (NMK) and local government agencies, it is stated that a few “*politically connected individuals*” have attempted to undertake development of the property and the buffer zone that would threaten its integrity. For instance, a private developer has put up a perimeter wall around an area used as a boat repair yard.

Of more concern is the threat to the Shella sand dunes. In June 2008, a private developer began to construct a hotel within the protected area of the Shella sand dunes, part of the buffer zone. Apparently this is one of many plots earmarked for cancellation by the Chief Lands Registrar. The NMK has undertaken a scientific study of the Shella sand dunes which underlines its importance for water resources – something some developers had challenged. The NMK has developed an alliance with the National Water Resources Management Authority to conserve the dunes. Lamu residents have also petitioned the Minister of Lands to deal conclusively with the encroachment of the dunes. However, there appears to be the potential for a major conflict between the Lamu County Council and the NMK. The NMK has brought the matter to the attention of ‘top government officials’ but still considers that it needs much more support from the ministries concerned in order to protect this crucial resource.

The NMK has managed to deflect many less major threats using existing legislation and the County Council has introduced new by-laws and now employs a District Engineer. The District Physical Planning Liaison Committee, which is the responsible planning authority, is said to be now much more sensitive to the significance of the property after a workshop for them run by the NMK in July 2008.

b) Development of Kenya’s second port

Consultations with the Ministry of Transport and Communications have indicated that the proposed port will be at Magagoni Creek, 20km north of the property. If the port goes ahead, it has been agreed that both the Ministry of National Heritage and NMK will be consulted at all levels and a cultural and archeological impact assessment will be carried out before a development is carried out. However, the NMK has lodged an appeal to ask that it is involved in the whole planning process. However, it is stated that if the location of the port remains unchanged, it should not impact adversely on the property.

c) Oil exploration

The oil and gas exploration has been abandoned after a survey indicated insufficient resources.

d) Extension of the buffer zone

The Ras-Kitau-Manda skyline area was gazetted in April 2008 as an extension to the buffer zone. Proposals to extend the buffer zone to the whole of the Lamu archipelago have been included in various discussion papers including the development of cultural heritage assets on Pate Island.

e) Strengthen infrastructure

The NMK has been lobbying the government to allocate more funds for the conservation and maintenance of the property. Specifically, it has suggested that the Ministry of Local Government allocated a special fund out of the Lamu County Council Local Authority transfer fund to reduce the burden on the NMK.

In November 2008, the NMK convened a donors' conference to mobilize technical and financial resources for a rescue plan that addressed the challenges facing the property and its buffer zone.

The conference agreed that:

- It was necessary to extend the gazetted boundary of the water catchment area from 958 to 17,000 acres;
- The need to set up a Community Conservation Fund for the restoration of old houses;
- The need for the government through local agencies to control the informal settlements impacting on the property;
- The development of the new port should respect all the historical sites in the area.

The following major improvement projects are being implemented:

- One year project for the restoration of manuscripts in Lamu Fort library and Riyadh Islamic Academy – with grant from the American Government;
- Improvements to the fish and meat market;
- Improvements to street paving and lighting;
- Renovation of the main jetty;
- Provision of waste collection bins.

The following major schemes have been presented to donors:

- Rehabilitation of Lamu Fort (USD 72,000);
- Upgrading of Lamu seafront with concrete paving slabs (USD 650,000).

f) Archaeological investigation

The Chinese Government has provided USD 3.7M to support the exploration of a Chinese wreck at Pazali. This work will commence in June 2009.

g) Finalise and approve management plan and supplementary action plan

A donation from a sponsor of USD 50,000 will cover the costs of the third consultation meeting on the plan to be held in March 2009. An action plan has been drawn up which is due to be ratified at this meeting.

h) Published Regional Development Plan

This plan is out for consultation.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that oil and gas exploration have now been discontinued and that the current location for the large new port means that it is unlikely to have a major impact on the property but nevertheless stress the need for NMK to be involved in the whole planning process for the proposed port.

Concerning the Shella sand dunes, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are extremely concerned at the potential conflict over the development of the area and the need for its protection as an essential part of the setting of the property.

They further note the intention to formally increase the buffer zone to include the Ras-Kitau-Manda skyline area, a proposal that need to be presented to the World Heritage Committee for approval. The conference of donors is a major step forward towards gaining support for conservation and maintenance of the property. Details of the two major projects for which donor support is being sought should be notified to the World Heritage Committee in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.44

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.48**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes the progress made with the finalisation of the management plan, the extension of the buffer zone, the development of infrastructure projects and the identification of possible donors;*
4. *Also notes that the oil and gas exploration has ceased and that the current plans for the second national port are unlikely to impinge adversely on the property; but nevertheless stresses the need for National Museums of Kenya (NMK) to be involved in the whole planning process for the proposed port;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the management plan which is due to be completed shortly, together with an action plan, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
6. *Also requests that the proposal to extend the buffer zone to cover the Ras-Kitau-Manda skyline be submitted to the World Heritage Committee for approval;*
7. *Urges the State Party to continue with its exploration of a wider extension of the buffer zone to cover the Lamu peninsula and the wider water catchment area supported by the Donor Conference;*
8. *Requests that the proposals for major developments at Fort Lamu and the Lamu seafront be submitted to the World Heritage Centre in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
9. *Expresses its continuing concern at pressures on the property from informal settlements and projects in the buffer zone;*
10. *Urges the State Party, in collaboration with the relevant ministries, to support the NMK and the Lamu County Council to put in place strong planning mechanisms and*

protection measures in order to provide a robust structure and ensure the protection of the property;

11. *Further requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS / ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to the property in 2010 to assess the state of conservation and in particular, the potential threat to the Shella sand dunes and other parts of the buffer zone, and also the overall sustainable development of the property;*
12. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 **February 2011** a progress report on the implementation of the above for consideration by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

45. Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Application of the Reinforced monitoring mechanism)

46. Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission)

47. Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956 bis)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Complementary information received late)

48. Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

49. Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape (Republic of South Africa) (C 1265)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2007

Criteria

(iv) (v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 8B.20; 32 COM 7B.52

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20.000 for Preparatory Assistance in 2004

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

Prospecting mining permit issued for exploration inside the property.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1265>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee expressed its concern about the issuance of a prospecting mining licence for a considerable part of the property and its buffer zone to Bushmanland Minerals and requested that a joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission be invited to assess the state of conservation and the implementation of the decision adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008).

The State Party provided a report on the state of conservation of the property on 29 January 2009, responding to the issues raised in Decision **32 COM 7B.52**, and was reviewed by the mission team, from 2 to 6 March 2009.

a) Prospecting mineral license

The State Party indicates that in spite of the existing prospecting licence, the National Environment Management: Protected Areas Act no. 57 and the South Africa World Heritage Convention Act 1999 preclude the possibility of carrying out prospecting activities at the property, even with a valid licence. The mission verified this situation and commends the State Party for the initiative taken to minimize and possibly eliminate a repetition of such situation involving mining in World Heritage properties, including through the compilation of a

comprehensive database by the Department of Environment and Tourism (DEAT), which will be availed to the Department of Minerals and Energy (DME).

Discussions have been continued between the DME and Bushmanland Minerals, which has agreed to remit its permit for both the property and the buffer zone, on the condition that the State Party pays compensation for expenses incurred in the early prospecting stages. The mission noted that the process for cancelling the permit needs to be expedited to ensure the final resolution on the matter and address a situation that is frustrating all the stakeholders.

b) Boundary, human use and management issues

The State Party reports that discussion on boundaries were initiated with the Sida !Hub Communal Property Association (CPA, landowner) and other stakeholders in the Richtersveld and an agreement was reached on boundaries for the buffer zone, in particular the so-called 'Communal Buffer Zone'. The proposed revision would reduce the Communal Buffer Zone "*to an area of more logical dimension than at present*".

The mission noted that this reduction of the buffer zone would go against all recommendations for the property, both in the ICOMOS Evaluation of the nomination and in Decision **31 COM 8B.20**. The mission informed the State Party about the procedures to follow in case they wished to proceed with this reduction. It also recalled the State Party's consideration for the natural values of this area in 2006 and discussed with a variety of stakeholders the reasons for this reduction. CPA representatives expressed their concern about the prejudice on their pastoral and other rights by being included in the buffer zone, an issue that was clarified by mission members who also stressed that grazing and transhumance was at the heart of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and that adequate consideration of the cultural landscape and its cultural traditions relies heavily on the community of graziers that actively sustain the relationship between the people and the environment. In fact, the ideal extension to include the Richtersveld National Park would in fact contribute to support the traditional management arrangements to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the cultural landscape. In the resultant discussions during the mission, there was unanimous consensus in support of maintaining the current buffer zone as it stands, rather than reducing it, and looking into increasing the property to include, at an appropriate time, the Richtersveld National Park.

The mission also noted that existing diamond mining activities, taking place in areas adjacent to the buffer zone, could have a significant impact if not mitigated.

In regard to human use and management, the State Party reports that the management plan is currently being revised to strengthen provisions pertaining to tourism and the management of the cultural aspects of the property. Two participatory workshops and several consultations have taken place and an advanced draft of the plan was provided to the mission team. The community-driven and traditional management system, and the multisectorial arrangements currently in place that promote its effectiveness, should be particularly noted and welcomed as a model for other cultural landscapes.

In addition to the response to specific issues raised in Decision **32 COM 7B.52**, the State Party also noted factors that could threaten the property including desertification, overgrazing and plant poaching. In regard to desertification, reports by transhumant stock farmers indicate that the time period for the recovery of plants from grazing has increased and that precipitation has diminished. The information needs to be verified with scientific studies and to determine the extent of the problem. As for overgrazing, Global Environment Facility (GEF)/World Bank-funded study has identified signs of overgrazing at some parts of the property, mainly near water points, although the reasons for this effect have yet to be clarified. As a response, a grazing management plan is being developed and completion is foreseen in March 2009. Plant poaching has been identified as an issue that needs to be

studied and addressed in the integrated management plan. Additional staffing is also considered to mitigate the problem.

Finally, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the State Party reports on activities implemented on infrastructure at the property, including the upgrading and repairs of existing roads, the upgrading of five existing campsites and the establishment of five low-impact additional ones to eliminate *ad hoc* camping, the definition of a guided hiking trail and a construction of three traditional matjies houses and a cooking screen for meals as a traditional Nama village just outside Eksteenfontein. The State Party also reports that "The Feasibility of Conservation based Economic Opportunities in the Richtersveld World Heritage Site" study has been completed and will be an important tool to inform future plans for development of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note with satisfaction that the State Party has confirmed that the National Environment Management Act and the South Africa World Heritage Convention Act 1999 prevent any mining activities to take place within World Heritage properties and note that this is in line with the International Council for Minerals and Metals (ICMM) "No-go" commitment. They further note that the State Party has reached an agreement with DME and Bushmanland Minerals to withdraw their prospecting permit. It is also noted that there are existing mining activities adjacent to the property which could have a negative impact if not mitigated. There is a need for an assessment of the impact of these mining activities on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.49

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.52**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction that the State Party has confirmed that prospecting/mining activities are not allowed within the property and its buffer zone, in line with the "No-go" commitment of the International Council for Minerals and Metals (ICMM) in World Heritage properties (2003);*
4. *Also notes the actions implemented by the State Party to address the specific prospecting permit at the property and urges the State Party to expedite the process for the final cancellation of this permit as soon as possible and inform the World Heritage Centre;*
5. *Takes note of the results of the 2009 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, endorses its recommendations and requests the State Party to implement them, particularly in respect to presenting the property and addressing potential threats derived from overgrazing, desertification and plant poaching;*
6. *Welcomes the State Party's decision not to reduce the buffer zone and invites the State Party to probe the possibility of a potential extension into the Richtersveld National Park to strengthen the sustainability of the Outstanding Universal Value of the cultural landscape, in line with Decision **31 COM 8B.20**, paragraph 4a, at the time of inscription;*

7. *Encourages the State Party to carry out an assessment of the impact of mining activities in areas close to the buffer zone on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property and to identify measures to comprehensively address them;*
8. *Requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the revised management plan, including measures to address Paragraph 7 above, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations.*

50. Robben Island (Republic of South Africa) (C 916)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

Criteria

(iii) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.39; 30 COM 7B.44; 31 COM 7B.53

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2004: Joint ICOMOS/ICCROM/IUCN mission; 2005: joint ICOMOS/IUCN mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Visitor pressure;
- b) Lack of comprehensive Conservation management plan;
- c) Lack of specific annual plans of operation;
- d) Difficulties with operational aspects of maintenance and conservation implementation including lack of preventive maintenance funding and programming;
- e) Lack of appropriate conservation of the built heritage;
- f) Lack of proactive management of tourism pressure;

- g) Lack of integration of natural values in management of the property;
- h) Need for organizational restructuring of the management authority for the property.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/916>

Current conservation issues

On 30 January 2009, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property. The report focuses on the implementation of projects and activities under the Integrated Conservation management plan (ICMP). The following issues are raised in the report.

a) Management structure

In response to the management and organizational issues, the report noted that an interim Chief Executive Officer (CEO) was appointed and a three phase approach to a) stabilizing the institution, b) developing a new organizational and management structure, and c) appointing a permanent CEO for the Robben Island Museum, was instituted. At present, work is still ongoing on Phase one, that of institutional stabilization. The report does not mention progress towards establishing a statutory authority under the World Heritage Convention Act 1999 for managing the property.

The report also notes positively an improvement in coordination with the Department of Public Works (DPW), owner of the property. This coordination includes a number of preventive maintenance projects as well as “bulk services” such as supply of potable water, waste removal services, electricity generation, and water borne sewerage. There is no mention, however, of a more formalized agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the management authority of the property and the DPW, as mentioned in earlier recommendations.

b) Conservation of built heritage

The report notes a number of physical conservation and preventive maintenance projects that have been identified and planned at various parts of the property including the Maximum Security Prison, the Sobukwe Complex, the Administration Building and the harbour parking area, the Bluestone Quarry, the road to the Lime Quarry, as well as a number of boats. Each of these projects is being carried out in phases with progress reported to date and work still to be done highlighted.

c) Visitor planning and management

A focus has also been placed on interpretation, visitor planning and management. The rehabilitation of the visitor’s centre, and development of a phased, integrated interpretation, visitor and use plan are underway at the Maximum Security Prison, and research and exhibition development are underway at the Sobukwe Complex, and other parts of the property. Further work is being carried out on the planning of routes from one complex to another on the island.

d) Management of the Natural Heritage and Archives

The report notes progress on the conservation of natural heritage resources on the island. Work has included coastal clean-up efforts, ongoing monitoring and management of flora and fauna, and monitoring and removal of alien flora and fauna.

Finally the report notes that efforts are ongoing to improve the management and conservation of the Mayibuye Archives, located at the University of the Western Cape.

Although not located on the property itself, this archive is considered an important element in the understanding of the property and its history.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies encourage the State Party to establish, as one of the outcomes of the reorganization process, a statutory authority with a clear management structure aimed at protecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. A formalized agreement (MoU) between the management authority and DPW is recommended to strengthen the reorganized management structure of the property. The phased yearly approach for conservation projects should be commended within the larger structure of the management plan. In order to assess the effectiveness of the management plan and structure in conserving the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that a reactive monitoring mission be undertaken to the property during 2010/2011.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.50

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.53**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the continued progress by the State Party on the implementation of the Integrated Conservation management plan, specifically in relation to physical conservation and preventive conservation work, ongoing improvements in interpretation and visitor management, and better cooperation with the Department of Public Works ;*
4. *Encourages the State Party to continue working on stabilizing and reorganizing the institutional/managerial aspects of the property including the creation of a statutory authority under the World Heritage Convention Act with a permanent Chief Executive Officer ;*
5. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property, in 2010/2011, to assess the effectiveness of the management plan and structure in conserving the Outstanding Universal Value of the property ;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit, by **1 February 2012**, a detailed progress report on management/institutional aspects of the property as well as ongoing conservation, maintenance, interpretation, and visitor management.*

ARAB STATES

51. Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1982

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

2002–2006

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7A.18; 31 COM 7B.54; 32 COM 7B.56

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 99,231 for Emergency assistance, Technical cooperation and training.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 9,564 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust.

Previous monitoring missions

2002: World Heritage Centre and experts missions; March 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Natural degradation caused by littoral erosion, marine salt and vegetation covering part of the inscribed sectors;
- b) Deterioration of the remains due to vandalism, theft and uncontrolled visitation causing accumulation of rubbish;
- c) Urbanization on the outskirts of the property where, in the absence of a defined buffer zone, illegal construction provokes land disputes;
- d) Lack of capacities for site conservation, unsuitable restoration techniques, and poor conservation conditions for the archaeological remains;
- e) Proposed port development.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/193>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2009, a report on the progress made with the completion and implementation of the “Protection and valorization plan”

(PPMVSA), a map clearly displaying the delimitation of all components of this serial property, and its buffer zone, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009; and (as soon as possible and prior to carrying out the work), the detailed design of the proposed port development showing its impact on the property. The State Party report was received on 30 January 2009.

a) PPMVSA

The report notes that the first phase of the *Plan de Protection et de Mise en valeur des sites archéologiques de Tipasa et de sa zone de protection (PPMVSA): Méthodologie d'approche et contenu de l'étude*, expected in November 2008 has been delayed. The State Party submitted the first part of Phase I of the PPMVSA at the end of January 2009; this report presents a series of documents which delineate and illustrate the limits of the zone of protection for the five sectors of the property. This comprehensive visual analysis of the perimeter conditions of the site is undoubtedly a very valuable planning tool but it is worth noting that none of the work is explicitly linked to the delimitation of the World Heritage property or its buffer zone.

The State Party report presents a revised schedule which suggests the PPMVSA will be completed by the end of 2009. However work on phase I is behind completion dates established in the schedule submitted, and delay beyond the end of 2009 may be expected.

b) Buffer zone

The State Party refers to the PPMVSA report submitted above as containing the requested information concerning the boundaries of the inscribed property and its buffer zone. The State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre the map requested within the framework of the Retrospective Inventory as well as a proposal for a buffer zone, which will be presented to the World Heritage Committee in document *WHC-09/33.COM/8B*, related to "minor modifications of the limits of the property".

c) Proposed port

Concerning the request to present urgently all details of the design of the proposed port development showing its impact on the property, the State Party report mentions that the project is being carried out in close coordination between the Public Works Directorate, the Tipasa Wilaya and the various departments in charge of cultural heritage at national and local levels. The report includes a power point with an outline of the project and simulations. However, the slides are not accompanied by a project description, detailed plans, or an assessment of its impact on the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.51

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.56**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on progress made with the completion and implementation of the "Protection and Valorisation Plan for the archaeological site of Tipasa and its zone of protection";

4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, prior to carrying out the work, the detailed design and plans of the proposed port development, together with an assessment of its impact on the property;*
5. *Also requests that the State Party submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a progress report on the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

52. Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1992

Criteria

(ii) (v)

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.43; 29 COM 7B.44; 31 COM 7B.59

International Assistance

Total amount allocated to the property: USD 87,600 for Technical assistance

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

September 2001: World Heritage Centre reactive monitoring mission; December 2007 and September 2008: World Heritage Centre missions financed by the State Party for the Safeguarding Plan and the issue of the metro.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) *Natural erosion;*
- b) *Lack of maintenance of dwelling places;*
- c) *Loss of traditional conservation techniques;*
- d) *Uncontrolled land use;*
- e) *Non-operational safeguarding plan;*
- f) *Lack of coordination of activities.*

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/fen/list/565>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec, 2008), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to continue work on the ongoing rehabilitation measures and the implementation of the Permanent Safeguarding Plan. The State Party submitted its report to the World Heritage Centre on 30 January 2009. It provided information on progress achieved with regard to the Permanent Safeguarding Plan and enhancement of the Kasbah of Algiers, together with voluminous documentation. Monitoring of the implementation of this Plan is currently ensured by a coordination body comprising representatives of all the decentralized structures of the State concerned with the management of the property as well as the Wali of Algiers, or his representative. It is chaired by the Minister of Culture.

The Permanent Safeguarding Plan is divided into three phases:

- Phase 1: diagnostic and emergency measures, specifically the current shoring up, by 17 design offices (2007);
- Phase 2: historical analysis and typology and preliminary draft (2007-2008);
- Phase 3: final drafting of the Permanent Safeguarding Plan.

The funding for Phase 1 estimated at more than 628 million Algerian dinars (approximately USD 8 million) has been covered by the Ministry of Culture.

The conservation of this heritage has been the subject of an Interministerial Council that has taken the decision to strengthen the security and public order activities, re-house the families whose dwellings were threatened and to make available funds for protection activities. This Council also requested the Ministry of Culture to initiate a draft public utility executive declaration for the safeguarded sector of the Kasbah, as well as a second decree for the creation of a national commissariat and sectoral committees for the management of the medinas and their safeguarded sectors. The September 2008 mission made some recommendations, in particular to call upon high-level expertise for structural issues and their seismic resistance, and to group all training and cooperation activities under the umbrella of a « *Kasbah Heritage House* ».

a) The metro project

The infrastructure and ancillary works (e.g. stations, ventilating shafts) linked to the construction of the Algiers metro are located in the inscribed perimeter of the Kasbah and risk causing serious damage to archaeological vestiges in the substratum. At the request of the Algerian authorities, two missions were dispatched by the World Heritage Centre and funded by the Ministry of Culture. A physical and geotechnical analysis was executed, together with soundings carried out in view of the construction of the future Place des Martyrs metro station, in the Lower Kasbah. An archaeological diagnostic is planned in the near future to establish the importance and value of the buried remains and provide necessary information for the outline of a specific strategy for the planning of a metro station and land acquisition. This work will be monitored by the INRAP (National Institute for Preventive Archaeological Research, France) with support from the World Heritage Centre, in the framework of an agreement with the Ministry of Culture of Algeria. In particular, the September 2008 mission recommended a drastic reduction in the demolition foreseen for the construction of the Place de Martyrs station and that a study for an alternative plan be considered, with reduced land acquisition. It also recommended that the Algerian authorities complete the soundings and foresee necessary protective measures. Finally, the mission recommended that all areas where demolition was planned be the subject of prior archaeological excavations in order to safeguard archaeological information.

b) Documentation Centre

The report indicated that the establishment of the Documentation and Information Centre in the Kasbah of Algiers had begun. It is located in the « Dar Aziza Palace », that houses the

Management and Exploitation of Cultural Properties, and the Wilaya of Algiers has undertaken to assemble the different documents and archives relating to the safeguarded sector.

c) Property boundary

The report indicates that the area of the safeguarded sector covers the totality of the perimeter classified at the national level and inscribed on the World Heritage List, that is 70 ha to which are added 35 ha of buffer zone. Although numerous maps are included in the report, the State Party has not yet transmitted a «topographical or cadastral map clearly indicating the boundaries and area of the inscribed property » as requested by the World Heritage Committee.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.52

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.59**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party on the activities carried out in view of the conservation of the Kasbah of Algiers, and regarding the carrying out of emergency work, as outlined in the first phase of the implementation of the Permanent Safeguarding Plan;*
4. *Also takes note of the concerted activities undertaken in order that the Algiers metro work does not affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
5. *Congratulates the State Party for all the measures undertaken and encourages the pursuit of its efforts to conserve and rehabilitate the property;*
6. *Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Committee informed on a regular basis of the progress achieved regarding the metro project;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit before **1 February 2010**, a cadastral plan on the biggest scale available, showing the boundary of the property;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, before **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, regarding the implementation of the Safeguarding Plan and rehabilitation activities, for examination by the Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

53. Qal'at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun (Bahrain) (C 1192)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.49; 31 COM 7B.60; 32 COM 8B.54

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January-February 2006: World Heritage Centre mission; June 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Project of land reclamation ("North Star") in the bay in front of the property, as well as the project of a fishing harbour;
- b) Physical and visual integrity threatened by the urban and architectural development projects around the protected area;
- c) Visual integrity threatened by a project of a causeway foreseen off the northern coast as part of the global response to the traffic congestion in this part of the country.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1192>

Current conservation issues

In its Decision **32 COM 8B.54**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee approved a minor modification of the property boundaries, which defined the visual corridor in the bay north of the site as buffer zone and included a second area to the property which comprises the ancient sea tower and the historic entrance channel. This entails that the North Star project, should it be maintained, will not be built at the previously foreseen location.

With respect to the other issues raised by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **31 COM 7B.60**, the progress report submitted by the State Party on 5 March 2009 provided the following information:

- a) The National Planning and Development Strategies (2030) were endorsed by Royal Decree in November 2008. The World Heritage property and its approved modified buffer zone have been integrated into these Strategies, as a development exclusion zone. Therefore, the legal protection of the whole property is assured, in addition to the zone owned by the Ministry of Culture. All requests for building or development in the area received by the Ministry of Municipalities and Agriculture are forwarded to the Sector for Culture and National Heritage.
- b) The National Planning and Development Strategies (2030) foresee an off-shore highway, planned for 2015, but specifies that the exclusion corridor can only be crossed by a bridge at a minimal distance of 3km to the shore;

- c) With regard to the relocation of the local community living at the southern edge of the site, following its specific request, the report confirms that a location has been officially attributed by the Ministry of Housing. However, due to lack of funding the infrastructure and construction works have not yet been scheduled or designed;
- d) The “Action plan towards a management system” submitted in March 2006 as the basis for a future integrated management and conservation plan has been reviewed and updated by a working group consisting of staff members from the Ministry of Culture and Information and from the Ministry of Municipalities and Agriculture. It includes a new Action Plan for the period 2009-2011, attached to the State Party’s report. The report expressed that in order to improve some of the coordination mechanisms the State Party will review and evaluate its effectiveness for two more years before adopting a finalized version.

Representatives of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies attended the opening of the new visitor centre and site museum on 18 February 2008, which provides high standard presentation facilities for the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome the progress made but note delays in finalizing the management plan.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.53

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **31 COM 7B.60** and **32 COM 8B.54**, adopted at its 31st (Christchurch, 2007) and 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the progress achieved by the State Party in the implementation of a series of important measures aiming at conserving and protecting the property;*
4. *Requests the State Party to provide, by **1 February 2011**, three printed and electronic copies of the final integrated management and conservation plan, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.*

54. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission)

55. Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(i) (v) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.50; 31 COM 7B.56; 32 COM 7B.58

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 503,849 for Technical Assistance

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: Special Account for the safeguarding of the cultural heritage of Egypt: USD 44,000 allocated for the preparation of the project document for the management plan.

Previous monitoring missions

August 2002, March 2005: ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions; April and December 2007: World Heritage Centre missions for the Cairo Financial Centre; October 2008: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Rise of the underground water level ;
- b) Dilapidated infrastructure ;
- c) Neglect and lack of maintenance ;
- d) Overcrowded areas and buildings ;
- e) Uncontrolled development ;
- f) Absence of a comprehensive Urban conservation plan ;
- g) Absence of an integrated socio-economic revitalization plan linking the urban and the socio-cultural fabric of the city core.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/89>

Current conservation issues

Since early 2007, at the request of the Supreme Council of Antiquities, the World Heritage Centre has been monitoring the progress of a new construction in the vicinity of the Cairo Citadel, the Cairo Financial Centre. Three missions were carried out and their recommendations taken into consideration. At its 32nd session, the World Heritage Committee reiterated those recommendations regarding notably the height of the buildings. It

also urged the State Party to implement the main recommendations of the 2002 Symposium, in particular to prepare a comprehensive Urban Plan for the Conservation and Development of the Old City, whereby the conservation of historic buildings would be accompanied by appropriate development regulations.

a) Cairo Financial Centre (CFC)

As requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), a reactive monitoring mission was carried out at the end of October 2008. The main findings and recommendations of the mission are that the Egyptian authorities and the responsible body for the Cairo Financial Centre (CFC) are in favor of accepting a consolidated approach which would allow the project to continue while at the same time, not causing unacceptable harm to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The solution is to minimize the negative effects through specified additional modifications to the final shape of the complex. Detailed architectural and technical documentation was requested (not only visualisations, but also plans, cross-sections and facades containing all the planned modifications and enhancements needed to meet the above requirements), as a basis for a final agreement. In the meantime, the State Party has negotiated a pause in the development until the final documents have been agreed.

In its report sent on 29 January 2009, the State Party specifies that the developer of the CFC is keenly following the work. In March, the World Heritage Centre received from the State Party a drawing of the roof plan. Following the World Heritage Centre's request for additional detailed architectural and technical documentation, the drawings of the elevations and visualizations were received in April, reflecting the major modifications agreed during the October 2008 mission.

b) Management and Conservation plan

Simultaneously, another World Heritage Centre mission visited Cairo to discuss a project to support the Egyptian authorities in preparing a comprehensive management plan for the property under extra-budgetary funds deposited by Egypt at UNESCO. The lack of maintenance and of appropriate legal and planning tools were underlined. In particular:

- the lack of a definite and operational delimitation of the property;
- the lack of coordination among the different institutions involved;
- beyond the regulations for the protection of the monuments and antiquities, no specific urban planning tools exist for the conservation of the unlisted buildings and the remaining urban fabric in Historic Cairo.

The mission suggested creating a dedicated "technical branch" for Historic Cairo, integrating the competencies of the Supreme Council of Antiquities (SCA) and of the Cairo Governorate, which would become the official counterpart for the activities and the experts to be identified by the World Heritage Centre for the management plan project.

The State Party report indicates its willingness to carry out this project. The report also lists the issues the SCA will address in the preparation of the management plan. It will also be scheduling meetings in the coming months with representatives of the various governmental departments that focus on Historic Cairo within the Urban Planning Unit of the Cairo Governorate, the Ministry of Awqaf (Religious Endowments), the Ministry of Housing, and the Historic Cairo Project. These discussions will address notably the restoration of monuments, the adaptive reuse programmes for these monuments, and the implementation of urban rehabilitation plans. They will also address the absence of legal, institutional and planning frameworks and identify the delimitation (limits and buffer zone) of the Historic Cairo property with clear complementary maps.

c) Other issues

In addition, the State Party's report describes the considerable interventions of urban rehabilitation that have been recently carried out in Al Muiz street (upgrading of the urban fabric, relocation of incompatible activities, limitation on heavy traffic identification of pedestrian streets, new uses for restored monuments, new lighting and paving, and upgraded infrastructure). It also mentions a joint Cairo-City of Paris project for the rehabilitation of 32 buildings, on-going since the year 2000, of which the World Heritage Centre is not aware. The report only contains the list of these 32 buildings with no indication of the type or status of work undertaken.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the revised drawings for the CFC developed following the mission, and consider that while the submitted documents are not as detailed as specified by the mission (plans of all levels and cross-sections, besides facades), they allow to assess that the revisions coincide with the experts' proposals to minimize the negative effects of the building complex.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note the willingness of the State Party to prepare a comprehensive management and conservation plan for the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.55

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.58**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes the State Party's commitment to obtain a modification of the design of the Cairo Financial Centre so as to mitigate its impact on the urban landscape of the Citadel;*
4. *Takes note of the steps taken by the State Party for the preparation of a Management and Conservation plan for the property and welcomes its decision to involve the World Heritage Centre in this process, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and a progress report on modifications to the Cairo Financial Centre and on the elaboration of the management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

56. Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(i) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.51; 31 COM 7B.57; 32 COM 7B.59

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 18,750 for Technical cooperation

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 6,000 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust

Previous monitoring missions

March-April 2005: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; November 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS mission; March 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; July 2008: World Heritage Centre expert mission for the stylite tower.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Unstable structures and lack of security;
- b) Lack of comprehensive conservation plan;
- c) Lack of management structure and plan;
- d) Important tourism development project with new constructions.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1093>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee congratulated the State Party for the conservation measures undertaken since the reactive monitoring mission of November 2006, and noted the steps being taken by the State Party to address the threat of loss of Outstanding Universal Value, and sustaining the property's authenticity and integrity; the World Heritage Committee considered that there was no need to include the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Committee further requested the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre a detailed documentation of all initiatives mentioned in its 2008 state of conservation report, and supplementary information on the new management structure and staffing, the completion and initial operations of the visitor's centre, the definitive organization of the pathway system, progress in development of the conservation plan and in the elaboration of a management plan. It also encouraged the State Party to: develop a financial system with a minimum annual operations budget, prepare a possible revision of the boundaries of the property and buffer zone, and also develop a timeframe for the implementation of short and long term corrective measures (conservation, maintenance and monitoring plans for ongoing consolidation and security works), as well as a needed archaeological research policy.

The State Party submitted the state of conservation report by letter dated 31 March 2009. Concerning management, the report only details numbers of new staff appointed, and mentions installation of a new electronic security system. A state of conservation summary includes information on new fencing for the entire site, new works carried out on the St. Stephane complex including its shelter, new organization and completion of the pathway system, (including extension of a road from the visitor's centre to the St. Stephane complex, and beyond to the stylite tower), completion of the visitor's centre (now partly in use for tourist police but not yet offering visitor's services), and acquisition of parcels of land to strengthen the integrity of the property.

The State Party report does not mention the alarming state of conservation of the Stylite tower that led to its request for International Assistance, granted in February 2009. This technical assistance aims at undertaking all the necessary studies for the elaboration of a restoration project for the tower, including the urgent dismantling of the *cella* on the top of the structure and the consolidation of the scaffolding.

However, the State Party report notes that a solid financial system that would permit the functioning of the Visitor's Centre, provide for a permanent operations budget for the property and permit for implementation of short and long term corrective measures, is not yet in place.

It is also important to note that the State Party's report does not provide the new information concerning progress in developing either the conservation plan or the management plan for the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee. The State Party has also not provided the technical report documenting all initiatives described in its 2008 report, nor does the State Party report note progress in preparing a revision of the boundaries of the property and the buffer zone.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned however that most of the progress described in the State Party report concerns expenditure made under the European Commission project, and that the needed efforts from the State Party to develop and implement urgently the management plan (including a comprehensive conservation plan and an archaeological research policy) and fully supportive financial system requested by the World Heritage Committee have not progressed.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are also concerned with the State Party report references to building and completing roads on site, given the strong objections raised by the World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission of March 2008 to roads running from the site entrance to the church complex, and the earlier decision of the State Party to abandon road-building within the sensitive archaeological site, following the 2006 mission.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.56

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.59**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes with appreciation the State Party's continuing efforts to improve the state of conservation of the property;*
4. *Expresses its concern that the road building described in the State Party's report may have been carried out in spite of the objections raised by the World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission of March 2008, and requests the State Party to*

provide detailed information including maps and photographs to the World Heritage Centre on the completed road system;

5. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre a technical document including detailed documentation for all initiatives described in its state of conservation reports for 2008 and 2009;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to provide a progress report on the technical studies serving as a basis for the restoration project of the Stylite tower;*
7. *Also reiterates its request to the State Party to report on the progress in developing the management plan (including a comprehensive conservation plan and an archaeological research policy) for the site, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, and to urgently develop a financial system which will support annual operations, a possible revision of the boundaries of the inscribed property and its buffer zone, and timeframe for the implementation of short and long term corrective measures already identified;*
8. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on its progress in implementing the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

57. Tyr (Lebanon) (C 299)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

58. Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

59. Ancient Ksour of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

60. Ksar of Ait-Ben-Haddou (Morocco) (C 444)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

Criteria

(iv) (v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.43; 30 COM 7B.45; 31COM 7B.65

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 49,833 for technical cooperation

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

September 2003: reactive monitoring mission; November 2003: World Heritage Centre mission; April 2006: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; February 2007: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Partial abandonment of the property;
- b) Gully erosion;
- c) Rock falls due to erosion;
- d) Increased offences in old *Ksar* and degradation;
- e) Delays in the establishment of a technical and administrative structure responsible for the property;
- f) Uncontrolled tourism and visitor pressure.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/444>

Current conservation issues

During its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee noted that while progress had been made in completing the management plan and in establishing consultative committees, it was concerned that a satisfactory, overall, and well resourced management structure on the property was not yet functioning and there were no sustainable funding arrangements for long term conservation and management of the property.

The mission of February 2007 identified several measures to be effectively implemented by 1 February 2009, including the establishment of an effective and transparent on site management structure with legal powers, adequate decentralised financing and technical staffing; the issuance of a special decree or by-laws to mandate interventions regarding

ownership issues in relation to planning activities, the finalization of the draft and formal adoption of the management plan and the continuation of preventive conservation measures.

The State Party report, received on 10 February 2009 notes that the management plan has been completed (in French and Arabic), reviewed, adopted by the appropriate authorities, diffused to all stakeholders and is now being implemented, with the support of the local site management committee.

Concerning the need expressed by the World Heritage Committee to develop an overall and adequately funded management structure for the property, the State Party's progress report was less positive. At present, decisions for the property are taken by the Governor of the Province of Ouarzazate on the basis of advice provided by CERKAS (*Centre de Conservation et de Réhabilitation du Patrimoine Architectural des Zones Atlasiques et Subatlasiques*). The report notes that the authorities have explored giving CERKAS these responsibilities (as recommended by the 2007 mission above) – rather than creating a new institution for the purpose - but that CERKAS lacks sufficient human and financial resources to take this on.

The State Party report also notes - following the recommendations of the management plan - that from October 2008, a special account has been created to receive visitor revenues, and proceeds from other site activities (such as film making), and to direct these revenues to conservation on site.

The State Party report also describes completion of two preventive conservation projects mentioned in the 2007 State Party report. The report also described efforts by CERKAS to improve support for conservation work undertaken by the local population, including efforts to provide appropriate materials and tools for the work.

Finally, the report reviews the progress of initiatives included within the Action Plan (2007-2012) of the Management plan, including:

- a) Plan for the restoration of the fortification walls financed by the Ministry of Culture, on the basis of studies carried out by CRATerre and CERKAS;
- b) Plan for the improvement of water quality, financed by the Government of Belgium;
- c) Development of a First Aid response facility within the Ksar staffed by two young people of the Ksar;
- d) Plan for the restoration of the houses of the Ksar, financed by a private sector holding company in collaboration with CERKAS, the Agence Urbaine Ouarzazate-Zagora and the population of the Ksar.

With respect to the need to ensure a well resourced management structure on the property, to co-ordinate communication among all involved and to direct implementation of decisions, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are pleased to see the continuing efforts of the State Party devoted to the property but are very concerned that the State Party has merely noted that no progress has been made in reinforcing CERKAS or creating an a new purpose-built management agency with over-arching responsibility for the site. Securing the necessary funding and support internally should be the highest priority of the State Party in protecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS have also reviewed the 2007 management plan prepared with the expertise of CRATerre, which provides a very comprehensive overview of the situation and identifies many important potential remedial actions. The Plan has been built according to an explicitly stated set of eight ethical principles including the necessity to build such a plan with the full involvement of local stakeholders at all phases, giving priority to re-establishing craftsmanship, reinforcing existing local capacities, and privileging maintenance and preventive actions.

However, the management plan, while accurately describing the many management groups involved with the property, does not align itself with the World Heritage Committee's observations concerning the need to consolidate and co-ordinate these functions within one overarching management authority. Nor does it, in the section devoted to analysis of the significance of the property, mention the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property. Certainly, these need to drive the management of this property from a World Heritage perspective.

While drafting this document, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was received by the World Heritage Centre, and will be reviewed by the Advisory Bodies in due course.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.60

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.65**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the continuing efforts of the State Party to improve the state of conservation of the property;*
4. *Also notes with satisfaction the completion of the management plan in 2007, and initial efforts to implement it;*
5. *Reiterates its concern that no progress has been made in establishing a satisfactory overall management structure and in putting in place sustainable funding arrangements for conservation and management of the property;*
6. *Urges the State Party to undertake the following:*
 - a) *Put in place a fully resourced management structure to co-ordinate the planning process for the property, take responsibility for the decision-making and implementation,*
 - b) *Integrate the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property into the management plan;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011** an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, and on the progress achieved in implementing the measures identified above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

61. Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

Criteria

(iv)

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

1988-2004

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.56; 31 COM 7B.67; 32 COM 7B.62

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 66,772 for Technical Assistance.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 25,000 (private funding).

Previous monitoring missions

2001, 2002 and 2003: World Heritage Centre expert missions

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Deterioration of the earthen structures of the Fort;
- b) Use of inappropriate conservation techniques;
- c) Urban pressure;
- d) Lack of a management plan and appropriate legislation.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/433>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to finalise and adopt the Management plan and to provide a detailed progress report on the Souq project, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

On 1 February 2009, a report on the state of conservation of Bahla Fort was submitted by the State Party. A major portion of this report is dedicated to the technical studies, archaeological excavations, and restoration works undertaken in the Qasaba area of the Bahla Fort. The report also contains details about the visitor facilities, training activities and the work on the Bahla wall (*Sur*).

a) management plan

With regard to the management plan requested by the World Heritage Committee there is very little information in the report except to say that the Plan prepared in 2003 and updated in 2005 is now being further updated by a consultant before its adoption.

b) Souq project

With reference to the project to rehabilitate the Souq, the report says that the project is being developed "in full consultation with the World Heritage Centre". However, in July 2008, the State Party submitted a detailed report on the proposed restoration work of the Souq, which is considered to be the most important surviving section of the Fort. ICOMOS has made

detailed comments on the project proposal which were transmitted to the State Party. These comments reflect concerns on the overall approach of the project which it considers needs considerable modifications.

c) Archaeological excavations and restoration work

The State Party's report contains a detailed account of the work carried out in the property including important archaeological excavations in the Qasaba portion and the findings and, moreover, major restoration work in the same area, said to be the most ancient of the property. This seems to be a major activity about which details have not been submitted.

d) Additional information

The report also mentions the establishment of a new workshop, including a brick production unit, which will also serve for the restoration and maintenance of wooden and iron elements in the whole country, by means of specialised manpower.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned about the lack of progress in the finalisation and the adoption of the management plan. They are also concerned about the new proposal for the rehabilitation and restoration of the Souq, as well as about the major works being undertaken in the property, particularly in the Qasaba area for which no details were provided for assessment in advance, in conformity with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. In the absence of the management plan and other details, indicating the priorities and the type of activities undertaken, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are not in a position to judge the impacts of the work being carried out on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.61

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.62**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not yet finalise and adopt the management plan taking into account the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies and did not establish the necessary legal and administrative frameworks for its implementation;
4. Notes that the State Party has provided a revised detailed project proposal for the restoration of the Souq and the concerns expressed by ICOMOS on the overall approach of the project, and requests the State Party not to commence the work until a further revised proposal has been agreed;
5. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the overall state of conservation of the property, in particular the activities in the Qasaba area and the Souq, and their effects on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
6. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, the adopted management plan in three printed and electronic copies and a

detailed progress report on its implementation, the legal framework and administrative structure, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

62. Aflaj Irrigation Systems of Oman (Oman) (C 1207)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2006

Criteria

(v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 8B.37; 31COM 7B.68

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1207>

Current conservation issues

At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee noted that new laws had been drafted for the property and requested the State Party to provide further details. It also congratulated the State Party on progress with the management plan, including support for community involvement, emerging local initiatives in the development of local plans for specific water management systems, and the formation of an inter-disciplinary Management Committee to take forward the management plan process. It requested the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre the medium term management plan when it is developed and to report to the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session. On 23 March 2009, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report which provided details of progress on the following:

a) Protection Laws

Royal Decree 1429 (2008) is for the organisation and protection of the *Aflaj* property inscribed on the World Heritage list. This law protects the entire *Aflaj* system, both underground and above ground channels, from the area where water is collected to its distribution around the fields, the environment around the channels, and archaeological buildings, monuments and agricultural land within the property. Certain types of activity are prohibited, while modifications and alteration that might be allowed need to be approved by the National Committee for the Management and Development of the *Aflaj*. The are penalties set out for non-compliance.

b) Short-term Action Plan and Development of Medium-term management plan

There is now much greater understanding and knowledge of the property as a result of studies which have identified key issues and priorities for the cultural landscape, built heritage, socio-economic context, governance, management, tourism and visitor management, as a basis for the development of the management plan. The Ministry of Heritage and Culture is undertaking a survey of traditional settlements in the property, as part of a comprehensive survey across Oman. The Ministry of Regional Municipalities and Water Resources has launched a pilot project to document oral traditions associated with water distribution and the way science of astronomy was used for the timing of water shares. This covers six *aflaj*, including two that are part of the property. The management plan process has increased understanding of the rationale for the boundaries and buffer zone and set out the parameters for a detailed topographical study.

The two Ministries have set out international standards for the conservation of the *Aflaj* channels, including the use of traditional materials and techniques. Buildings and settlements that are key areas for conservation have been identified that will allow urgent stabilisation works to be undertaken. Good practice on materials and process for traditional buildings have also been set out. The Ministries have engaged in wide consultation with local stakeholders and studies of the socio-economic context have focused on sustainability of the local communities at each of the sites within the property.

The final draft of the management plan sets out a vision for the property, together with medium term objectives and short-term actions. The Plan should be submitted shortly to the World Heritage Centre.

c) Communication

Various activities have taken place to promote understanding of the complex socio-cultural activities associated with the *Aflaj* system. These include an exhibition in Muscat, two international TV documentaries, a book and the development of a web-site for all the *Aflaj* sites within the property.

d) Restoration projects

Three major restoration projects have been approved for the period 2009-2011. These are the restoration of 137 metres of an underground channel at *Falaj* Daris in Nizwa Town using traditional materials and techniques; restoration of a 135 metre aqueduct at *Falaj* al Khatmin; and the restoration of stone steps down to the open channels at *Falaj* Aljila.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge the substantial progress made in putting in place legal protection for all aspects of the property. They also note the considerable progress made in creating a well-researched framework as a basis for the development of the management plan, in promoting wider understanding of the value and

attributes of the property, in involving local communities and their expertise, and in supporting the restoration of *Aflaj* channels and their associated buildings. The management plan, once submitted will be reviewed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.62

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31COM 7B.68**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Acknowledges the details of the legal protection now in place for all aspects of the property;*
4. *Notes the considerable progress that has been made in putting in place a well-researched framework for the development of the management plan, in promoting wider understanding of the value and attributes of the property, in involving local communities and their expertise in working towards sustainable management, and in supporting the restoration of Aflaj channels and their associated buildings;*
5. *Also notes that the management plan is due for completion in the near future;*
6. *Requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the completed management plan to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.*

63. Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.58; 32 COM 7B.63

International Assistance

Total amount allocated to the property: USD 149,690 for Technical Cooperation.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount allocated to the property: USD 10,000 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust

Previous monitoring missions

March and December 2007: World Heritage Centre missions for the King Faisal Street project; April 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Poor state of conservation;
- b) Inappropriate restoration techniques;
- c) Lack of a buffer zone;
- d) Lack of a management plan.
- e) Development projects threatening the significant historic fabric.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/20>

Current conservation issues

2. At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee, while welcoming the cancellation of the development foreseen on King Faisal street, requested to be informed of any revised plans and of details of any other major projects. It also requested that all infrastructure work should include an archaeological impact assessment and salvage excavations. It further highlighted the need to apply traditional approaches to conservation, restoration, repair and maintenance of building fabric, in order to maintain the authenticity of the property. The World Heritage Committee regretted the construction of the new cultural centre on Medhat Pasha Street, urging the State Party to transmit all available information on the project.

3. It reiterated its invitation to the State Party to consider extending the boundaries of the property, in order to include associated historical neighbourhoods and further requested the State Party to complete its work on defining a buffer zone.

4. Finally, regarding the development of a management plan, the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to ensure co-ordination of all actions undertaken, bringing together the various planning mechanisms and international co-operation programmes, and to grant the authority, resources and status to the bodies responsible for the Ancient City of Damascus.

The State Party submitted a report on 28 January 2009, prepared by the Directorate General of Antiquities and Museums (DGAM).

a) Development in King Faisal street area

The State Party reported that the Governorate of Damascus, after having stopped the first phase of the project, intends to re-study it again, taking into consideration the importance of the area and the urban and traffic plan of Damascus.

b) Buffer zone

A committee has been established by the Ministry of Culture to identify the buffer zone (limits and regulations) of the property and other historical areas. Among the different zones, the

identified historic districts will receive the same level of protection as the Ancient city. Detailed building regulations will be set up and adopted by the protection committee according to the national law applied in the Ancient city. Urban infrastructure development would be allowed in identified "Neighbourhood Conservation Districts", with limitations on the height and appearance and under the supervision of the Antiquities Authorities. A series of urgent actions is suggested, in particular the preparation of a master plan and detailed plan for the buffer zone.

The results of this committee's studies have been approved by the Minister of Culture and the Governor on 28 January 2009 and the identified areas submitted to the High Council of Antiquities to be registered on the national list.

c) Infrastructural work

A first phase of the infrastructure rehabilitation project in Medhat Pasha street was completed at the end of 2008 and a second phase for the lighting will be implemented in 2009. The report stresses that the works were carried out "quickly", although in close coordination with the DGAM that formally documented all archaeological findings. The results of excavations (158 pieces of columns and stones) are presented inside the Old City. The infrastructure works will continue in Al Nakashat area, Sit Raqia and the Jewish area.

d) New cultural centre on Medhat Pasha Street

At its 32nd session, the World Heritage Committee regretted the construction of a cultural centre in Medhat Pasha street, and requested further information. This information was not included in the State Party's report.

e) Other issues

The State Party report also mentioned the following:

In relation to the important stock of abandoned buildings in the Jewish quarter, the report states that the government is now considering designating the neighbourhood as a "preserved cultural area" and preparing a plan for its renovation.

It is reported that a comprehensive cooperation system to protect the historic districts is being established between the national authorities and the international institutions involved in the preservation of Old Damascus, but without additional information being provided.

It gives information about the "rehabilitation and reuse of the Damascus Citadel master-plan", under preparation by an Italian team: until now an analysis of the existing conditions have been carried out, whereas the project document specifies the principles for concept design, identifying conservation and regeneration areas in order to preserve the architectural complex and open it to the public, creating new functional and spatial connections between the Old City and the City Centre.

Finally, the State Party mentions a new project in the south corridor between the citadel and Hamidiyeh Souq involving the design of a new streetscape environment. After having asked for additional details, the World Heritage Centre was informed that "the general goal of the project for developing the Souq is to give a unified architectural style to a construction that was composed of many elements and varied styles. This can be done by replacing some of the materials and shapes used in the facades with others that integrated more harmoniously into the general environment. ". Besides these works, the infrastructure redevelopment is an important component of the project.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that urgent attention must be paid to the re-study of the King Faysal Street project and in general to the strongly negative consequences of the "beautification" activities in the property and other historic

neighbourhoods. The example of the renovation of the facades on the Medhat Pasha street, showing an uniform and sometimes insensitive design that does not correspond, in many cases, to the internationally established conservation requirements, should be avoided elsewhere.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.63

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.63**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Requests to be informed in detail of any future proposals to re-design or re-shape the King Faisal street area;*
4. *Regrets that the requested information on the new cultural centre on Medhat Pasha Street was not provided and reiterates its request to receive it as soon as possible for review;*
5. *Takes note of the progress made in protecting the historical neighbourhoods of the Ancient city and in defining a buffer zone and also reiterates its request to the State Party to complete the establishment of the buffer zone to be submitted for approval by the World Heritage Committee;*
6. *Also notes the numerous conservation and rehabilitation projects on-going in the property, however, while acknowledging the need for infrastructure improvement and the importance of upgrading buildings for the quality of life of the local community, also requests the State Party to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property be respected and its authenticity and integrity maintained, through employing traditional approaches to conservation, restoration, repair and maintenance of building fabric;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to ensure proper archaeological studies and salvage excavation prior to undertaking infrastructure work and to present the archaeological remains discovered in an appropriate setting;*
8. *Urges the State Party to ensure coordination of all actions undertaken in the property and to develop a comprehensive management plan;*
9. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a progress report on the above recommendations and on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

ASIA-PACIFIC

64. The Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) (C 322)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

Criteria

(i) (ii) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.48; 31 COM 7B.76; 32 COM 7B.64

International Assistance

Training Assistance: USD 48,000; Technical Assistance USD 65,000

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 800,000 from UNDP, UNESCO, Japan Funds-in-Trust, France UNESCO Cooperation Agreement and NORAD

Previous monitoring missions

October 2002: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; February 2003: UNESCO experts mission; February/March 2009: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of an effective management system;
- b) Lack of adequate human and financial resources;
- c) Property and buffer zone boundaries not clearly defined;
- d) Drainage and internal moisture contents problem.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/322>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee in Decision **32 COM 7B.64** noted the lack of progress in the implementation of the activity concerning drainage problems at the property and in the development of a management plan. In particular, it expressed serious concern about recent works carried out at the site concerning the installation of draining pipes along the main stupa and light fittings in its immediate vicinity and requested the State Party to suspend these works and implement appropriate mitigating measures to prevent possible deterioration of the property until the situation is reassessed by a joint World Heritage Centre/Advisory Bodies reactive monitoring mission. The World Heritage Committee also requested the State Party to continue its efforts towards the definition of the boundaries of

the property and the buffer zone and encouraged the State Party to submit a request for International Assistance to undertake this task. The proposed delimitation of the property and its buffer zone, as well as the management plan for the property, were to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2010. The World Heritage Committee further requested the State Party to develop a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity. The World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to strengthen the capacity of the Department of Archaeology by providing it with adequate human and financial resources.

The State Party's progress report was sent on 23 February 2009, just before the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission (24 February-1 March 2009). It indicated that the State Party is in the process of implementing the recommendations of previous advisory missions carried out in the framework of International Assistance projects in 2007 and 2008 and looked forward to advice from the forthcoming reactive monitoring mission.

The State Party indicated that the drainage pipes from the top of the structure had been replaced, as previously recommended, and that all the drains, including both open air non-metallic and underground, had been cleared. The Department of Archaeology (DOA) had submitted a project proposal to the central government for approval that will deal with the drainage issue and also enable completion of the management plan.

The State Party further indicated that the light fittings near the central stupa were temporary and would be removed after the original terracotta plaques have been replaced by replicas. It recognised the need for adequate human and financial resources and agreed to submit a request for International Assistance to undertake a project to define the boundaries of the property and the buffer zone. The State Party assured the World Heritage Committee that it would develop a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, and that it would seek assistance from the Advisory Bodies and/or the forthcoming mission to that end.

The mission noted that, while the authorities had made some progress in implementing the recommendations formulated by the World Heritage Committee, a large number of key conservation and management issues had not been resolved. The mission found that these problems were directly linked to the lack of a methodological approach to conservation and the absence of a management plan. In addition to the considerable number of staff vacancies within the DOA, the staff require professional guidance and training in concepts and practices of heritage conservation and management. Failure to seek assistance and advice from national experts, national institutions, universities and the public sector have added to the isolation of decision making. The replacing of drainage pipes embedded in the brickwork, as reported to the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee (Quebec City, 2008), was found to have caused irreversible damage to the original brickwork. As regards the processes leading to damage caused by water and salinity, further studies are needed. Systematic monitoring of the property, especially the terracotta plaques, both *in situ* and in storage, is required to measure the extent of the decay, while better security and visitor management is needed to prevent visitors climbing on the central shrine.

The mission recommended that no major interventions should be carried out until a management plan that sets the priorities for protection and conservation has been established, and provided advice on maintenance activities to be carried out. With regard to boundary definition, the mission found that, while the DOA is in the process of developing new boundaries, this is not being done on the basis of an agreed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Further, adequate maps of the geomorphology, hydrology and land-use/ownership status of the area are needed to inform the definition of the buffer zone.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that unless the management effectiveness and conservation of the property are significantly improved by the State Party in the near future, the impact of the above-mentioned threats could eventually lead to its

inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Priority should be given to developing a management plan based on a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, including appropriate conservation policies and provisions for a buffer zone. The State Party should be encouraged to request International Assistance under the World Heritage Fund to this end.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.64

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.64**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Takes note of the information provided by the State Party on the steps taken in the past year and the readiness for cooperation of its authorities;
4. Regrets that issues of drainage, management and conservation of the property have not been adequately addressed by the State Party despite International Assistance;
5. Urges the State Party, as a matter of priority, to address the recommendations made by the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission carried out in February-March 2009, in particular to:
 - a) *Draft in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the property including condition of authenticity and integrity;*
 - b) *Elaborate in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies a comprehensive management plan which includes conservation policies and provisions for a buffer zone;*
 - c) *Refrain from carrying out any major conservation works until the management plan has been developed and adopted and to ensure in the meantime that all necessary maintenance works are carried out in line with the recommendations made by the 2009 reactive monitoring mission;*
 - d) *Ensure that the necessary professional staff are recruited to fill the vacant posts in the Department of Archaeology, including additional guards at the property;*
 - e) *Remove the incompatible light fittings installed within the courtyard of the monastery once additional guards have been deployed at the property;*
 - f) *Build the capacity of the staff of the Department of Archaeology in heritage management and conservation, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;*
6. Invites the State Party to request International Assistance to implement the recommendations contained in paragraph 5 above;
7. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the progress achieved in the implementation of the recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

65. Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia) (C 1224 rev)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Application of the Reinforced monitoring mechanism)

66. Old Town of Lijiang (China) (C 811)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.69; 32 COM 7B.67

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20.000 Conservation and Management assistance

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions:

January 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; November 2008, UNESCO advisory mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Progressive loss of integrity and authenticity due to major tourism and commercial developments in and around the property
- b) No clearly defined boundary or buffer zones;
- c) Lack of a comprehensive Conservation Master Plan for the property and its surroundings

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/811>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee in its Decision **32 COM 7B.67** focussed on three main conservation issues: the drafting of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value; the completion of an appropriate conservation master plan; and the capacity of the local implementation agency, the World Cultural Heritage Management Bureau. In its Decision **32 COM 8B.53**, on a proposal for minor boundary modifications, the World Heritage Committee recommended deferral so that the State Party could consider enlarging the buffer zones, provide full details of their protective arrangements as part of the overall conservation master and management plans, and propose ways to protect the area between the three sites within the property to ensure key elements of the rural landscape that supported the settlements are sustained as well as key views of the mountains.

In order to assist the State Party to respond to these requests, a UNESCO advisory mission visited Lijiang in November 2008 and met with Chinese officials from national, provincial, municipal and county levels. The advisory mission confirmed the findings of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission of January 2008 that the Old Town of Lijiang is currently witnessing the progressive loss of integrity and authenticity due to new tourism and other commercial developments in and around the inscribed sites of Dayan, Shuhe and, to a lesser extent, Baisha.

a) Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The advisory mission provided guidance to the national and local authorities in the preparation of a clear Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which would be the essential reference point for all future conservation and management planning of the property.

b) Boundaries of the property and Buffer Zones

As a follow up to the World Heritage Committee's decision, the advisory mission highlighted on the need for a clear delimitation of the boundaries of Baisha and Shuhe, and on ways to protect the area between the three components of the inscribed property, particularly in the light of tourism and other development pressures already evident or being proposed.

The advisory mission recommended that a revised submission be made for minor boundary modification in order to extend the boundaries of the currently inscribed buffer zone in the case of Dayan and to establish buffer zones in the case of Baisha and Shuhe, larger than submitted in 2008. Protection for these buffer zones should be reflected in the conservation master plan and site management plan that are being developed and should be demarcated on the property in order to allow better interpretation of the property and appreciation of its Outstanding Universal Value by visitors.

c) Comprehensive Conservation Master Plan

The advisory mission was impressed with the work being carried out by Tongji University and collaborating agencies in the preparation of the conservation master plan but noted that work was not yet complete and that new threats to the property's integrity seemed to be emerging, such as to the east between the existing built-up area of Dayan and the proposed railway station.

A further issue raised by the advisory mission concerned the institutional arrangements for the development, implementation and monitoring of management plans for the inscribed property. Previous reports have commented on the need for articulation of plans and coordination of regulations and interventions at Lijiang. The advantages of bringing the two plans together into a single conservation management plan (CMP) should be investigated but if it was decided to retain the division into two plans, the specific role of each plan should be clarified to remove inefficient and confusing overlaps.

d) *Capacity of the World Cultural Heritage Management Bureau*

The World Heritage Committee requested in its Decision **32 COM 7B.67** that the State Party strengthen the capacity of the World Cultural Heritage Management Bureau to implement and coordinate more effectively the planning initiatives needed to safeguard the property's heritage values. The Bureau had been created in October 2005 to take local responsibility for the implementation of existing conservation rules and regulations as well as the development and implementation of the conservation master plan and site management plan. The advisory mission recommended that a review of the mandate and the capacity of the Bureau to perform its key role should be undertaken, possibly within 2009.

e) *Public Participation*

The advisory mission recommended that ways be found to strengthen public participation as a regular part of the process of developing Lijiang's Conservation Master Plan and its subsequent implementation.

The State Party submitted a report on 30 January 2009 in response to Decisions **31 COM 7B.69** and **32 COM 7B. 67**. This report included a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and a state of conservation report.

f) *Statement of Outstanding Universal Value*

The Statement largely adheres to the approved format for retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value but does not include the management and protection requirements necessary to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value. This Statement will be evaluated by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre and will be presented to the World Heritage Committee for examination.

g) *Boundaries*

The State Party's response to the World Heritage Committee's decision to defer the proposed modification of the boundaries, is that the World Cultural Heritage Management Bureau consider that the boundaries submitted as a minor modification in 2008 were "sufficient enough to ensure the security of the property and that it would not extend the scope of the buffer zones".

h) *Conservation Master Plan*

The State Party's response indicates that the comprehensive Conservation Master Plan, which it refers to as the "Conservation plan of World Heritage Site Old Town of Lijiang", or simply the "Conservation plan", has been under development by Tongji University since 2002 and has been approved by experts organized by the Yunnan provincial authorities and revised according to proposals from the State Administration of Cultural Heritage and the national Ministry of Construction. It remains unclear whether this plan now has been completed, has legislative force and is being implemented.

The State Party's response also summarises the wide-ranging efforts made to build up the capacity of the Bureau personnel and indicates an intention to increase investment in professional training and to strengthen communication and cooperation with the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and other training institutions and networks in the Asia-Pacific region and beyond.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note that the conservation master plan and the management plan are being developed and that the former is nearing completion. Both are needed as a matter of urgency as tools to address the threats to the property. They are concerned that the State Party does not consider that it is possible to address the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee in respect of putting in place buffer zones to ensure the adequate protection of the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.66

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.67**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes the continued efforts made by the State Party to improve management of the property, and its timely response to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee;
4. Requests the State Party to:
 - a) Complete as a matter of urgency the comprehensive Conservation Master Plan,
 - b) Consider a re-submission of a request for minor modification to the buffer zones and the possibility of an extension to the boundaries of the property in order to protect the property and the area between its three components,
 - c) Continue to strengthen the capacity of the World Cultural Heritage Management Bureau to implement and coordinate more effectively these planning initiatives;
5. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including information on the progress made in implementing the actions mentioned above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

67. Historic Centre of Macao (China) (C 1110)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 8B.28; 32 COM 7B.68

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2009: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1110>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee, in its Decision **32 COM 7B.68**, focussed on two principal conservation issues.

a) Negative Impacts of Urban Development near buffer zones

It noted with concern that that urban development around the property's buffer zones, especially around the Guia Hill and Lighthouse and the Monte Fortress (Mount Fort), might impact negatively on the visual integrity of the property. These concerns had already led to the State Party issuing a Chief Executive Directive 83/2008 in April 2008 designed to mitigate this threat in sensitive areas through the use of building height controls. While welcoming these measures the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to determine whether the measures are adequate to ensure the long term protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

b) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

In order to make such a determination, as well as to develop a comprehensive long-term strategy to safeguard the property, there was seen to be an urgent need to clearly define the property's Outstanding Universal Value. Decision **32 COM 7B.68** therefore requested the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity. The Decision further asked that the mission provide advice on defining the setting of the property and any possible revision of the boundary of the buffer zone that might be required.

It further requested the State Party to submit an updated report on the progress made in implementing the measures mentioned above. A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited Macao from 18 to 24 January 2009. Its report covered the main concerns raised in **32 COM 7B.68** but also identified another serious issue and made eleven recommendations for staged action. The mission found that the Chief Executive Directive 83/2008 introducing measures to reduce the height of the buildings constructed or planned near the Guia Hill and Lighthouse and establish new controls over the area provided adequate protection to maintain the visual connections between the Guia Lighthouse and the sea, towards the east, and to the Monte Fortress, to the west. It noted, however, that to the south, the visual connection had already been compromised by several tall buildings on the more distant reclaimed land, mostly constructed before the inscription, and it therefore concluded that the newly proposed buildings near the Guia Hill's southern buffer zone would not constitute a problem once their height had been reduced in line with Chief Executive Directive.

The mission found that a larger issue was that the present management and conservation system was inadequate – indeed a significant risk – for the future conservation of the property. While the system, with its boundaries and legal provisions, is effective for protecting the main monuments, a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was needed to ensure that the very important visual and functional linkages between the monuments and the wider

land and seascape of Macao were also protected. Without such linkages it would be difficult to understand why Macao had come to be what it is today – a trading port along commercial sea-routes. The mission therefore recommended more work to identify these linkages through a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value that included identifying the attributes that carry Outstanding Universal Value and then to develop the appropriate legal and planning tools to protect them. This would include, in the medium term, a comprehensive urban plan that seeks to protect the heritage significance of what is left of the historic urban landscape, related to the setting and views of the property. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will be able to provide assistance to the State Party in developing these components of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, within the framework of the forthcoming periodic reporting exercise for Asia and the Pacific.

The State Party responded to Decision **32 COM 7B.68** on 13 February 2009, shortly after receiving the mission, assuring the World Heritage Committee that the monuments inside the property are in a very good state of conservation through continuous efforts that are in line with conservation charters and supported by sound financial resources made possible by Macao's growing economy. The response confirmed that measures adopted to mitigate against the negative impacts of development projects on the visual integrity of the property are as outlined in its response to the World Heritage Committee in March 2008 and subsequently written into legislation under Chief Executive Directive 83/2008. The response also indicated that the drafting of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, including conditions of authenticity and integrity is under way and the final Statement will be submitted for consideration by the World Heritage Committee.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the State Party report.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.67

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.68**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Welcomes the measures taken by the State Party of China to mitigate possible negative impacts of development projects on the visual integrity of the property by reducing height limits for construction in sensitive areas surrounding the Guia Hill and the Monte Fortress;*
4. *Notes with concern, however, the apparent inadequacy of the current management system, with its buffer zone and legal provisions, to protect effectively the very important visual and functional linkages between the inscribed monuments and the wider urban land and seascape of Macao;*
5. *Requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, to develop a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, including the above-mentioned linkages;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to develop the appropriate legal and planning tools to protect these linkages, including a comprehensive urban plan that seeks to protect the heritage significance of what is left of the historic urban landscape that contributes to the setting and views of the property;*

7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, an updated report on the progress made in implementing the measures mentioned above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

68. Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C 707 ter)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994; 2000; 2001

Criteria

(i) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.55; 29 COM 7B.50; 31 COM 7B.77

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2001: ICOMOS monitoring mission; April 2003: UNESCO/ICOMOS expert mission; May 2005: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Uncontrolled urban development and expansion of tourism-related facilities in and adjacent to the boundary of the property;
- b) Negative impact of the rehabilitation projects on the protection of the traditional urban tissue of the historic centre.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/707>

Current conservation issues

At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee noted the efforts made by the State Party and requested it to continue the revision of the Urban Development Plan and the elaboration of conservation plans for the three areas of the property, ensuring that they are coherent and complementary and include conservation policies for the

traditional buildings within the historic areas of the City. The Plans should be prepared based on an assessment of the foreseeable socio-economic impacts of the conservation policies adopted by the State Party for the property on the local communities, as well as proposed mitigation measures. The World Heritage Committee also requested the State Party to share drafts of the above-mentioned plans with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, before their finalisation and enactment by the competent authorities. It further requested the State Party to submit a report on the state of conservation of the property.

The State Party submitted its report on 26 March 2008. It contained buffer zone modifications submitted in response to the World Heritage Committee's decision at its 31st session in 2007, by which the World Heritage Committee referred back to the State Party the proposal for minor modifications, to allow for the rationale for the boundaries to be set out and for protection to be put in place. The revised proposals will be considered by the World Heritage Committee as a minor modification.

Urban Development Plan

The report provides a detailed outline of the revision of the Urban Development Plan of Lhasa and the elaboration of conservation plans for the three areas of the property. The report does not make clear whether the Master Plan for the City of Lhasa (1995-2015) is the same as the Urban Development Plan being revised or, if they are indeed two plans, how they complement each other since both appear to include regulations on the protected heritage sites. The report indicates that, at the time of its submission to the World Heritage Centre in March 2008, the Autonomous Region's Cultural Heritage Bureau and the Chinese Academy of Cultural Heritage were in the process of formulating the conservation plans for the three sites, together with the Henan Research Institute of Ancient Architecture Protection in the cases of Potala and Norbulingka.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that it would be important that the Urban Development Plan/Master Plan and the conservation plans are developed in a coherent and complementary manner. The State Party's report refers to protected historic sectors of the old city that are rich in ethnic tradition and culture and contain traditional structures, including Tibetan houses in which a large number of residents continue to live, as well as temples and monasteries. Further information is required about the conservation policies being applied by the State Party within these protected sectors, as well as the impacts of the conservation policies on the local communities living in these areas and elsewhere in the inscribed property. No draft of these plans has been provided, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session.

In the framework of the forthcoming periodic reporting exercise for the Asia Pacific region, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will be able to provide assistance to the State Party in the development of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.68

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.77**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*

3. Notes the efforts made by the State Party to revise and extend the boundaries of the proposed buffer zones;
4. Acknowledges progress with the Urban Development Plan for Lhasa and with elaboration of conservation plans for the three areas of the property and requests that the State Party ensures that they are:
 - a) Coherent and complementary,
 - b) Include conservation policies for the traditional buildings within the protected sectors and other parts of the property,
 - c) Based on an assessment of the foreseeable socio-economic impacts of the conservation policies on the local communities and include proposed mitigation measures, and
 - d) Implemented through an institutional coordination body;
5. Also requests the State Party to submit the drafts of the above-mentioned Plans to the World Heritage Centre, before their finalisation and enactment by the competent authorities, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
6. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

69. World Heritage properties in Beijing (China)

A. Imperial Palaces of the Ming and Qing Dynasties in Beijing and Shengyang (China) (C 439bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List:

1987-2004

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.49; 30 COM 7B.63; 31 COM 7B. 78

International assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

October 2005: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/439>

B. Summer Palace, and Imperial Garden in Beijing (China) (C 880)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1998

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.49; 30 COM 7B.63; 31 COM 7B. 78

International assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

October 2005: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/880>

C. Temple of Heaven: an Imperial Sacrificial Altar in Beijing (China) (C 881)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1998

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.49; 30 COM 7B.63; 31 COM 7B. 78

International assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

October 2005: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/881>

Main threats identified in previous reports (for all three properties)

- a) Urban development pressure;
- b) Tourism pressure;
- c) Lack of documentary evidence and clearly formulated principles to guide the conservation works.

Current conservation issues (for all three properties)

The World Heritage Committee during its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), reiterated its request to the State Party to implement the recommendations made by the reactive monitoring mission of October 2005, and in particular to:

- a) Develop appropriate Conservation Master Plans, in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM, integrating components on risk-preparedness and tourism management, for the World Heritage properties of the Temple of Heaven and the Summer Palace in Beijing,
- b) Carry out a comparative study on the restoration of polychromy and ways to ensure its authenticity within East Asia in collaboration with countries such as Japan, Korea and Vietnam;

On 30 January 2009, the State Party submitted the state of conservation report requested by the World Heritage Committee.

a) *Conservation Master Plan*

The report notes that Tsinghua University has completed a conservation plan for the World Heritage Temple of Heaven, and that Tianjin University prepared a Conservation Master Plan for the Summer Palace, both of which give emphasis to risk preparedness and tourism management. Both plans are being reviewed and will shortly be submitted to the State Administration of Cultural Heritage. The report also notes that the authorities responsible for the Imperial Palace of the Ming and Qing Dynasties in Beijing have completed preparation of an Outline of the conservation plan on the World Heritage Imperial Palaces of the Ming and Qing Dynasties in Beijing, and that this has been forwarded to the World Heritage Centre for review by the World Heritage Committee.

b) *Comparative study on the restoration of polychromy*

The report also notes that from 29 October to 2 November 2008, an *International Seminar on Conservation of Painted Surfaces on Wooden Structures in East Asia* was organized by the State Administration of Cultural Heritage of China, the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS,

ICCROM, Beijing Municipality, the Chinese Academy of Cultural Heritage and ICOMOS China. 50 participants from 11 countries participated, and prepared the *Beijing Memorandum on the Conservation of Caihua in East Asia*. The Chinese authorities have followed up this meeting by sending delegations to East Asia countries such as Viet Nam and Cambodia, to communicate lessons and experiences gained in the seminar.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies would note that the seminar mentioned above, contributes greatly, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session, to strengthening “the theoretical framework on which are based conservation decisions, notably as regards issues of authenticity, for World Heritage properties”. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress with the development of Conservation Master Plans for all three properties. These should be submitted in due course for review. In the framework of the forthcoming periodic reporting exercise for the Asia Pacific region, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will provide assistance to the State Party to formulate Statements of Outstanding Universal Value for the three properties.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.69

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.78**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Expresses its appreciation for the organization of the International Seminar on Conservation of Painted Surfaces on Wooden Structures in East Asia (29 October – 2 November 2008), carried out in order to improve knowledge on the restoration of polychromy within East Asia, as well as to strengthen the theoretical framework for conservation decision-making, notably in relation to the authenticity of World Heritage properties;*
4. *Notes the special efforts of the State Party to strengthen conservation of the World Heritage properties in Beijing, including the development of conservation plans for the World Heritage properties of the Temple of Heaven and the Summer Palace in Beijing, and the Imperial Palaces of the Ming and Qing Dynasties;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of each of the three Conservation Master Plans to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.*

70. Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India) (C 1101)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late State Party's report on the state of conservation)

71. Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986

Criteria

(i) (iii) (iv)

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

1999-2006

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7A.24; 31 COM 7B.81; 32 COM 7B.70

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 122,370 for Technical co-operation.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: Funding under the France-UNESCO Co-operation Agreement for expert missions (2003, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009) for a total amount of 20,000 Euros.

Previous monitoring missions

2000: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; 2001: expert technical assessment mission; 2003 and 2004: World Heritage Centre and experts advisory missions; August 2005: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission; January 2007: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; March 2009: UNESCO New Delhi Office technical mission to the property.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of an operational site management plan;
- b) Lack of traffic regulations limiting heavy duty vehicular traffic.

Illustrative materials

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/241>

Current conservation issues

The Group of Monuments at Hampi was inscribed on the World Heritage in Danger List in 1999, due to the partial construction of a cable-suspended bridge within the protected archaeological area, which threatened the property's integrity and authenticity. Construction work was subsequently suspended and several mitigation measures were implemented between 2003 and 2006.

Recalling its Decision **28 COM 15A.24**, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2008), commending the State Party for its decision to consider the vehicular bridge to be temporary, pending the identification of a long-term solution within the comprehensive site management plan, the World Heritage Committee decided to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2006 and requested the State Party to "reconsider and adapt the design and dimensions of the Anegundi Bridge respecting the visual integrity of the property" and to address long-term concerns over the impact of the bridge with regard to heavy vehicle

traffic and illegal construction activities (Decision **30 COM 7A.24**). Subsequent decisions (**31 COM 7B.81** and **32 COM 7B.70**) contained requests to the State Party to implement the recommendations of the January 2007 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and to submit associated documentation to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for review.

On 22 January 2009, the World Heritage Centre was informed, by the UNESCO Office in New Delhi, of the collapse of a portion of the Aneundi Bridge, following the resumption of work on site, causing 8 deaths and injuring some twenty persons among the workers. By letter dated 22 January 2009, the World Heritage Centre expressed its condolences to the State Party and requested further information on the situation.

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Centre on 30 January 2009, which provides information on the collapse of the Aneundi Bridge and outlines progress at the site as follows:

a) Aneundi Bridge

Construction work on the Aneundi Bridge was resumed in mid January 2009. On 22 January 2009, following the collapse of the Aneundi side of the bridge, public entry was restricted and additional security and safety measures put into place for the remaining part of the bridge by the Karnataka State Government Authorities. Consultations are ongoing between the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) and the State Government of Karnataka with regard to the future of the Aneundi Bridge.

b) Integrated management plan (IMP) and Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The integrated management plan (IMP) and Statement of Outstanding Universal Value are being finalized by the Hampi World Heritage Area Management Authority (HWHAMA) in consultation with ASI and other stakeholders.

Tasks identified in the IMP currently being taken up to address problems of a living heritage site include the preparation of an accurate base map, establishment of a technical unit within the HWHAMA, financial and technical strengthening of HWHAMA, preparation of a Master Plan (Land Use Plan), establishment of an Integrated Information Management Centre, development of a tourism strategy, interpretation strategy and urban design guidelines, rationalization of the property boundaries and a Joint Heritage Management Programme (no details were given about what this programme encompasses).

The State Party reports that new proposed boundaries for the property and its buffer zone have been clearly identified as part of the new IMP. The total area falling under HWHAMA after the rationalization of the buffer zone is 236 sq kms in comparison to the original area of 136 sq kms. This has not yet been officially submitted to the World Heritage Committee for approval.

The Government of Karnataka has approved the appointment of new staff and an additional grant of USD 48,214 for the current financial year. A recruitment process is underway to fill the new positions. A new location has been identified for the interpretation centre on the north side of the Kamalapuram settlement, which will be one of the main entries to the prime archaeological area. The State Party reports that the recommendations of the IMP have been incorporated into a Master Plan notified under the Karnataka Town and Country Planning Act, as of August 2008, and thus is now integrated into the National and State Planning framework.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the continuing efforts of the State Party to improve the management of the property, including by building capacity within the HWHAMA, by relocating the interpretation centre, and by identifying new extended

boundaries of the property. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note, however, that a copy of the approved version of the Master Plan based on the IMP; a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value; an official request for the modification of the property's boundaries; and a transport study of regional and local scope with new traffic regulations for heavy vehicles within the property have not yet been received.

The collapse of the bridge has made the question of its modified design no longer relevant. Noting that consultations are on-going between the ASI and Karnataka State authorities to determine the future of the bridge, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies suggest that a new, more appropriate location for a vehicular bridge be identified by the State Party outside the property, as well as outside the extended boundaries which are considered for its possible extension, upon reviewing the transport study expected to be completed in the coming months, and recommend the complete demolition of the remaining parts of the bridge to preempt any accidents.

A mission to the property was organised by the UNESCO New Delhi Office in March 2009, composed of a conservation architect-planner seconded from the French Ministry of Culture, a town planner and an Indian conservation architect-planner. The mission identified the need for the early completion and official notification of detailed building regulations for all towns and villages within the new proposed boundaries of the property, especially within its four settlements (Hampi, Kaddirapuram, Kamalapuram and Anegundi), as well as for vigilant control over the continued construction of illegal buildings, particularly in Virupapuragadda Island and Hampi villages. The mission further noted the proliferation of social housing for the poor being constructed on hillocks with poor drainage and living conditions, and that these are also undermining the site's landscape. There is an urgent need to adopt and implement the IMP, in order to address the issues through putting in place appropriate development control.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.71

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.70**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes the substantial work undertaken at the property by the Hampi World Heritage Area Management Authority (HWHAMA), notably the identification of the new proposed boundaries of the property and its buffer zone as part of the new integrated management plan (IMP);*
4. *Requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *Draft, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, an updated Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, and submit it to the World Heritage Centre, for examination by the World Heritage Committee,*
 - b) *Consider officially submitting a request for the extension of the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone according to the procedures indicated in the paragraphs 163-164 of the Operational Guidelines and*
 - c) *Adopt and implement the IMP and incorporate fully its recommendations in the Master Plan, notably through the development and official adoption of detailed*

building regulations applicable for each category of zones within the new proposed boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, as well as the related urban design guidelines;

5. *Offers its condolences for the death of eight persons and its sympathy for some twenty injured due to the collapse of the Anegundi Bridge during construction,*
6. *Encourages the State Party to demolish the remaining pillars of the collapsed bridge (taking into account security concerns and negative visual impacts) and to consider a new, more appropriate location for a vehicular bridge outside the current and possible future boundaries of the property;*
7. *Expresses its concern over illegal constructions and other developments, such as social housing projects, within the extended boundaries which are being considered for the possible extension of the property, particularly in Virupapura Gada Island and Hampi Villages, which appear to have a negative impact on the integrity of the landscape;*
8. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2010** a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value; the adopted IMP and a report on the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations contained in paragraphs 4 and 6 above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

72. Sangiran Early Man Site (Indonesia) (C 593)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(iii) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

26COM 21B.52; 31 COM 7B.70; 32 COM 7B.71

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 40,000 for training activities.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

September 2006: UNESCO expert mission; January-February 2008: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of an effective site-management authority;
- b) Absence of appropriate land-use regulations in the face of development pressure;
- c) Need for a buffer zone;
- d) Poor site interpretation and museum display

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/593>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to give full consideration to implementing the recommendations of the joint UNESCO/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission which had visited the property from 28 January to 3 February 2008. These were to:

- i. Put in place effective operational planning for the next stage of the Master Plan;
- ii. Develop a conservation plan and establish applied conservation research prior to physical intervention;
- iii. Establish the authority of the site manager to control development within the World Heritage Area;
- iv. Create a full-time Director position at the appropriate level;
- v. Ongoing involvement of the residents as key stakeholders of the site;
- vi. Set up archaeological and socio-cultural cultural impact procedures for development;
- vii. Sustain the local cultural heritage which augments the Outstanding Universal Value;
- viii. Interpretation on the site with minimal physical intervention;
- ix. Involvement of the local population;
- x. Development of tourism-based rural industry.

The mission was particularly concerned that effective operational planning for the next stage of the Master Plan should be completed as a matter of urgency in order to avoid further uncoordinated development and management of funds and to achieve systematic development of the conservation and interpretation strategies for the property.

The State Party submitted a report on the above issues on 30 January 2009, outlining progress as follows:

a) Operational Policies for the management plan

The State Party report indicates that cooperation among the various government agencies is already taking place under a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and that a follow-up Agreement was currently being drafted to define the authority and responsibility of the various institutions under the MoU, as well as the financial responsibility. The response clarified that the property conservation and interpretation are the responsibility of the Central Government and are incorporated in the Master Plan (policy) and the Detail Engineering Design (DED) (implementation) and that these two documents provide the framework in

which conservation, site concept development and creation of the visitor centre are being carried out.

b) Resources for the Conservation office

The report states that from 2009 the Conservation Office (BPSMP) has secured independent funds to support its work of conserving the property and interpreting it to the public. The report also outlined existing strategies for conservation, community empowerment, land use regulation, interpretation and visitor management, as well as proposed coordination of research activities, including social research, within the framework of the Master Plan and DED. The State Party agrees that the values statement in the Master Plan should be augmented by the recognition of the cultural heritage value of the traditional wood and bamboo architecture, lifestyle, and folk arts and practices of the local community.

The response also advised that, from early 2008, the Indonesian Central Government has been making concerted efforts with the Regional Government (both Provincial and Regency) to conserve and develop the property within the context of cultural tourism. This includes drawing up construction plans for a visitor centre at Krikilan and open site museums at Ngebung, Bukuran and Dayu. These open site museums, being non-permanent buildings, integrated with nature and requiring no new roads, will be in conformity with the mission's recommendation that physical interventions be minimal. The State Party sees the local people's economic interests being best served through the encouragement of appropriate tourism industrial activities, such as the making of souvenirs, but it advises that the local government is endeavouring to provide tax holidays on land and buildings in the sites and providing training programs to enhance the local community's skills. It suggests that it will support the development of a strategy for tourist industry development in support of the Master Plan and community development and also a pilot project to provide clean home stay facilities.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made in relation to developing operational policies for the management plan and ensuring funding for the Conservation Office, but note that several aspects of the reactive monitoring mission's recommendations, such as ensuring the authority of the site manager to control development through appropriate land-use regulations, the setting up of archaeological and socio-cultural impact procedures for development, and the involvement of the residents as key stakeholders of the property, were not addressed.

In the framework of the forthcoming periodic reporting exercise for the Asia Pacific region, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will provide assistance to the State Party in developing the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.72

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.71**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Expresses its satisfaction regarding the progress made by the State Party in implementing some recommendations of the 2008 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission;

4. Urges the State Party to give full consideration to implementing the remaining recommendations of the 2008 mission, in particular:
 - a) Ensuring the authority of the site manager to control development through appropriate land-use regulations,
 - b) Setting up of archaeological and socio-cultural impact procedures for development, and
 - c) Involving the residents as key stakeholders of the property;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a progress report on the above issues, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

73. Prambanan Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C 642)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1991

Criteria

(i) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.60; 31 COM 7B.83

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 75,000 Emergency Assistance, June 2006.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 250,000 Saudi Arabia Funds-in-Trust for Emergency Rehabilitation.

Previous monitoring missions

February 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

Earthquake

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/642>

Current conservation issues

The main issue relating to the Prambanan Temple Compounds property is addressing the serious damage done by the earthquake of 27 May 2006 to all six temples in the property, the worst affected being the main temple of Siwa. At its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006), the World Heritage Committee called for a cooperative international effort to rehabilitate the property. Emergency funding was provided from the World Heritage Fund and, with the assistance of the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Jakarta Office, an International Expert Meeting was held at the property in March 2007 to define an Action Plan. This set out short and medium term actions under the following headings:

- a) Management and coordination,
- b) Research and monitoring,
- c) Restoration and conservation,
- d) Capacity building,
- e) Awareness-raising.

At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) the World Heritage Committee recommended that the State Party work in close coordination with the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM and encouraged the International community to support the implementation of the Action Plan.

Prior to the earthquake, the Periodic Reporting cycle for Asia-Pacific region in 2003 identified some other problems confronting the property. These included concerns about the uneven distribution of authority, funding and conservation duties between the various local community and provincial and regional governmental agencies involved, and the need to transfer more of the entry fee income to the preservation and development of the property. It was, however, observed that a management development strategy was being elaborated that included extending the management of the Prambanan temples to the cultural heritage located on the nearby hills, the creation of a planning and management body in the area, the introduction of environmental impact controls, and the revision of current regulations to enable improved community participation in cultural and environmental conservation activities. A Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited the property in February 2006 but its recommendations were put aside when the earthquake struck several months later.

The State Party submitted its progress report on 30 January 2009. It reported that most of the programs in the Action Plan have now been executed and some have been expanded to accommodate ongoing changes in the condition of the property. The main items not achieved were the restoration strategy for Siwa Temple and subsequent restoration work.

It is noted that during 2008, both the Borobudur and Prambanan World Heritage properties were included in the list of National Vital Objects based on the Minister of Culture and Tourism Decree No. PM.34/HM.001/MKP/2008 on Securing National Vital Objects of Culture and Tourism. As a consequence, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism will work with the Indonesian Police Force to secure the Prambanan Temple Compounds.

With regards to the preparation of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will provide assistance to the State Party in the preparation of the Statement, in the framework of the forthcoming periodic reporting exercise for the Asia Pacific region.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.73

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.83**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes with satisfaction that the continuing efforts made by the State Party towards the rehabilitation of the property, in co-operation with the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and other international partners, following the May 2006 earthquake, have led to the reopening of all damaged temples to the public;
4. Recommends to the State Party that it continues these efforts to make good the remaining earthquake damage, including the restoration of the Siwa Temple, as in the Action Plan defined at the International Expert Meeting of March 2007;
5. Encourages the international community to support the implementation of the Action Plan;
6. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property with information on the progress made in the implementation of the above-mentioned Action Plan, for the examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

74. Borobudur Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C 592)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1991

Criteria

(i) (ii) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.53; 30 COM 7B.65; 31 COM 7B.84

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 5,000 for Promotional assistance in 1999.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 7,000,000 between 1972 and 1983.

Netherlands Funds-In-Trust: USD 35,000, 2008 and 2009.

Previous monitoring missions

April 2003 and February 2006: reactive monitoring missions; September 2007 and October 2008: UNESCO expert missions.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Ineffectual legal and institutional framework for the management and protection of the property;
- b) Impacts on the stone of Borobudur Temple from the use of epoxy resin, steam cleaning and water repellants.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/592>

Current conservation issues

The Borobudur Temple Compounds was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991. At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to continue its efforts towards the revision of the legal and institutional framework for the protection and management of the property; to discontinue practices that appeared to have a negative impact on the stone of the Borobudur temple; and to continue monitoring and research activities (Decision **31 COM 7B.84**).

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property to the World Heritage Centre on 29 January 2009, which reported progress against the Committee's requests as follows:

a) Revision of the legal and institution framework

The State Party has engaged in a consultation programme with stakeholders and inter-institutional representatives to revise the legal and institutional framework for the protection and management of the property and its surrounding area. Consultation meetings were held in June 2007, October 2008 and February 2009 at Borobudur and Jakarta and were financed under the Netherlands Funds-In-Trust. As a result, all parties agreed to continue efforts to revise the existing legal framework (Presidential Decree Number 1 of 1992) to ensure a better protection and management of Borobudur and its surrounding areas.

Subsequently, the State Party designated Borobudur as a National Strategic Area, in which the property will be directly under the central government's control. The State Party is yet to finalize a zoning system which will clearly demarcate the boundaries of the protected area and associated management conditions. Management of the property will be coordinated through a national institution and involve ongoing consultation with all stakeholders. The State Party estimates that the draft revised Presidential Decree will be finalized by 2010.

The State Party's report also included a Master Plan concept, prepared by Indonesia's Ministry of Culture and Tourism, which overviewed the proposed updates to the existing 1979 Master Plan for the property. The new Master Plan will address issues including the legal system, visitor management, community development, tourism development and administrative structures.

b) Discontinuation of conservation practices that have potential adverse effects

The State Party reports that it has now limited the use of epoxy resin, but not totally eliminated it, as an alternate substance has not yet been found. They envisage that it will be gradually phased out until a substitute has been identified. The report indicates that the primary ongoing uses of epoxy include coating for water resistance, gluing of broken stones and glue injection into cracks and camouflage. To minimize the adverse effects of the epoxy

on the property, the State Party has been conducting research into the impacts of epoxy and potential substitutes, and has discontinued the use of epoxies that have noted adverse effects. They also report that the use of steam cleaning is now very limited and is only applied to the floor. In addition, the State Party reported that water repellents are no longer used on the Borobudur Temple.

Monitoring and research programs are ongoing, further to studies undertaken in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre in 2006 and 2007, including the 'Collaboration Project on Methods for Monitoring the Monument' in conjunction with the National Research Institute for Cultural Properties, Tokyo. Monitoring programmes include conservation of temple stones, geo-hydrology, leakage of temple walls, structure stability, environmental impact, utilization and security.

c) Additional information provided by the State Party

In addition to responding to the Committee's requests, the State Party reported:

- i. interpretation and presentation of the property has been recently improved through installation of information boards and signage, preparation of a 'green map' of the property, conduct of on-site management and conservation training and production of leaflets and brochures; and
- ii. a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been prepared, based on the format developed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The text provides a brief synthesis of the significant heritage features of the property as well as justifications for inscription on the World Heritage List.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the efforts of the State Party in addressing the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee, particularly in its progress in revising the legal and institutional framework for the management of the property, as well as in the improvement of the interpretation and presentation of the property. They also note that whilst the policies for stone conservation have been strengthened, there is continued use of epoxy resin at the property and they encourage the State Party to progress research and testing into finding an alternative substance, giving special consideration to the use of traditional local mortars combined with frequent maintenance. They also recommend that the State Party might consider requesting International Assistance to develop a pilot project in this area in order to formulate a protocol for the long-term conservation of the stone.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the preparation of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value by the State Party, but also note that this does not include information on the authenticity and integrity of the property, nor protection and management requirements necessary to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will provide assistance to the State Party to develop these components of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, within the framework of the upcoming periodic reporting exercise for the Asia Pacific Region.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.74

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.84**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),

3. *Notes the State Party's efforts in revising the legal and institutional framework for the protection and management of the property and its surrounding area, and encourages it to continue the development of the new Presidential Decree and updated Master Plan;*
4. *Requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *Update the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, to include conditions of integrity and authenticity of the property and the protection and management requirements necessary to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value;*
 - b) *Develop in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies a management plan, based on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and integrating, visitor management and community development;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *Discontinue the practices that appear to have a negative impact on the stone of the Borodbudur temple,*
 - b) *Continue monitoring, research and testing activities, to find a substitute for the epoxy resin;*
6. *Also encourages the State Party to apply for International Assistance to develop a pilot project in order to formulate a protocol for the long-term conservation of the stone;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies informed of progress made in the implementation of paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 above.*

75. Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(i) (v) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.57; 31 COM 7B.71; 32 COM 7B.72

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 2,752 (Training assistance)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: 5,710 Euros (France/UNESCO Cooperation Agreement)

Previous monitoring missions

July 2002: ICOMOS and France – UNESCO Cooperation Agreement mission; June 2004 and May 2005: UNESCO Tehran Office fact-finding missions; May 2006: World Heritage Centre mission; June, December 2006 and April 2007: UNESCO Tehran advisory missions

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Uncoordinated urban development - construction of a large scale commercial complex;
- b) Subway route through the historical axis of Esfahan.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/115>

Current conservation issues

A UNESCO mission in January 2002 found that a commercial complex had been constructed within the property's buffer zone. The construction was not authorized by the central government, exceeded height limitations and impacts on the visual integrity of the property. The World Heritage Committee requested the redesign of the complex to ensure that the height restrictions and regulations established by the Iranian Cultural Heritage Organization are followed (Decision **26 COM 21B.53**). The World Heritage Committee subsequently encouraged the State Party to reduce the height of the Jahan-Nama building (Decisions **29 COM 7B.54**, **30 COM 7B.57**).

The World Heritage Committee also requested that the State Party establish mechanisms for undertaking systematic cultural, social and environmental impact assessments prior to designing large scale development projects and nominate the extension of the property to include the historic axis of Friday Mosque, the Bazaars, the ancient bridges, the Zayanderoud River, and the South Chahar Bagh Avenue.

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Centre on 4 February 2009, which provides the following information:

a) Uncoordinated urban development - construction of a large scale commercial complex

Demolition of the top two floors (levels 13 and 14) of the Jahan-Nama building commenced in October 2005 and was reported completed at the end of 2006. The State Party reports that the demolition of the next two floors (levels 11 and 12) has commenced, as a result of an agreement reached with the Governorate of Isfahan Province to provide the necessary funds for the demolition. In addition, the Isfahan Municipality has agreed to establish an Expert Committee which will implement, coordinate and supervise the creation of green spaces between adjacent buildings and squares, as well as a hanging garden on the roof of the Jahan-Nama building as part of an effort to harmonize the urban setting.

Through the decision taken by the Council of Ministers (2004) Iranian governmental administrations are directed to evaluate the impacts of their large scale projects on the cultural assets and to conform to the conclusions of the evaluations. Under the provision of this act the Iranian Cultural Heritage, Handicrafts and Tourism Organization (ICHHTO) has control over the metro project. However, many of the large scale projects predate the act of 2004.

b) Subway route through the historical axis of Esfahan

The issue of the proposed metro line passing under the Char-Bagh Avenue has recently re-emerged and the report states that:

1. Physical effects of the metro line as well as the effects of the metro stations on the cultural and environmental settings are being considered;
2. The metro company has continued its work after the technical interpretation of the decision of the Higher Council for Traffic. It has considered the metro trains to have no negative effect on the historical monuments and environment if suitable precautions are taken. These include a slight change to the route by 20m away from the Chahar-Bagh Madresseh (school) and running the trains on anti-shaking cushions, 5 meters deeper than previously planned;
3. Isfahan Governorate and the metro company have recently agreed that engineers will be asked to study the above issues and find solutions in line with World Heritage principles. Should the use of techniques and materials not be appropriate a new route for the passage of trains shall be sought. No decisions can be taken without prior approval by ICHHTO.

ICHHTO has requested by letter dated 28 January 2009, the World Heritage Centre to carry out an advisory mission to Esfahan with a view to assist the authorities in identifying the most appropriate solution for the new proposed metro line.

c) Possible extension of the property

The extension of Meidan Emam to include the cultural-historical axis or cultural landscape is underway. The identification, documentation and registration on the National Monuments list of buildings, monuments, places of worship, streets and squares in the area which may be considered for extension has been completed. The definition of the zones to be proposed for inscription on the World Heritage List however is challenging due to the size of the area on the one hand and the social, economic and urban needs on the other hand. The State Party hopes that the World Heritage Centre can assist the authorities with these questions in order for the nomination dossier to be submitted in 2010.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the slow progress in the reduction of the height of the Jahan-Nama building which has been requested by the Committee since 2003. They consider that a mission to the property to advise the authorities on the issue of the metro line would be useful, once all the ongoing studies, including an Environmental Impact Assessment, have been completed. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will also assist the State Party to prepare a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property, within the framework of the forthcoming periodic reporting exercise for the Asia Pacific region.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.75

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.72**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008);*
3. *Acknowledges the steps taken by the State Party to implement the decisions of the World Heritage Committee in particular with regard to the proposed extension of the property to include the Historical Axis of Esfahan;*

4. Regrets that no further progress has been made in the reduction of the height of the Jahan-Nama building despite the repeated assurance provided by the State Party in the past years, and urges the authorities to complete its reduction by the proposed two floors as soon as possible;
5. Also urges the authorities to carry out the Environmental Impact Assessment of the metro line project as a matter of priority and to submit the findings to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies in advance of the project moving forward;
6. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property, to advise on the issue of the metro line once the Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2010** a report on the progress made in reducing the height of the Jahan-Nama Commercial complex tower and in the proposed metro line project, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

76. Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (C 870)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1998

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.67; 31 COM 7B.72; 32 COM 7B.73

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Potential negative impact of an express highway on the property;

- b) Potential negative impact of large-scale events commemorating 1300th Anniversary of Nara Heijo-kyo capital, planned to take place on the property in 2010.

Illustrative materials

5. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/870>

Current conservation issues

In its Decision **32 COM 7B.73**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), concerning the Nara Palace site (Heijo-kyo site), one of the eight sites forming the property, the World Heritage Committee recommended further development and establishment of appropriate groundwater monitoring systems and risk mitigation plans in order to prevent any unwanted fluctuation of groundwater level which might have been caused by the construction and/or use of a proposed expressway. It also recommended that the State Party take appropriate measures not to damage the buried archaeological relics when preparing the detailed designs for the commemorative events foreseen in 2010. The World Heritage Committee further requested that the State Party confirm whether or not any new reconstruction is being planned at the property, as well as clarifying if any change in the legal and institutional framework of the property was envisaged and elaborating possible implications for management and conservation of the property.

The World Heritage Centre received, on 2 February 2009, a report from the State Party outlining progress as follows:

a) The Yamato-Kita Road highway

The Yamato-Kita Road Groundwater Monitoring Study Committee held its 4th meeting on 1 August 2008. It analyzed the results of studies on the soil at the site and discussed measures for the preservation of the *mokkan* (buried ancient wooden writing tablets). This included ways to maintain the groundwater levels stable in case of any unexpected contingency. This Committee is expected to develop a “basic plan” for the monitoring of groundwater and risk mitigation, in view of the establishment of a more comprehensive plan. The State Party did not provide any timeframe for the completion of these two plans.

b) Commemorative Events for the 1300th Anniversary of Nara Heijo-kyo Palace in 2010

The Commemorative Events of the 1300th Anniversary of Nara Heijo-kyo Capital will be held throughout the year 2010, primarily on the Nara Palace site. The events are being prepared and will be run by the “Association for Commemorative Events of the 1300th Anniversary of Nara Heijo-kyo Capital”, formed by the Nara Prefectural government and other local organizations. On 10 September 2008, the Association applied for permission to the Agency for Cultural Affairs in Japan (ACA), in compliance with the Cultural Properties Protection Law to set up event-related temporary structures within the Nara Place site. As reported in the previous state of conservation report submitted for the 32nd session, the overall events plan had been significantly scaled-down in January 2008 from the original plan. After careful review, ACA judged that the plan would not have any negative impact on the archaeological remains, and that the landscape impact of the temporary structures would be minor and not permanent. Permission was thus granted on 21 November 2008.

c) Decision to make the Nara Palace site a “National Government Park”

The State Party report notes that the Government of Japan approved, on 28 October 2008, a cabinet resolution to develop the entire Nara Palace site, with the exception of a few adjacent residential areas, as a “National Government Park”. Such parks are urban parks maintained and administered by the national government, based on the provisions of the Urban Parks Law, under the responsibility of the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (MLIT). The report does not elaborate on the reasons why this decision was taken. It clarifies, however, that the management of the Nara Palace site will continue to be based on the Japanese Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties under a new framework involving

MLIT, ACA and the Nara Prefecture, which remains, from the legal point of view, the site-managing authority.

On 1 December 2008, MLIT approved a “Basic Plan for the Asuka-Nara Palace Site Historical National Government Park” (hereafter “the Basic Plan”). This Basic Plan was drafted taking into account the fundamental policies and specific contents articulated by ACA in its “Basic Scheme for the Preservation and Development of the Nara Palace Site” (hereafter “Basic Scheme”) which had been adopted in 1978.

The State Party reports that the Basic Plan includes the reconstruction of full-scale replicas of some of the ancient buildings and structures within the Palace, such as the earthen-walled corridors, the south gate, and the east and west towers in the vicinity of the First Imperial Audience Hall (currently under reconstruction). This will be based, according to the State Party report, on “the result of the sufficient investigation and survey” and conducted under the close scrutiny of ACA.

The reconstruction of the above structures was not mentioned in the nomination file (1998), while the then on-going reconstruction of the *Suzaku gate*, *Toin-teien* area (Eastern Palace Garden area) and *Daigokuden* (Imperial Audience Hall) were. It appears, however, that the reconstruction of the Imperial Audience Hall Compound was already envisaged in a 1993 version of the Basic Scheme. The Basic Plan also foresees the relocation of the existing roads, railway and research facilities to outside the newly established Nara Palace Special Historic Site “National Government Park”.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, whilst noting the progress made on the development of monitoring and risk mitigation measures for possible groundwater fluctuation and other risks with regard to the highway construction and its future use, point out the need for a concrete timetable for realization of these measures. Regarding the temporary structures to be built for the 1300th Anniversary commemorative events, it is noted that these will be light in weight, sensitively designed and will not involve any foundation or excavation of trenches. Nevertheless, a timetable for their removal after the festivities needs to be formulated.

With regard to the State Party’s intention to reconstruct full-scale replicas of some buildings and structures within the Nara Palace site, the rationale for this large scale project has not been established. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recall that this would have to be done in consultation with the World Heritage Committee and “only on the basis of complete and detailed documentation and to no extent on conjecture”, as stated in Paragraph 86 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and respect the all provisions of the *Operational Guidelines* pertaining to authenticity and integrity. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that before any such reconstruction project commences, a full justification of the rationale for the reconstruction, including the detailed evidence on which it is based, should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for evaluation by the Advisory Bodies.

With regard to the new administrative and institutional framework for the management of the Heijo Palace site, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that it would be important to see how this change impacts on the overall management system for the entire inscribed serial property, i.e. in which ways the conservation policies at each of the eight sites forming the listed property are harmonised and coordinated so as to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property is maintained and presented. In light of these changes, it may be appropriate for the State Party to give consideration to the establishment of an overall coordinating framework for the management of this serial property.

In the framework of the forthcoming periodic reporting exercise for the Asia Pacific region, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will provide assistance to the State Party in the preparation of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.76

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.73** adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes that plans are being developed for a groundwater monitoring system and risk mitigation plans to protect the buried cultural properties from possible fluctuation of groundwater levels, and further requests the State Party to submit as soon as possible a concrete timetable for their completion to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
4. Further notes that the proposed design for temporary structures to be set up on the Heijo Palace site for the 1300th Anniversary Commemorative Events in 2010 would not have a negative impact on the buried cultural objects and the visual integrity of the landscape and requests that a date for their removal be established;
5. Recalling that any reconstruction project within the property would have to be based only on complete and detailed documentation and to no extent on conjecture, and on all provisions for authenticity and integrity as outlined in the Operational Guidelines, and appropriately interpreted,
6. Also requests the State Party, in case it wished to proceed with the proposed reconstruction of certain structures within the Nara Palace site, to submit to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies a full justification of the rationale for the reconstruction, including the detailed evidence on which it is based;
7. Further requests the State Party to clarify how the new administrative and institutional framework for the management of the Nara Palace site “National Government Park” impacts on the overall management system for the entire inscribed serial property, i.e. in which ways the conservation policies at each of the eight sites forming the listed property are harmonised and coordinated so as to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property is maintained and presented;
8. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report including information on the points above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

77. Town of Luang Prabang (Lao People’s Democratic Republic) (C 479 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.60; 31 COM 7B.73; 32 COM 7B 74

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 117,242 for Preparatory, Promotional and Training Assistance, and Technical cooperation.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 200,000 (France / UNESCO Cooperation Agreement)

Previous monitoring missions

February 2005: UNESCO mission; September–October 2007: UNESCO/Region Centre/Ville de Chinon international co-operation project mission; November 2007: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; January 2009: UNESCO/Ville de Chinon/ADUC cooperation programme mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of enforcement of the Luang Prabang conservation plan (PSMV) and illegal constructions;
- b) Public works (proposed new town, airport extension, pedestrian bridge) which may affect the World Heritage values.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/479>

Current conservation issues

In its Decision **32 COM 7B.74**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee repeated its concern that the level of co-ordination and the priority given to the protection of the property's Outstanding Universal Value had been insufficient to halt the progressive loss of its fabric and traditions in the face of development pressures. The commitment of the State Party to improve the state of conservation of the property was recognized in recent measures to begin the revision of the Urban Plan and strengthen the Maison du patrimoine (Heritage House) and coordination with local stakeholders. The World Heritage Committee nevertheless urged the State Party to implement all the recommendations made by the November 2007 joint reactive monitoring mission.

In response, the State Party provided its state of conservation report on 1 October 2008, addressing the World Heritage Committee Decision in the following terms.

- a) *Revision of the Urban Plan for the province of Luang Prabang and definition, in this context, of a buffer zone for the property*

The State Party advised that the Master Plan developed between 2002 and 2006 was approved by the Provincial Governor on 29 August 2008 and is being implemented. The State Party conceded that the Master Plan does not contain a buffer zone for the property

and therefore does not meet the UNESCO/ICOMOS recommendation. However the State Party assures the World Heritage Committee that the buffer zone will be defined in the context of a new urban plan. Responsibility for directing the development of this new plan has already been given to the Ministry of Public Works while the Institute of Urbanism has been charged with its technical preparation, with assistance from ADUC, the urban planning agency of Chinon, France. Funding has been assured through the French Development Agency (FDA) and the work of defining the buffer zone will commence in March 2009.

The report indicates the State Party's intention to submit the revised urban plan containing the buffer zone to UNESCO in February 2010. In the interim, necessary background studies have been conducted to establish an inventory of ponds and hydraulic networks within the inscribed area and around it, and to gather data on the use being made of land plots in the zones threatened by urban sprawl and in the zones offering the best economic potential. A third survey – of buildings in the zone around the property – has yet to be conducted but will enable determination of the priority zones for future urban development, the form of which, the State Party's report notes, will draw inspiration from the traditional urban patterns of the inscribed property.

b) Imposition of a moratorium, pending the approval of the revised Urban Plan, on major development projects

The State Party assures the World Heritage Committee that while there continues to be lively discussion about the possibility of a new town being constructed in the Chompeth Valley, no decision has been made. If the concept of a new town is eventually endorsed, its location will be determined in the context of the revised Urban Plan and its implementation will be subject to a number of specialised studies and carried out with prior negotiation with and approval by UNESCO.

The State Party's response indicates that the airport realignment is required to cut the number of flights over the town and reduce noise and risk, while the airport extension is needed to handle the increasing flow of tourists. Assurance is given that the Lao Government does not envisage an extension that would cater for airplanes larger in capacity than the Boeing 737.

The State Party further assures the World Heritage Committee that the primary school, being of great architectural and historic significance, will not be transformed into a tourist facility but kept as a school. The Fine Arts College has historic significance and is protected under the current heritage regulations (PSMV) although it is now in a degraded state. Both the primary school and the Fine Arts College are included in the list of buildings that will be restored with FDA funds.

The provincial authorities have asked the *Maison du patrimoine* to undertake a feasibility study for the construction of a permanent bridge across the Nam Kham that will be a light structure using natural materials for pedestrians and motor cycle. The eventual proposal will be in conformity with existing heritage regulations and will be submitted to UNESCO. The potential noise and visual impacts referred in the joint reactive monitoring mission report are not specifically addressed in the State Party's response.

c) Strict application of the Luang Prabang conservation plan (PSMV) and preparation of an updated inventory and maps of the property

The State Party recognises that strict application of the current heritage regulations is one of the most important concerns of the *Maison du Patrimoine* and assures the World Heritage Committee that the *Maison du patrimoine* will work to catch up on the two-year backlog of applications and will provide a table showing changes in permit application numbers and a series of maps showing changes in listed buildings, new constructions, building materials, vegetation and fences.

d) Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The Lao Government reiterates its request for assistance in this task. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will be able to provide assistance to the State Party with a view to meeting the requirements of the World Heritage Committee's Decision **32 COM 7B.74** and within the framework of the forthcoming Periodic Reporting exercise for Asia and the Pacific.

e) Press reports of an alleged planned Mekong mainstream dam at Luang Prabang

The State Party advised that the river level after the dam, which will be 60 km upstream, is constructed will be no higher than occurs in the rainy season but that, in any case, an environmental-social impact assessment is being prepared, the results of which will be sent to UNESCO.

f) Other problems identified by the State Party

The State Party is acting to stop further cutting of trees and filling of ponds in the protected zone. It notes that the development of large scale hotels in the surrounding zone remains a problem but it has firmly decided to control their location and orientation in future.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that a technical assistance mission was carried out from 16 to 26 November 2009 in the framework of the France-UNESCO Cooperation Agreement, which confirmed the launching of the urban plan and of the updated inventory of the safeguarded areas. This mission found that the governance of the Heritage House has significantly improved following reorganization measures taken by the State Party, including the appointment of a new Director and the recruitment of technical and administrative staff.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that funding is now in place to allow the commencement of the revision of the Urban Plan. They also note that reassurance has been given that no decision has been made on the location of the new town, that the final College and Primary School would be restored, and that a study has been undertaken to design a lighter structure for the pedestrian bridge. However, they note that the State Party has decided to proceed with the realignment of the airport. There is also concern that a baseline inventory and updated maps have not yet been established, which would allow an assessment of changes in listed buildings and of new construction that has taken place since the inscription.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.77

The World Heritage Committee,

- 1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
- 2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.74**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
- 3. Recognizing the commitment of the State Party to improve the state of conservation of the property, including the measures to develop a revised Urban Plan that will include a buffer zone and priority zones for development, and the efforts undertaken to improve institutional and technical capacity of the Heritage House thus enabling a more efficient implementation of the conservation plan for the property (PSMV),*
- 4. Also recognizing the State Party's assurances regarding the Chompeth new town, primary school and Fine Arts College, and the lighter pedestrian bridge, but also noting with concern that the State Party proposes to go ahead with the extension and realignment of the airport runway,*

5. *Encourages* the State Party to continue its efforts, with assistance from the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the international partners, in order to implement all the remaining recommendations made by the November 2007 mission and especially to ensure the strict and timely application of the Luang Prabang conservation plan (PSMV) and prepare an updated inventory and maps of the property, indicating the changes since the inscription;
6. *Requests* the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, at the latest by **1 February 2011**, the revised Urban Plan, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
7. *Also requests* the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

78. Melaka and George Town, Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca (Malaysia) (C 1223)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission)

79. Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

Criteria

(iii) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.55; 30 COM 7B.58; 32 COM 7B.75

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 50,000, of which USD 20,000 in 2001 for Brick Conservation and Geophysical Survey of the property; USD 30,000 in 2007 for the Preparation and establishment of an integrated management plan.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 57,200, USD 50,000 from Oriental Cultural Heritage Sites Protection Alliance in 2008 and USD 7,200 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust in 2006.

Previous monitoring missions

May 2004 and November 2005: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; April and September 2008: UNESCO Advisory missions.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a conservation policy and inappropriate management of the property;
- b) Impact on the archaeological remains, as well as on the visual integrity of the property by the Maya Devi Temple constructed in 2002.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/666>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee had requested the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and to continue its work on the integrated management plan (IMP), incorporating the recommendations of the 2005 mission. A time-framed programme of activities to this end was expected. The World Heritage Committee had also requested the State Party to avoid carrying out any development project pending completion of the IMP.

On 30 January 2009, the State Party submitted a report outlining progress as follows:

a) Draft an updated Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, including the conditions of authenticity and integrity and Progress on the preparation of an IMP:

With support through International Assistance under the World Heritage Fund, a draft outline for the IMP has been prepared and is being reviewed. This focuses on the conservation of the property, but includes consideration of two sites, presently on the Tentative List of Nepal, that are closely associated with the life of Lord Buddha - Ramagrama, the Relic Stupa of the Lord Buddha, and Tilaurakot, the Archaeological remains of the Ancient Shakya (the father of the Lord Buddha) Kingdom. The process for the development of the IMP will follow that which was used for the Kathmandu Valley property, i.e. will be driven by those responsible for its implementation (that is the Lumbini Development Trust and the Department of Archaeology) and include extensive consultations with all stakeholders.

The IMP draft presented during the April 2008 start up workshop for the IMP in Lumbini contained a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, offered at that time for discussion to the Lumbini Development Trust, and all stakeholders.

b) Avoid carrying out any development project pending completion of the IMP

The report noted that the no development works have been carried out within the boundaries and the buffer zone of the property pending the completion of the management plan, except for a temporary toilet for visitors, constructed at the edge of the buffer zone. Fencing around the property has been enlarged to protect it from animal and human disturbance.

c) Develop a strategy to ensure the long-term protection of the significant archaeological remains of the property

The report also noted that further work on excavation of the surrounding levee has been undertaken, under the strict supervision of the Lumbini Chief Archaeologist. The area to the south west of the buffer zone, the assumed location of the ancient Lumbini village, and the south east and the north parts of the buffer zone, have been identified as potential archaeological areas for possible future excavation. More detailed documentation and monitoring procedures will be integrated within the future IMP.

d) Develop a strategy for the rehabilitation of the Maya Devi temple incorporating the recommendations and the implementation of the corrective measures proposed by the 2005 mission

Various corrective measures on the Maya Devi Temple have been carried out, including the waterproofing of the roof and removal of the external staircases. Access to the roof has been restricted to maintenance. With regard to the removal of the false ceiling inside Maya Devi Temple and its replacement with natural materials such as bamboo plywood, or fabric, and the review of the railings of the roof of Temple, the State Party has suggested that these aspects would be reviewed in the context of the IMP under preparation. With regard to the protection of the archaeological remains, which are threatened by ground water and humidity, the State Party reports that ground water is being regularly monitored, but that the expertise to analyse the data, understand the threats and establish an approach to deal with the ground water and humidity is not available. The State Party has requested UNESCO to provide an expert to study and analyse this problem.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made with respect to the recommendations contained in the Committee's decisions of the last few years. However they also note that the State Party report did not include a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, and the requested time-framed programme of activities.

With respect to the IMP, the World Heritage Centre had supported in 2006 the preparation of a comprehensive project for its elaboration, with detailed cost estimates. Presently, resources are being sought to enable the implementation of this important activity. Additional opportunities to mobilise resources for the conservation of Lumbini, including the IMP, are being considered at present, including through a possible project funded under the Japanese Trust Funds with UNESCO and a partnership with the *Oriental Cultural Heritage Sites Protection Alliance*, an NGO based in France and China. The UNESCO Office in Kathmandu is also exploring a possible cooperation with the Asian Development Bank in the context of a loan to Nepal to foster tourism development related to Buddhist sites in South-Eastern Asia.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned about some proposed development projects, including the enlargement of the existing airport and the construction of a ring road south of Lumbini. Information on these proposed developments was provided by the UNESCO Office in Kathmandu as well as by a group of stakeholders self-named "Lumbini Institutions", by letter dated 30 October 2008. The ring road, in particular, appears to be located outside the inscribed property and its buffer zone, however it is felt that the project might still have a negative impact on its Outstanding Universal Value, notably through traffic and noise pollution which may affect the sacred character of the area. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that decisions on these proposals should be based on an Environmental Impact Assessment taking into account the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, within the framework of the IMP under preparation.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.79

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.75**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes the efforts and commitment of the State Party for the safeguarding of this property;
4. Reiterates its request to the State Party to draft, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, an updated Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, and submit it to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible, for examination by the World Heritage Committee;
5. Also reiterates its request to the State Party to continue its work on the development of the integrated management plan (IMP), based on the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and avoid carrying out any development project within the property and the adjacent areas identified as having potential archaeological significance, pending completion of the IMP;
6. Calls upon the international community to provide technical and financial support to assist the State Party in the development of the IMP and in particular in identifying and implementing the appropriate conservation measures for the archaeological remains contained within the Maya Devi Temple;
7. Requests the State Party to submit detailed information to the World Heritage Centre on any proposed developments in the vicinity of the property which might have an impact on its Outstanding Universal Value, and particularly on the proposed ring road surrounding Lumbini, in line with the provisions of Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011** a report on the progress made on the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

80. Historical Monuments of Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1981

Criteria

(iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.103; 30 COM 7B.68; 31 COM 7B.85

International Assistance

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November-December 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Significant decay of the property caused by local climatic conditions and alluvial erosion;
- b) Stability of the foundations (earth mechanics) of the Jam Nizamuddin tomb;
- c) Lack of definition of boundaries of the property and buffer zone of the necropolis;
- d) Lack of monitoring.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/143>

Current conservation issues

The property was listed on the 100 Most Endangered Sites of the World Monuments Watch List in 2005 due to significant decay resulting from harsh climatic conditions and topsoil erosion caused by the shifting riverbed. A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was undertaken to the property in November-December 2006. The mission identified a series of general and specific recommendations which the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to implement (Decision **31 COM 7B.85**).

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Centre on 27 January 2009. The report details progress on the implementation of the recommendations as follows:

- a) *Urgently identify the boundaries of the property and buffer zone of the necropolis*

The necessary work for defining the boundaries of the property and buffer zone, including topographic satellite imaging and archaeological work, is awaiting approval from the Government as part of the overall Master Plan.

- b) *Adjust the strategy from a one-monument concept to a serial-site strategy (cluster of many individual tombs) with individual registration and evaluation of each tomb including their historic value, state of conservation, and an individual treatment plan*

No specific information was provided in the State Party report.

- c) *Work out a monitoring programme in association with the treatment plan*

No specific information was provided in the State Party report.

- d) *Further develop the site management plan*

The Department of Archaeology and Museums (DOAM) has prepared a comprehensive Master Plan for the conservation and preservation of the Makli Hill Monuments at Thatta, which includes immediate-, medium- and long-term conservation and management plans for

the property. The Master Plan is awaiting approval from the relevant authorities and the State Party indicates that it will be immediately implemented during the current financial year after it has been approved.

e) *Further develop the didactic concept and documentation*

Documentation of the structures within the property is ongoing, with the DOAM photographing and drawing monuments, and reviewing archive material. Once the Master Plan has been approved the DOAM intends to establish a documentation centre. Signage and interpretive boards have been installed at each monument for visitors.

f) *Further develop capacity building*

Capacity building will be facilitated through the documentation centre once this has been approved and established. The State Party notes its concern about the lack of funding available to carry out conservation work at the property.

g) *As a matter of urgency, carry out soil investigations to determine the stability of the subsoil and the foundations of the tomb of Jam Nizamuddin*

The State Party has recently applied for Emergency Assistance under the World Heritage Fund, to undertake preservation and stabilization work at Jam Nizamuddin's tomb. It has resubmitted a revised application document, which was received by the World Heritage Centre on 11 February 2009 for an amount of USD 28,200.

h) *Prepare a condition report for all other monuments and tombs and establish a prioritized emergency intervention plan*

No specific information was provided in the State Party report.

i) *Set up a weather station for data collection for monitoring the property*

No specific information was provided in the State Party report.

j) *Request a name change of the property to adequately reflect its Outstanding Universal Value*

The State Party requested a name change for the property to "Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta". This request will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document WHC-09/33.COM/8B).

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the ongoing conservation work being undertaken at the property including the documentation of monuments and tombs, repair work and the installation of interpretive signs and boards. However, they are concerned about the overall lack of progress in the development of a) overall monitoring programme, b) management plan, c) condition report for all monuments and tombs, d) prioritized emergency intervention plan, and e) identification of the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note however that a majority of the proposed conservation work at the property is dependant on the approval and implementation of the Master Plan. In the framework of the forthcoming periodic reporting exercise for the Asia Pacific region, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies will provide assistance to the State Party to formulate a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.80

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.85**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes the ongoing conservation work undertaken by the State Party including the documentation of monuments and tombs, repair work and the installation of interpretive signs and boards;
4. Requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the Master Plan, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
5. Also requests the State Party to continue progress in the implementation of the following:
 - a) Overall monitoring programme,
 - b) Management plan,
 - c) Condition report for all monuments and tombs,
 - d) Prioritized emergency intervention plan, and
 - e) Identification of the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone;
6. Further requests the State Party to make progress with the soil investigations and stabilization of the tomb of Jam Nizamuddin, in the light of comments received from the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre;
7. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011** on the progress in implementing the recommendations of the 2006 mission, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

81. Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro (Pakistan) (C 138)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(ii) (iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.69; 31 COM 7B.86

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 23,500,000 (total of contributions for the International Safeguarding Campaign for Moenjodaro)

Previous monitoring missions

Following the closing of the UNESCO International Safeguarding Campaign (1974-1997), numerous UNESCO and expert missions have been carried out; November/December 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of appropriate conservation work;
- b) Deterioration of structures;
- c) Suspension of management system.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/138>

Current conservation issues

In the past, the property had experienced deterioration through periodic flooding by the Indus River, exposure to harsh climatic conditions, rising salinity from the shallow water table and water-logging. Conservation of the property has been supported by the International Safeguarding Campaign for Moenjodaro (1974-1997) and a post-campaign strategy (Medium Term Strategy for the Preservation and Conservation of Moenjodaro) developed in 2003-2004.

Following the closure of the Campaign, an Executive Board was set up, which meets yearly, comprising representatives from the national and regional governments, UNESCO and the Department of Archaeology and Museums (DoAM). It approves budgets and work plans for Moenjodaro. Recently a parallel body to the Executive Board has also been set up in Sindh. In addition, a Technical Consultative Committee (TCC) was established, consisting of international and national experts and including UNESCO, to advise the Executive Board on technical issues. The TCC has not met since 2005.

The World Heritage Committee requested at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) (Decision **31 COM 7B.86**) that the State Party revise the Action Plan for Moenjodaro according to the recommendations made by the 2006 reactive monitoring mission; to redefine the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone and submit to the World Heritage Centre all necessary documentation for the extension of the property; to ensure the implementation of the conservation and rehabilitation programme; to develop an excavation strategy in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies before any further archaeological interventions are undertaken; and to submit a detailed report on the implementation of the Action plan to the World Heritage Centre.

The World Heritage Centre received a state of conservation report from the State Party on 4 February 2009. The report describes the progress made as follows:

a) Management system

A Master Plan for Rehabilitation and Cultural Tourism at Moenjodaro – Phase I and Phase II, covering preservation, development and tourism, has been prepared and is in the process of being approved by the Pakistan Federal Government. The DoAM has established a

documentation centre for conservation activities in Moenjodaro, which is currently implementing an updated Medium Term Action Plan.

b) Redefinition of boundaries

The State Party is carrying out activities required in order to redefine the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, including the preparation of a topographic map of the area, dry core drilling across the site to assess the extent of archaeological features, and further archaeological excavations at selected locations based on the dry core drilling results. The State Party indicates that these activities, which are essential to determine the actual extent of the archaeological area, will be undertaken during the first quarter of 2009, pending the identification of an appropriate consultant to undertake the work.

c) Conservation work

Implementation of the conservation and rehabilitation programme is ongoing. Plantation work has been undertaken in selected areas outside the ruins to stabilize the surface. Landscaping has been undertaken around the property including a visitor recreation area. The State Party reports the need to construct a boundary wall or other protective measures to prevent grazing animals from entering the property; however this is dependant on the definition of the boundary.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that a comprehensive Master Plan is in the process of being approved by the Pakistan government. They also note that it is unclear as to whether the comprehensive Master Plan is the Master Plan that was prepared in January 2006 or an updated version. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the January 2006 Master Plan comprises a list of activities to be implemented rather than a management plan containing policies and procedures for the ongoing management system for the property, which remains to be developed.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note that the DOAM is implementing an updated Medium Term Action Plan, and they wish to clarify whether this Action Plan constitutes the revised Action Plan requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session in 2007.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note the delay in undertaking the archaeological soundings work, on which the redefinition of the property's boundaries depends, and suggest that they may be able to assist the State Party in sourcing an appropriate specialist for the work. Also in relation to boundary definitions, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned that the areas of potential archaeological interest, which might be part of a future extended World Heritage property, should be adequately protected pending the redefinition of the boundaries. The requested archaeological strategy to be developed in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, moreover, does not appear to have been prepared.

In view of the above, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the Technical Consultative Committee for Moenjodaro should be convened at the earliest possible opportunity. In the framework of the forthcoming periodic reporting exercise for the Asia Pacific region, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will provide assistance to the State Party to formulate a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.81

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.86**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes that a comprehensive Master Plan has been prepared, that a Medium Term Action Plan is being implemented and that work is in progress to identify the actual extent of the archaeological area of Moenjodaro;*
4. *Requests the State Party, however, to clarify if the Master Plan has been updated since January 2006; and whether the updated Medium Term Action Plan referred to above integrates the World Heritage Committee's previous request to revise the Action Plan according to the recommendations of the 2006 mission;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to convene the Technical Consultative Committee for Moenjodaro as soon as possible, to review the on-going activities and the contents of the Master Plan;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *Continue its work to redefine the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone,*
 - b) *Develop an archaeological research strategy, including non-invasive methods of investigation, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, and refrain from undertaking any major archaeological interventions until this strategy is in place,*
 - c) *Ensure that adequate protection measures are in place to prevent encroachments within the areas of potential archaeological interest, which may be subject to a future extension of the property,*
 - d) *Submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the progress made in the implementation of the above mentioned recommendations, and associated documentation, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

82. Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

Criteria

(vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.56; 32 COM 7B.77

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2002: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; November 2007: UNESCO expert advisory mission; April/May 2008: UNESCO New Delhi Office advisory mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Need for development and management plan;
- b) Intrusive and illegal constructions within the Galle cricket ground impacting on the integrity of the property;
- c) Potential impacts of a proposed port construction on the integrity of the property.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/451>

Current conservation issues

A UNESCO mission conducted in May 2008 considered the property to be threatened, due to the strong impact on the site's integrity by the Galle international cricket stadium and a proposed port development project.

The World Heritage Committee requested at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) (Decision **32 COM 7B.77**) that the State Party carry out a series of short- and long-term mitigation actions for the cricket stadium, as recommended by the mission, which prioritised removal of illegal buildings and all related structures, lowering of the middle building by one storey and reducing the impact of the fences. The World Heritage Committee also requested the State Party to abandon or downscale the port development project; to build capacity within the relevant authorities; to develop a comprehensive conservation and management plan for the property; and to submit to the World Heritage Centre revised boundaries for the property and buffer zone incorporating the important underwater archaeological discoveries made in recent years in the bay to the east of the Old Town.

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Centre on 30 January 2009. The report describes the progress made as follows:

a) Illegal constructions within the Galle cricket ground

The State Party has reported the demolition of a building owned by the Galle Municipal Council within the cricket ground, but does not indicate whether this building corresponds to one of the buildings identified in the mission's short term recommended actions or is part of the long term complete removal of the cricket ground. The State Party also indicates that "the remaining municipal buildings are planned to be demolished once the new proposed building is completed". However, no details are provided as to what the new building will comprise or when it will be completed. Other future actions identified by the State Party include the reduction of a planned five story building to three stories and the decision to construct the sight screen at the rampart side with a hydraulic system by which a cloth can be raised only when matches are in progress.

b) Proposed port construction

The port development project has been downscaled through several actions including the reduction of roads and reclamation area, reduction of the Container Port to two multipurpose berths to exclude gantry crane structures, conversion of flour and cement silos to horizontal silos, use of micro blasting method and monitoring stations to minimize vibrations, minimization of the height of the breakwater crests, and no multi story building are to be constructed. No plans have been provided.

c) Revision of the boundaries

Revision of the boundaries of the property and buffer zone is ongoing. The State Party has not indicated any timeframes for completion or submission to the World Heritage Centre.

d) Management

Improvement in the capacity and processes of the relevant authorities has been progressed through the provision of funding and personnel by the Ministry of Cultural Affairs and National Heritage to the Galle Heritage Foundation. Expertise has also been provided through the Central Cultural Fund and the Department of Archaeology. A draft comprehensive conservation plan has been prepared and the State Party has indicated it will be provided to the World Heritage Centre once it has been finalized.

e) Additional information

Additional actions that have been reported by the State Party include the conservation of sixty historic houses and four other historic buildings within Galle Port area, the establishment of a maritime biological museum, planning for the future establishment of a Maritime archaeological and historical museum and Tourist information centre, delivery of several awareness raising programmes on the Outstanding Universal Value and conservation of the property, streamlining the building approval process to prevent unauthorized constructions, restoration of 75% of the Galle Port tsunami-damaged sewage system, and planning for the establishment of the Maritime Training and Research Institute for the Asia Region in Galle Fort and underwater museum in waters around Galle Fort.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the significant work accomplished by the State Party to conserve historic buildings and re-establish the sewage system within the World Heritage property. Given the commitment demonstrated by the State Party to the conservation of the property, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are confident that the demolition process that has now commenced at the cricket stadium will continue, however, they would like to request further clarifications on the demolition programme.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge the intention of the State Party to significantly reduce the port development project, however plans need to be submitted together with an Environmental Impact Assessment. They consider that a mission to the property to assess the issues above, including the port development project, would be advisable, once the Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed.

In the framework of the forthcoming periodic reporting exercise for the Asia Pacific region, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will also provide assistance to the State Party to formulate a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.82

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.77**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes the efforts of the State Party in the conservation and restoration of the property and sewage system and progress made in implementing the recommendations of the 2008 mission concerning the removal of constructions of the cricket stadium;
4. Also notes the intention of the State Party to downscale the port development project,
5. Urges the State Party to carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment of the proposed port development project as a matter of priority and to submit the findings to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies in advance of the project moving forward;
6. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property in 2009, to advise on the issue of the port development once the Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible additional details regarding the demolition programme for the Galle international cricket ground including clarification on which building has been demolished, which buildings are planned to be demolished, what the new proposed building referred to in the State Party report comprises and the schedule for completion of these works;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2010** for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session, a detailed report including:
 - a) Revised boundaries of the property and buffer zone to reflect the recent underwater archaeological discoveries made in the bay to the east of the Old Town,
 - b) Finalised comprehensive conservation and management plan, and
 - c) Detailed report on the progress made concerning the above mentioned recommendations.

83. Parthian Fortresses of Nisa (Turkmenistan) (C 1242)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2007

Criteria

(ii) (iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 8B.30; 32 COM 7B.78

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

Lack of interpretation and visitor management plan.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1242>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to submit a interpretation and visitor management plan and to provide three copies of the completed management plan.

The State Party submitted its report on 28 January 2009. A summary management plan activities against results achieved to date is included as part of the report. The schedule is presented in five sections – site protection, conservation, promotion and education, presentation and interpretation and visitor management. Each section is dealt with under headings of ‘regular activities to be implemented’, ‘short term activities’ and ‘long term activities’ up to 2010. The plan indicates that work has been accomplished on all sections.

A detailed interpretation and visitor management plan has not been submitted as a separate plan, but proposed actions to 2010 are indicated in the summary management plan. They include increasing the number and training of guides, and the construction of a new site museum and visitor facilities. The location of the latter is not indicated. Presentation and interpretation works have included the installation of site location maps and plans at the entrance, and information boards in English, Russian and Turkmen at the archaeological sites.

The report also outlines progress on the following:

- a) Site protection works completed in 2008 include drainage works to the Red Building complex at Old Nisa, the planting of a hedge around Old Nisa and the development of new visitor routes around the property via corridors connecting halls, aimed at avoiding visitor access on walls.

- b) Conservation works completed in 2008 include roof drainage at the Site Museum; conservation of the Red Building, partial restoration of the exterior walls of the Round Building and cleaning and partial restoration of the Great Square Building and auxiliary structures.
- c) Promotion and education works completed in 2008 include development of a new tourist route for the Great Square Building, and interpretation material about the property including a booklet, post cards and brochures.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the positive progress made in implementing the management plan covers most of the recommendations made at the time of inscription (Decision **31 COM 8B.30**). Key priorities of site drainage and conservation/protection of the excavated remains have been addressed.

Since the management plan covers only the period up to 2010, consideration should now be given to revising the Plan for a further three to five years to identify action plans in the following five years to 2015, so that applications for national budget and/ or other funding can be secured in a timely manner.

In the framework of the forthcoming periodic reporting exercise for the Asia Pacific region, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will provide assistance to the State Party to formulate a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.83

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **31 COM 8B.30** and **32 COM 7B.78**, adopted at its 31st (Christchurch, 2007) and 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) sessions respectively,*
3. *Notes the summary management plan submitted by the State Party and progress that has been made by the State Party on the implementation of the management plan, including interpretation and visitor management;*
4. *Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies informed on the design and location of the proposed new site museum and visitor facilities;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a progress report on the implementation and revision of the management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

84. Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603 rev)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Application of the Reinforced monitoring mechanism)

85. Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam) (C 678)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1993

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.58; 30 COM 7B.71; 31 COM 7B 75

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 307,111 (Technical co-operation and Emergency assistance)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2003: Monitoring mission by international expert, October 2006: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; September 2008: Expert mission within framework of France/UNESCO Cooperation Agreement.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Development of the road infrastructure and modern constructions in and around the Citadel;
- b) Urban infrastructure of Hué and its surroundings.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/678>

Current conservation issues

By Decision **31 COM 7B.75**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to give urgent consideration to the recommendations of the 2006 mission and their phased implementation.

It urged the State Party to prepare, in consultation with and with assistance from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a management plan that would include consideration for the significant geomantic elements associated with the inscribed monuments, thus providing a stronger level of protection, in view of the possible eventual re-nomination of the property as a cultural landscape.

The World Heritage Committee also requested the State Party to prepare an action plan of necessary works to minimize the negative impact of noise pollution on the Minh Mang and Khai Dinh tombs.

An expert mission to the property was conducted in September 2008 within the framework of the France/UNESCO Cooperation Agreement to assist the State Party to meet these recommendations. The mission report contains a series of recommendations, each with proposed Action Plans to bring them into effect and meet Decision **31 COM 7B.75**.

The State Party submitted its report on 9 March 2009, outlining progress as follows.

a) Illegal buildings and inventory of properties of heritage significance

The State Party's progress report advises that a further 59 illegal households had been removed from the citadel during 2007-8 and that the Hue Monuments Conservation Centre and relevant agencies had been recently commissioned by the Hue Municipal People's Committee to continue the clearance of illegal buildings and preventing new illegal works from being constructed in the inscribed core areas in the period 2010-2020. The report notes that the Provincial Government has enforced policies related to compensation and land allocation to households moved away from the World Heritage property. Much work has taken place in 2007-8 to re-investigate the zoning status and field demarcation of the inscribed sites and a number of other monuments have been recommended to Provincial and National heritage lists in order to provide a legal basis for their inclusion in an extended heritage area. Work has continued with Waseda University in expanding the inventory of traditional buildings and studying the historical water system in the citadel, with the University of Tokyo in proposing ways of stabilising the life of people residing in the inscribed area and with the Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology in setting up a digitised database of historic buildings.

b) Suspension of major infrastructure projects and redefinition of boundaries

With regard to the proposed moratorium, the State Party advises that the local authority has not approved any major infrastructure projects near the property's buffer zones. It is not clear, however, if this concerns the areas identified by the 2006 mission for the potential re-nomination of an extended property – as it was implied by the World Heritage Committee in its recommendation of 2007 – or rather the existing buffer zones as currently defined. In 2007 and 2008, 24 new sites were investigated and documented by the Hue Monuments Conservation Centre (HMCC) with a view to including them in extended boundaries for the property. The Provincial authorities have also assisted in the preparation of recommendations to the relevant National body regarding the amendment of the National Law for Cultural Heritage that will be required to enable changes to property and its buffer zone (Zone I and II) as recommended by the 2006 mission.

c) Development of a management plan

The State Party and local authorities have realised that the development of a comprehensive management plan requires in-depth studies, high professional competencies, the participation of many government agencies and priority investment on the part of the national government. The State Party's report informs that a project to develop an integrated management plan is being carried out with support from the Netherlands Government and the UNESCO Hanoi Office. This project has already produced a draft Heritage management plan and is being reviewed by local stakeholders. The State Party expects the draft management plan to be submitted to UNESCO in the third quarter of 2009. With regard to the establishment of a GIS mapping system recommended by the 2008 mission, the State

Party seeks financial and technical assistance, with the expectation that the system could be implemented in 2010-2012.

d) Action plan to mitigate impacts of noise pollution on Minh Mang and Khai Dinh Tombs

The State Party advises that projects involving the construction of low mounds and the planting of vegetation are being implemented to mitigate the noise problems at the Minh Mang tomb, together with a monitoring system to measure their effectiveness. Similar treatment will be implemented at the Khai Dinh to deal with the negative visual impacts of the road and to limit landslide dangers.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made by the State Party in addressing the recommendations of the 2006 mission, notably in dealing with illegal buildings, preparing an inventory of heritage properties, starting the development of a management plan and carrying out mitigating measures at the Minh Mang and Khai Dinh Tombs to reduce the impact of the new highway. They would have welcomed information on how this management plan under preparation will be integrated in the context of the new Master Plan for the larger city of Hue, which was due for 2010.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note, however, that no significant progress appears to have been made in developing a statement of Outstanding Universal Value that includes consideration for the significant geomantic elements associated with the inscribed monuments, and in redefining accordingly the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, and that no request of International Assistance has been submitted by the State Party to support these activities. Considering that a management plan is apparently being developed, this seems very urgent.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note press reports concerning a series of other conservation activities that are being carried out in Hue, through international cooperation. These include the restoration of the Tu Duc mausoleum (with German support), the 3D modelling of the city, in cooperation with Italy, and the promotion of local community involvement in heritage conservation (in the framework of a cooperation with the Nord Pas de Calais region, France).

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.85

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.76**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the progress made by the State Party in dealing with illegal buildings, preparing an inventory of heritage properties, starting the development of a management plan and carrying out mitigating measures at the Minh Mang and Khai Dinh Tombs to reduce the impact of the new highway;*
4. *Notes, however, that no significant progress appears to have been made in developing a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value that includes consideration for the geomantic elements associated with the inscribed monuments, and in redefining accordingly the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone;*

5. *Encourages the State Party to consider, in due time, renominating the property and, in preparation for this, ensure that the management plan under preparation covers the areas being considered for the extension of the property and is based on a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property that includes consideration for the geomantic elements associated with the inscribed monuments as well as the conditions of integrity and authenticity;*
6. *Requests the State Party to ensure that the management plan is integrated in the larger regulatory framework being developed for the city of Hue (Master Plan);*
7. *Urges the State Party to complete the works needed to minimize the negative impact of noise and visual pollution on the Minh Mang and Khai Dinh tombs;*
8. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to consider refraining from carrying out major infrastructure projects within the areas being considered for the extension of the property, as recommended by the 2006 mission, until an appropriate regulatory framework is approved, including the management plan for the property ;*
9. *Notes press reports concerning ongoing international projects for the conservation of the World Heritage property and recommends to the State Party to ensure that all works are carefully coordinated within the framework of the management plan under elaboration;*
10. *Invites the State Party to request International Assistance to implement the recommendations of paragraph 5 above;*
11. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a progress report on the implementation of the recommendations above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

86. Butrint (Albania) (C 570 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1992, 1999

Criteria

(iii)

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

1997-2005

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 8C.3; 30 COM 7B.75; 31 COM 7B.92

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 47,000 for implementation of the immediate actions proposed in the report of the October 1997 mission.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1999: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/Butrint Foundation mission; 2001: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; 2003: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission; 2005: World Heritage Centre /ICOMOS/ICCROM mission; 2007: World Heritage/ICOMOS/ICCROM joint mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Insufficient management mechanisms
- b) Illegal constructions
- c) Slow progress on the implementation of the recommendations of the joint missions

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/ist/570>

Current conservation issues

At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee requested information on progress on two main issues, namely the updating of the management plan and the illegal construction at the Ksamili villages in addition to drawing the attention of the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 2007 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM joint reactive monitoring mission.

On 1 February 2009 the World Heritage Centre received from the State Party a detailed implementation report on the above issues.

a) Comprehensive management plan for Butrint and its surroundings

An environmental management plan, which has been financed by the World Bank will be completed at the end of June 2009, and this will be integrated with the existing 2007-2012 management plan to create a new document that will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review. This will cover archaeology, history, environment and tourism;

b) Illegal constructions and development in the surrounding areas of Butrint

This remains an issue in the Ksamili area, where the park and all the respective state institutions continuously monitor the situation. It is confirmed that during February-March 2009, illegal construction will be demolished close to zone A, which influence the image and integrity of the World Heritage property. These actions will also include interventions near the Diaporit site. Other work has been stopped by park staff and the respective ministry through notifying the respective authorities.

Furthermore, the report provides details on the implementation of the recommendations of the joint 2007 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission as follows:

c) Prepare an archaeological map of Butrint and its surroundings

This has not so far been achieved but the management plan will provide maps which can be used by the park authority to create a map of the archaeological remains, as requested;

d) Assign one agency with management authority

This has not been achieved;

e) Authority of the office of the manager along with adequate human and financial resources

Starting 1 July 2009, an expert in site planning issues will start work for a two year long period to enable the park to implement the site management plan;

f) Collaborate with the World Bank in reviving the "Albanian Coastal Zone management plan"

Full cooperation of the park authorities with the World Bank Coastal Zone management plan is said to be in place.

g) Ensure that the heritage values, including World Heritage values of Butrint are fully considered in regional and local planning, and that the environment and cultural impact studies are undertaken when appropriate

It is stated that all development will respect the criteria established by the World Bank Coastal Zone study, and local communes will be cooperating with the park authority in all processes of such planning. However, it is not clear how this will be achieved;

h) Review World Heritage values of the site of Butrint, and prepare a Statement of significance

It is stated that the management plan will include a Statement of significance. It is further stated that this will be used to 'initiate the procedures for the criteria under which the Butrint site should be inscribed, including the natural values'. There thus seems to be a misunderstanding of the rationale for the statement;

i) Boundaries of the World Heritage area and a surrounding buffer zone

A special TV programme organised by the park and local media has informed local residents about the boundaries of the property and its values. No formal review of the boundaries appears to have been undertaken;

j) Studies for the preservation and presentation of the structure and the mosaics of the baptistry

A conservation plan for the whole property has been completed by park staff and foreign specialists. Its implementation has started for specific monuments. In relation to the monuments that have a high water table, such as the baptistery, it is said that there is no common agreement on the best solution amongst specialists. An ongoing study of the conservation status of monuments has been commissioned by the Butrint Foundation;

k) Establish a provisional museum

The museum was transferred to the park authorities on 31 October 2008. The park will need to reform its structure to accommodate a permanent post at the museum;

l) Establish and compile a site archive of scientific reports, documentation, photographs etc.

No progress has been made in compiling a site archive of scientific reports, documentations, photographs etc. but future reports will be deposited with the Park;

m) Improve site protection by repairing and extending the protective fence around the property

No details have been provided on the repair of the protective fence

n) Ensure proper surveillance by police assigned to the site

The Park rangers are now part of a private security company and they are equipped with appropriate tools and equipments.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that progress has been made in implementing the recommendations of the 2007 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission. Considering the nature of the property which has a very large geographical area, its link to the RAMSAR site and the coastal area, it is a sensible move to integrate the management plan with the larger environment management plan which is being prepared with the help of the World Bank. This point was highlighted by previous missions as well.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the issue of Illegal construction raised by the World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission seem to have not been addressed sufficiently. The mission particularly reported that the situation of Ksamil village was 'alarming' in April 2007 and requested the authorities to work closely with planning agencies to adopt systematic approach to the development of the village with a view to avoid any impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The results reported after nearly two years on this issue are not satisfactory.

Attention of the State Party is also drawn to the full implementation of the mission recommendations.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.86

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.75**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Acknowledges considerable progress made with the development of Management and conservation plans and putting in place adequate resources;*

4. Expresses its concern that adequate measures are yet to be taken to control the illegal construction in the Ksamili village;
5. Urges the State Party to fully implement the 2007 mission recommendations and in particular, in parallel with the finalisation of the management plan, the establishment of a planning system for controlling development around the property that acknowledges the Outstanding Universal Value;
6. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011** a report on progress made concerning the issues above and the implementation of the recommendations of the 2007 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission.

87. Historic Centres of Berat and Gjirokastra (Albania) (C 569bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005, 2008

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 8B.48; 32 COM 8B.56

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 44,964.00 (two requests for the preparation of the nomination file of Gjirokastra and a joint management plan for the two cities)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 1,367,014 is provided by the Albanian Government under the framework of the project 933 ALB 4000 "Safeguard and restoration of selected monuments within the World Heritage site of the Old City of Gjirokaster – Albania"

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

Threats mentioned in the ICOMOS evaluation report at the time of inscription:

- a) Illegal construction dating from the late 1990s
- b) Lack of specific monitoring indicators

- c) Lack of a programme of archaeological excavations
- d) Lack of adequate firefighting arrangements in the historic urban zone
- e) Lack of a detailed tourist development plan

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/569>

Current conservation issues

In its evaluation of the nomination for Berat as an extension to Gjirokastra, ICOMOS noted that 'this damaging phenomenon [of illegal constructions] has been practically stopped and is under control. It would be important for the State Party to ensure that these unauthorised constructions should be identified, and penalties imposed, and that a return to this type of practice is made impossible. A map identifying the constructions concerned has been announced and tighter monitoring ensuring that future actions of this type are prevented. ICOMOS considers that it is indeed essential to precisely identify the illegal constructions through an inventory and plans, and to absolutely prevent the return to such practices, which took place at a particular period of Albanian history. ICOMOS also considers that it is necessary to draw up a long-term plan to remove the illegal constructions, in order to improve the values and integrity of the property.

ICOMOS recommended that the nomination be referred back to the State Party in order to allow it to provide details of the structure for the coordination of the management plan for the two towns, in accordance with Paragraph 114 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and guarantee its setting up, its competencies, as well as addressing the need for an inventory of illegal constructions, monitoring indicators, fire fighting arrangements and responsive archaeological investigations.

The World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2009** on the implementation of a number of measures.

Meanwhile the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS have been made aware of further illegal constructions, particularly in a prominent area of the buffer zone for Berat.

On 1 February 2009, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report presents in some detail alterations and constructions carried out illegally within the two towns, inadequacies of the fire fighting arrangements, but does not address all the concerns of the World Heritage Committee.

a) Illegal constructions

The report provides an inventory of building violations in both Gjirokastra and Berat. According to the data on the infringements of the law on Protection of the Cultural Inheritance, there are 40 violations in Berat and 245 in Gjirokastra. These include new buildings and amendments to existing buildings. Some of these infringements have a greater impact than others: for instance new buildings and changes in materials, such as the use of concrete, have a greater impact than interior alterations. Similarly some changes are reversible, such as a change in roof covering, while others are not. The reason why the infringements are much greater Gjirokastra is explained by the lack of possibilities for expanding the city apart from within the protected zone, while in Berat these possibilities exist. In response to these threats, it is stated that the revision of the law on the protection of the monuments will be amended to be more appropriate to allow improvements to living conditions which respect value, in conformity with the international standards in this field. With regard to the infringements, it is stated that it will be necessary to demolish certain illegal constructions and to amend or reverse certain modifications. These decisions will be

preceded by professional evaluations and authorizations by the relevant authorities. However, no action plan or timescale is provided for these processes. Although at the time Berat was inscribed as an extension of Gjirokastra, it was stated that illegal constructions had taken place, particularly in the buffer zone, but that this had practically been stopped and measures were in place to ensure that the lack of control did not persist. However comparatively large-scale new houses are continuing to be constructed in the buffer zone on a hill opposite the castle gate, and these constructions are highly visible from within the old town.

b) Monitoring indicators

The report states that monitoring indicators which reflect the way the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is being sustained would be the number of the monuments restored each year and the annual funds put towards this process. It is suggested that these would be monitored every three years. Given the problems of illegal construction outlined above, it is clear that more detailed indicators need to be established to monitor changes in the overall urban fabric of vernacular buildings, not just the main monuments, as these are part of the justification for inscription. It is suggested that the main attributes of the two towns that reflect Outstanding Universal Value should be indicated and monitoring indicators developed to monitor these which should include, streetscapes and views.

c) Archaeological excavations

The report states that the Institute of Archaeology does not envisage excavations in the two castles of the two towns in the five next years. However, the Institute of Monuments (IMK) will carry archaeological surveys out as part of restoration and conservation work by specialists qualified in this field. The report also states that IMK, will insist that the Institute of Archaeology should carry out excavations in the two castles in order to precisely determine the phases of construction of these fortifications. It should be clarified that major excavations are not being requested but rather a programme to allow archaeological intervention when any development of major restoration is undertaken.

d) Fire Fighting

Fire-protection is problematic in both Gjirokastra and Berat because of difficult access for fire fighters. The most serious situation exists in the districts Mangalem, Gorice and part of the Kala in Berat where the movement of the firemen is almost impossible. The municipality of Berat has defined a project for installing a hydrant network in the problematic districts like Mangalem and Gorice; however, the cost of such a project in the Mangalem district would be approximately 61,680 Euros, and in Gorice 43,250 Euros. Gjirokastra has a fire station with qualified personnel, vehicles and equipment as well as five water hydrants. In July 2008, the Town Council agreed to improve collaboration between the regional institutions for water and fire prevention to allow the construction of new hydrants.

The Municipality of Gjirokastra does not have an overall plan for the protection of the historic town. The World Bank has financed preparations towards the development of such a long-term plan.

e) Tourism Development Plan

Although considerable details are provided on the number of tourists, the increase due to inscription, the effect on the two towns in terms of changes of use (hotels and guesthouses), promotion and the aim to quadruple the number of tourists by 2014, (from 20 to 80

thousand), there are no details of a coordinated tourism strategy, not any mention of the management plan.

In view of the difficulties of controlling development in the two towns, a coordinated cultural tourism development plan that puts in places strategies for sustainable growth in tourism numbers and plans facilities that respect the value of the property is essential in order to avoid any negative impact of tourism and could balance between benefits and disbenefits to the local community. The improvement in visitor services should be strictly assessed within the framework of the management plan.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies acknowledge progress with the development of an inventory of planning violations but is concerned at the lack of an agreed action plan and timescale to address these and the fact that planning violations are continuing to occur in a prominent part of the buffer zone in Berat opposite the castle gates and as well as in Old Bazaar area of the World Heritage of Gjirokastra. There is also a need to develop monitoring indicators that fully reflect the attributes of the two towns that carry Outstanding Universal Value and which could help address these planning violations.

Although the vulnerabilities of the fire protection are acknowledged, there is concern at the lack of an overall agreed fire response plan for the overall property. In the light of the ambitious targets for tourism development, there is great concern about the lack of an overall tourism development plan within the framework of the management plan for the serial property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.87

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 8B.56**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Urges the State Party to fully comply with the requests of the World Heritage Committee;*
4. *Acknowledges progress made with the development of an inventory of planning violations;*
5. *Expresses its concern that violations are continuing to occur in a prominent part of the buffer zone in Berat opposite the castle gates, as well as in Old Bazaar area of Gjirokastra;*
6. *Also urges the State Party to put in place an agreed action plan and timescale to address these violations and to stop further violations;*
7. *Requests the State Party to put in place more detailed and appropriate monitoring indicators related to the attributes that carry the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
8. *Also acknowledges some progress in planning better provision of water hydrants, to enhance fire protection, but expresses concern at the lack of an overall agreed fire*

response plan for the property and encourages the State Party to address this issue as a matter of urgency;

9. Expresses its great concern, in view of the ambitious targets for the tourism industry, that there is a lack of an overall tourism development plan that would aim to reconcile the benefits and disbenefits of tourism for local communities within the framework of the management plan and also requests the State Party to address this issue;
10. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a progress report on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

88. Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.72; 31 COM 7B.105; 32 COM 7B.81

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2009: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressure, high-rise projects;
- b) Train station project outside the buffer zone.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/784>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee, at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), regretted that the State Party had not provided the requested report on the state of conservation of the property, and expressed its concern about the lack of information on major on-going development projects, and the lack of progress in completing a management plan meant to ensure the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

In compliance with the World Heritage Committee's request, the State Party submitted a detailed report on the urban development projects on 31 October 2008, and the management plan and a report on the state of conservation of the property on 29 January 2009.

The State Party's report including the management plan (which is described by the State Party as an outline document, not yet complete), was submitted to the mission during its visit and passed to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for review at that time. The report also provided an overview of the state of conservation of the property and complemented the report submitted on 31 October 2008 on current urban development projects.

The State Party report presents a number of projects currently being planned and reviewed which may have long-term impacts on the property. Among these are infrastructure projects such as the possible construction of a small hydroelectric power plant outside the buffer zone and which would necessitate a dam on the Salzach river, the Kapuzinerberg tunnel project long discussed and now the object of a feasibility study to conclude in 2010, as well as a possible underground parking project in Makart Square in the World Heritage property. The report also describes restoration and rehabilitation projects, including the renewal project for the "Alte Diakonie", the planned refurbishment of the Old Town Hall as well as the completed work at Max Reinhardt Square involving the enlargement of the Furtwangler Garden.

The State Party report also reviews a number of recent and planned projects within and beyond the buffer zone of the World Heritage property. These include the University Campus Nonntal (implementation delayed), the railway bridge, the railway station, the railway station square, the Stern Brewery (begun in 2008 and to be completed in 2010), and the Uzilinga project.

a) Results of the joint UNESCO World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

A joint UNESCO World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the World Heritage property took place from 27 to 29 January 2009 to assess the potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value that could result from the implementation of the urban development projects mentioned above.

The mission report stated that "The traditional city structure of the Old Town of Salzburg, its architectural ensembles, the roofscape as well as to the individual buildings, town houses, castles and churches are well preserved. Moreover, there is a vital practice of continuing Salzburg's tradition as a centre of performing arts, in particular those linked to its prominent resident genius Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart."

However, the mission report noted that in a number of recent projects, the loss or relocation of valuable built fabric were problematic. The mission report also noted that the rehabilitation and use of the open spaces and squares in the historic centre was "not always in line with appropriate safeguarding principles and measures", and that single new constructions were designed without regard for the historically evolved urban structures of the city, or the city's traditionally important views.

While the report describes several projects as exemplary (the restoration of the Residence Fountain, the contemporary building of the "Alte Diakonie", the Makart bridge), it also notes

shortcomings in other projects in terms of respect for existing urban scale and historic patterns (design of the Max Reinhardt Square, design of the concert hall of the new Mozarteum whose unbalanced proportions and material negatively impact the Mirabell Gardens and the ensemble of Mirabell Castle, and the exceeding height of new constructions in the *Sternbrewery* complex), loss of in situ historic fabric (the relocation of walls of a Roman house in the new Museum Carolino Augusteum), the demolition of the frontage of the *Small Festival Hall* (Kleines Festspielhaus).

Finally, the report also emphasizes the need to be vigilant when implementing current and possible future projects, such as the installation of a new lift in the Old Town Hall, the access road to the Museum of Contemporary Art on the historic Mönchsberg fortifications, and possible tunnelling through the *Kapuzinerberg* to facilitate access to the historic centre.

Based on its review of the main projects, the mission report points out a number of instances where the Republic of Austria, the Federal State of Salzburg and the City of Salzburg lack clear mechanisms of coordinated decision-making due to unclear and “adverse overlapping of responsibilities” among the national authorities, e.g. Federal State Office for Protection of Monuments (Bundesdenkmalamt), Austrian National Railways, the Regional authorities and the Municipality. The mission report provides several examples of the questionable results which follow from this uncoordinated approach – for example, the decision by the *Architectural Advisory Board* (*Gestaltungsbeirat*) to accept the *University Campus* on formerly open sports grounds (buffer-zone), or the planned dismantling of the Marble Hall in the train station and its “historical iron construction” (outside the buffer zone).

The mission report highlights concern about the potential impact on the World Heritage property of the hydroelectric power station (*Wasserkraftwerk Salzburg-Lehen*), which would need to be assessed through an Environmental Impact Assessment, taking in to account potential impacts of the works foreseen upstream on the left bank of the river Salzach.

Other recommendations of the mission include the following:

- Harmonizing those built-up areas of the “Protection Zone I” currently outside the World Heritage property, in order to link all protection zones to the responsible bodies;
- Assuring the post of World Heritage site manager, and a facilitation role to improve communications as noted above;
- Strengthening the legal protection of squares and other open spaces in the World Heritage property;
- Improving communication with local groups of citizens and stakeholders.
- Establishing clear guidelines and terms of reference for all architectural competitions, new structures and other larger-scale interventions planned in the World Heritage property and its buffer zone;
- Strengthening the interdisciplinary composition of the relevant advisory boards - the Expert Commission for the Preservation of the Old Town (*Sachverständigenkommission*) and more importantly the Architectural Advisory Board (*Gestaltungsbeirat*).

b) management plan

Having reviewed the outline of the management plan submitted by the State Party, ICOMOS considers, while appreciating the historical overview of protection efforts provided and the commitment to protection, that this document does not represent a process-oriented planning instrument meant to ensure co-ordination and integration of decisions at all levels and in all sectors with respect to safeguarding the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property.

This argument is supported by many of the recommendations of the mission report which call for improved co-ordination and integration of decision-making, including:

- Strengthening the coherence of the Federal laws at national level so as to give priority to World Heritage conservation and enhance coordination of activities carried out in the World Heritage property by different national authorities in World Heritage sites;
- Providing a consultation mechanism, which would allow regular information flows and dialogue among all relevant national, regional and local authorities;
- Defining clear responsibilities of the Republic of Austria, the Federal State of Salzburg and the City of Salzburg in relation to the World Heritage property, and improving communication between the various institutions concerned within and beyond established legal frameworks.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note the mission's assessment of the overall state of conservation as being good, but nevertheless consider that the concerns identified by the mission should be addressed in due course and dealt with through improved coordination and decision-making developed through the implementation of the management plan. A need for regular compliance with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* has been identified as well as the need for thorough Environmental and cultural Impact Assessments of major projects.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.88

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.81**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes the State Party's timely submission of the draft management plan requested by the World Heritage Committee;
4. Also notes the recommendations made by the January 2009 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission;
5. Calls upon the State Party to ensure that Environmental Impact Assessments are carried out for all large-scale development projects even if located outside the buffer zone, with particular reference to the potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
6. Also calls upon the State Party to carry out an Environmental and Cultural Impact Assessment for the hydroelectric power station to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre;
7. Requests the State Party to take steps towards implementing the mission's recommendations, particularly by ensuring clear mechanisms for a co-ordinated and integrated approach among all decision-making entities;

8. *Also requests the State Party to revise the draft management plan taking into account the recommendations of the joint mission and elaborating on enhanced coordination mechanisms;*
9. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, and its efforts to strengthen and re-orient the management plan, for review by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

89. Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2001

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

27 COM 7B.57; 28 COM 15B.83; 32 COM 7B.82

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission to the neighbouring property of "Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn"

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) High-rise construction project of Wien-Mitte;
- b) High-rise construction project of Vienna Central Train Station.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1033>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to halt the construction of the 100m high building of the Vienna Central Train Station project, the height of which would protrude above the trees on one side of the Belvedere

Palace Park, and further, to carry out, in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, a comprehensive visual impact assessment of the entire project, fully sensitive to impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The State Party provided a report on 26 January 2009 which addresses the concerns raised by the Committee. The report notes that the Austrian authorities have succeeded in reducing the height of the tower from 100m to 88m. The report notes that this will reduce the height of the building by more than the one or two storeys previously noted by the State Party as the height reduction necessary to ensure that the building will not be visible from the park of Belvedere Palace.

The State Party report also emphasizes that the height reductions and relocations of the high-rise buildings made in the course of refining the master plan for the Vienna Central Train Station project are such that none of the 11 buildings would be visible from the park of Belvedere Palace. Presumably due to the height reduction noted, the State Party report does not make reference to the "comprehensive visual impact assessment of the entire project, fully sensitive to impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property".

However, the state of conservation report of 2008 demonstrated the necessity for such a visual impact assessment to be carried out utilising a transparent and objective methodology to permit assessment of visual impacts; which would:

- define all visual axes;
- define all view points from which visual assessments would be important, including the south front of the Upper Belvedere Palace, and the area of the park (part of the World Heritage property) immediately adjacent the Vienna Central Train Station project grounds;
- measure impacts during all seasons including both winter (when the loss of foliage will make high rise construction more visible), and evening (when illuminated towers may increase visibility).

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that carrying out this assessment would serve several purposes, including:

- involvement of all parties to collaborate in developing an appropriate methodology to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
- definition of permissible heights within a mutually agreed objective, and transparent process, on the basis of this agreed methodology;
- the opportunity given to the World Heritage Committee to review the methodology proposed and its results in this context;
- the opportunity to share methodological lessons learned with other World Heritage properties where similar visual impact issues are emerging.

While the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS appreciate the voluntary reduction by the State Party of the controversial high-rise building from 100m to 88m, they reiterate their earlier contentions that a comprehensive visual impact assessment of the entire project as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session, would be the best basis for establishing such height parameters.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS further note that any visual impact assessment of this project has to assess these impacts along all view axes, important views and view points, and in all contexts (season, time of day) which could affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.89

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.82**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes with appreciation the reduction in planned height of the tallest of the structures planned for the Vienna Central Train Station project from 100m to 88m;
4. Regrets that the State Party did not provide the requested comprehensive visual impact assessment of the entire project, and that there was no visual impact assessment used as a basis for determining the appropriate height for the planned building;
5. Strongly urges the State Party to carry out the comprehensive visual impact assessment of the entire project, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session;
6. Requests the State Party to halt any building permission for this project until the visual assessment has been reviewed by ICOMOS so that the project would not have any negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property including the visual impact assessment requested above for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

90. Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1996

Criteria

(i) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.73 ; 30 COM 7B.81; 32 COM 7B.83

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2006: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

High-rise construction project

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/786>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee expressed deep concern that the height of the new Kometgründe-Meidling structure would exceed the 60 metres agreed to by the State Party in June 2006, and requested the State Party to immediately halt the project and submit a visual impact study on the potential adverse impacts of the proposed structure on the integrity of the property and its Outstanding Universal Value for examination at its 33rd session in 2009.

The State Party submitted a report on 26 January 2009 noting that the "Kometgründe - Meidling" project is located outside the property and its buffer zone, and that in order to cooperate with the World Heritage Committee and to comply with its request, the State Party had reduced the originally planned 120m height of the project by 50% to 60m. The State Party also noted that for architectural reasons, a part of the main building core is four stories higher than the other parts corresponding to a height of 73m. The State Party further notes that the adjusted project with a height of 60m and 73m respectively is not visible from Schönbrunn palace as such. There is just one small part of the park from where the project would be visible (Gloriette). This small part does, however, not make up more than 1.5 percent of the whole World Heritage. The State Party refutes a local NGO's statement that parts of the proposed building would be planned as tall as 78m.

Concerning the World Heritage Committee's request to immediately halt the project, the State Party report notes that the authorities had stopped the project following discussions at the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (Durban, 2005). The State Party further notes that while "the Vienna City Council has, in the meantime, adopted the necessary legal regulations for the implementation of the adapted project", the "project is far from being implemented" with implementation foreseen by 2013.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS wish to point out that the State Party had agreed in June 2006 to limit the height of the new building project to a maximum of 60m and that building any part of this structure beyond the height of 60m would violate this commitment. ICOMOS has previously noted that it strongly believes that the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of a baroque complex such as the Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (whose view axes dominate its surroundings) would be seriously affected by exceeding the agreed height of 60m.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS also note that the State Party has not submitted any comprehensive and detailed visual impact studies on potential adverse impacts of the proposed building project on the integrity of the property and its Outstanding Universal Value as requested by the World Heritage Committee for consideration at its 33rd session in 2009. The State Party report only contains the brief comments provided above suggesting that in

the State Party's view the additional height of the 73m section would be of little visual consequence.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note that the State Party's conclusions appear not to be based on detailed visual impact studies. ICOMOS however reiterates the importance of carrying out a comprehensive assessment of the visual impact of the 73 metre structure on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, including analysis of impacts from all perspectives including views from the important view points from Gloriette toward the historic centre of Vienna, and the tower of St. Stephen's Cathedral.

In compliance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the State Party report also draws the World Heritage Committee's attention to the construction of a new hotel complex replacing the existing IMAX cinema to be built in the buffer zone of the property. The report notes that the height of the new hotel will match the height of the main façade of the adjacent Technical Museum.

While ICOMOS appreciates the State Party drawing attention to this project, it considers that it would require reviewing detailed plans in order to be able to comment on its potential impact on the integrity of the property. In addition, the World Heritage Centre wishes to recall that the two above-mentioned construction projects may be part of the high-rise construction plan of the city of Vienna, which however has not yet been provided by the State Party.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.90

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.83**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes that the State Party maintained the moratorium on construction of the project;
4. Expresses its continuing concern that the project plans for the new Kometgründe-Meidling structure exceed the 60m height which the State Party had agreed to maintain in June 2006;
5. Requests the State Party to ensure that construction of the Kometgründe-Meidling project remains halted until the World Heritage Committee has examined satisfactorily its potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property;
6. Urges the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, as soon as possible, the visual impact studies requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session in order to review any potential adverse impacts of the proposed building of 73m on the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, as soon as possible, detailed plans of the new hotel complex adjacent to the Technical Museum, as well as the high-rise construction plan of the city of Vienna, for review by ICOMOS;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2010**, a report on the issues above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

91. City of Graz – Historic Centre (Austria) (C 931)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1999

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.63; 30 COM 7B.76; 31 COM 7B.106

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

February 2005: Joint UNESCO World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission;
October 2006: ICOMOS advisory mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressure;
- b) Lack of management plan.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/931>

Current conservation issues

During its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee congratulated the State Party on submitting a management plan and a Master Plan for the property, and encouraged the State Party to implement the recommendations of the advisory mission of October 2006. The World Heritage Committee asked the State Party to report on the state of conservation of the property and in particular on important development projects.

a) Information on current development projects

On 26 January 2009, the State Party provided a state of conservation report for the property, which addresses a number of current development projects.

In the inscribed zone, seven projects are reviewed:

- The Pfauengarten (Peacock Gardens)

- The Kastner and Ohler Department Store
- The Kommodhaus/ Boardinghouse, Burgasse 15
- The Brandhaus, Andreas-Hofer-Platz
- The Provincial Museum Joanneum
- Sackstrasse 28-30,
- The Castle Hill restaurant- Schlossberg.

In the buffer zone, three projects are described:

- New project for the planned Thalia Hotel, 5a Opernring
- Nikolaiplatz 5
- The Former White Elephant Inn.

The municipal authorities have provided project descriptions which show what stage each project is at and the steps taken by the municipality to guide projects to forms, uses and designs appropriate for their place in the property. Much emphasis is given to showing the ways in which the planning process takes into account heritage concerns.

While the State Party describes this process as transparent, ICOMOS has received information about potential conflicts of interest, for example, the architect of one of the projects examined above (the Brandhaus) being as well the Vice-President of the Expert Commission on the Historic Center of Graz (the ASVK).

Concerning the design for the Kastner and Ohler Department Store, which was the object of the ICOMOS advisory mission of October 2006, the report notes the commitment by the Executive Board of Kastner and Ohler to follow the advice of the expert mission. Detailed planning in conformity with this commitment was recognized with issuance of a building permit in October 2007; construction, begun in spring 2008, should be completed by October 2010.

ICOMOS appreciates the efforts made by the State Party to report on these projects and their possible impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. However, ICOMOS would require more detailed documentation than that provided in the report in order to be able to provide any comments on these projects.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS point out that the State Party report does not mention any potential impacts of the projects on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Further, it should be noted that most of the projects are under implementation, and hence well beyond the stage at which the World Heritage Committee seeks an opportunity to review impacts on Outstanding Universal Value, in the context of Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The State Party report also includes information on a number of other initiatives, including:

- The status of the World Heritage co-ordination office established in February 2007, within the structures of the Board of City Planning in relation to the World Heritage management plan of 2007. This office is assigned to act as an information and mediation interface to “find solutions to critical problem issues (prior to submission of projects)”.
- The coming into force of the new Graz Historic Centre Preservation Law (GAEG) on 1 December 2008, updating the 1980 GAEG. The GAEG provides conditions for the work of the Expert Commission on the Historic Center of Graz (the ASVK). The objectives of the new GAEG acknowledge the importance of preserving the historic

centre of Graz in its World Heritage role, and also provide for a “historic centre advocate” to protect the public interest in the preservation of the historic centre. The role of this advocate is to verify that ASVK decisions are fully implemented by public authorities.

- The establishing of an ICOMOS Austria permanent monitoring group for the historic centre of Graz, whose function is to provide advice during the early stages of construction and rehabilitation projects.

b) Review of the management plan of Graz (2007)

ICOMOS has also recently examined the management plan prepared for the property. While ICOMOS has previously described the management plan as a “strongly credible attempt to layer on planning mechanisms and measures that will improve the capacity of the existing planning system to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and to move the municipality well beyond previous approaches”, ICOMOS has also noted a number of shortcomings:

- The management plan is described as “advisory”. A management plan should provide “executive power” for implementation of actions focused on preserving Outstanding Universal Value. The management plan does provide that development conflicts or proposals which appear to harm the Outstanding Universal Value be raised to the appropriate political level for resolution, with the commitment to protect the Outstanding Universal Value strongly highlighted in the process.
- The role of the World Heritage office is described as primarily concerned with information sharing and co-ordination. This leaves decision-making to other bodies and with other levels who may not give ultimate priority to preserving the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property.
- The criteria identified for assessing development projects in the World Heritage context are described as built on the need to respect the Vienna Memorandum, to improve quality of life and to foster identity and social cohesion. Within this overall framework, three general criteria are highlighted: location within the conservation zone, height and scale, and “outstanding value.” However, a World Heritage management plan should highlight respect for Outstanding Universal Value as its primary overall objective.

It is clear in relation to all of the above that the State Party is making important efforts to improve the transparency and quality of the decision-making process for new projects, including improving communication to the World Heritage Centre concerning emerging projects, and also providing opportunities for those with voicing contrary views on impacts and compliance.

However, ICOMOS considers that this process can still be improved:

- By giving the Graz World Heritage office sufficient independence from the planning functions of the City authorities in order to better advocate for the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value in relation to project proposals;
- By ensuring that there are no conflicts of interest of those involved in project review and in executing projects under review;
- By providing state of conservation reports to the World Heritage Committee, which reflect the views of all entities in charge of monitoring compliance in the planning system (City planning office, World Heritage office, historic centre advocate);
- By launching efforts to establish the 2007 management plan as an executive decision-making document rather than an advisory document, built around ensuring respect for the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.91

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.106**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007)*
3. *Notes with appreciation the detailed description of projects and initiatives underway provided by the State Party in the state of conservation report;*
4. *Acknowledges the initiatives undertaken in the last years by the State Party (since the 2005-2006 debate about the appropriateness of the design of the Kastner and Ohler Department) to improve the quality of the planning process and the planning instruments available to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to examine the implementation of the recommendations made in this report to improve the transparency and effectiveness of the planning system to protect the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity, and integrity of the property;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed on the state of conservation of the property and on its efforts to implement the recommendations above mentioned.*

92. Fertő / Neusiedlersee Cultural Landscape (Austria/Hungary) (C 772 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2001

Criteria

(v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

27 COM 8C.2; 28 COM 15B.84; 31 COM 7B.107

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

February 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN mission,

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) High-rise hotel development;
- b) Large-scale heart clinic development.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/772>

Current conservation issues

On 21 January 2009, the States Parties jointly provided an updated report on the state of conservation of the property informing about progress made on the implementation of zoning regulations as well as the introduction of supplementary strategies for the development and protection of vernacular buildings in the management plan.

The States Parties indicated that six expert workshops were held during 2008 that concluded with the drafting of new Construction Guidelines “Criteria for Building within the World Heritage Site”, which were approved by the Austrian authorities. As part of the exercise, an additional zone was established aiming at protecting important views outside the buffer zone (a so-called “sight protection zone”).

The Austrian authorities further established an Advisory Board with representatives from different administrative levels in Austria as well as observers from the Hungarian authorities. Based on the new Construction Guidelines, this Advisory Board has the role to review any project likely to have major impact on the property.

The Austrian State Party further informed that construction works of the hotel project in Parndorf have started with the agreed-upon height of 47.2m. The controversial construction project of a heart clinic in Winden was abandoned.

The Hungarian authorities expressed their support to the above-mentioned Construction Guidelines while also stating that the guidelines will not be applied to the Hungarian part of the property due to already existing classifications and regulations. They further informed that in 2008 the Hungarian Parliament amended the Act on the National Spatial Plan with the regional classification of “Zone of Cultural Heritage Sites”, covering World Heritage properties as well as sites on the Hungarian Tentative List. It is further planned to prepare a specific World Heritage act for integration into Hungarian legislation.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, although welcoming the principle of Construction Guidelines for the property, are concerned by some of the details. The guidelines dictate the maximum height and volume for new building according to various designated zones. In some cases the maximum height would appear to be considerably greater than that of existing traditional buildings – up to 14m in villages. Although the guidelines call for the limits of the existing settlements to be respected, there are also categories of buildings in isolated areas outside villages and in meadows. For these the maximum height is 10 m outside the villages and 7m in the open wetland zone. In the setting of the property, the height limit is 25m. Furthermore, the zones seem to have been delineated according to the natural aspects of the landscape (National Park, priority areas for nature) and the view points of tourists, rather than being based on the attributes of the cultural landscape that carry Outstanding Universal Value. It is suggested that the heights and zones should be reviewed.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.92

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.107**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes with appreciation the States Parties' joint efforts and activities and welcomes the fact that the controversial heart clinic project has been abandoned;
4. Also notes the development of Construction Guidelines, however expresses its concern that these appear to be encouraging development that is larger in scale than the existing vernacular buildings and would allow development in inappropriate locations and may impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
5. Requests the State Party of Austria to re-assess the Construction Guidelines to ensure that they respect the form and scale of traditional buildings, do not encourage development on open land, and are based on zoning that reflects the attributes of this cultural landscape, and submit them to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies.

93. Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh (Belarus) (C 1196)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 8B.34

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1196>

Current conservation issues

On 17 June 2008, the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to provide a report on the current state of conservation of the property, including detailed information concerning inappropriate demolition and reconstruction works within this property.

On 19 November 2008, the State Party provided a letter and report on the state of conservation of the property, including information of the 2nd meeting of the Advisory Commission of Belarus and Poland on Historical and Cultural Heritage at Nesvizh in October 2008. This group of experts inspected the work in progress, and decided that all future activities would be carried out under their supervision.

The State Party in its letter also indicated that the Republic of Belarus was fully committed to the *World Heritage Convention*, and expressed the State Party's willingness and intention to undertake all necessary measures to co-operate closely with the World Heritage Centre to ensure the protection and conservation of that heritage.

The report informs that, since its construction in 1582, the Nesvizh Castle complex underwent numerous reconstructions, modernisations and restorations until the end of the 19th century. In consequence it reflected and incorporated different architectural styles from Renaissance, Baroque, and Classicism to Modern.

It further points out the main goal of the current restoration project was to explore, study and preserve all authentic elements of the complex. The report indicates that since reconstruction work started in 2002 specialists have supervised all phases of the research, and been involved in the preparation of the project documentation. It also states that a high percentage of the costs have been spent on materials and technologies created for the conservation of ancient buildings by leading European manufacturers. It is stressed that these have been sympathetic to the authentic elements of the Castle, the Arsenal, Entrance gates and adjacent buildings. An exception to this approach occurs with the rebuilt 18th century Eastern Gallery. Critical for the functioning of the complex through the provision of a connecting passage between Castle and Tower, the Gallery had been unstable due to insufficient foundations. The walls were temporarily reinforced in 2001 followed by an unsuccessful attempt at stabilisation. In 2006 following in-depth hydro geological research which revealed that the structure was founded on filled ground, the decision was taken to dismantle and rebuild the Gallery. In doing so, it is claimed that the Gallery was accurately measured and carefully recorded to allow a full reconstruction using the original material and traditional building technologies in the rebuild. Work is currently in progress.

It is stressed that during the restoration works, every effort is being made to save the characteristic features of each building, to reconstruct some missing elements on the basis of documentary evidence - and to preserve the building interiors if there is insufficient evidence for reconstruction. In doing so, it is not envisaged that any major change or the addition of new elements to the original design will occur.

It is also recognised that the World Heritage Centre was not kept adequately informed regarding the actual condition of the Gallery and the need for such urgent action to dismantle it, which was unplanned for, and considered an emergency.

The longer term aim of the project is the adaptation of the Nesvizh Complex as an Estate Museum which will be used for cultural and educational activities, and as a visitor attraction.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that:

- a) given the reports' stated approach that work is soundly based on scientific analysis and research, it is of concern that the Eastern Gallery stabilisation work in 2001 was based on a lack of scientific knowledge regarding its foundational state;
- b) web-based photographs of what remains of the Gallery appear to reveal a significant mound of demolition material lying on the ground, with little apparent evidence of the structure being carefully dismantled brick-by-brick and set aside to enable a careful rebuild;
- c) despite the claimed expertise of the various official bodies involved, and the composition of the expert group, it is clear that there is a mixture of understanding between what is intended by conservation, restoration and reconstruction in the adopted approach to the project;
- d) an expressed faith in proprietary materials and technologies compounds this problem;
- e) it is not clear to what extent the basic understanding of traditional technologies, and their relevance for the property, is fully understood and adopted.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.93

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **29 COM 8B.34**, adopted at its 29th session (Durban, 2005),
3. Regrets the significant amount of dismantling as well as the intention to rebuild the Eastern Gallery;
4. Requests the State Party to urgently clarify, for review by the Advisory Bodies:
 - a) The methodology to be adopted in rebuilding the Eastern Gallery,
 - b) The types of proprietary materials and technologies being used in the conservation work,
 - c) The intended degree of conservation, restoration and reconstruction work in the adopted approach to the project,
5. Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to review the work in progress, to consider the conservation approaches and to review the overall state of conservation of the property;
6. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including all above-mentioned clarifications, as well as the technical analysis of the stability of all structures of the Complex, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

94. Historic Centre of Brugge (Belgium) (C 996)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Extensive review of potential threat)

95. Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2005

Criteria

(vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.82; 31 COM 7B.93; 32 COM 7B.85

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 44,960 for Technical cooperation

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 190,000

Previous monitoring missions

2006 : ICOMOS mission ; 2007: UNESCO / ICOMOS mission ; 2008: ICCROM/ICOMOS advisory mission;

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Construction of a hotel in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property, not in conformity with provisions of the Master Plan, which was part of the management plan included in the nomination file
- b) Cracks appearing on the surface of the bridge

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/946>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to redesign the Ruza Hotel, taking into account the requirements of the 2001 Master Plan and the 2005 management plan for the World Heritage property, the recommendations of the 2006 and 2007 missions, and in line with the specific recommendations made in the 2008 mission. The World Heritage Committee also requested continued monitoring of the bridge to ensure its structural stability after cracks appeared.

a) Construction of a new hotel in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property

The hotel, built in the 1970s, was badly damaged during the conflict of the 1990s. A building permit to rebuild it as a five star hotel and increase its height to four storeys was given in 2004. Work was in progress at the time of the inscription celebrations in December 2005 when certain invited experts noticed what they considered as a potential adverse impact of the emerging building, which was not in line with height restrictions of the Master Plan of 2001. Work was halted in 2006 and the subsequent missions in 2006, 2007 and early 2008 have addressed ways of modifying the designs in order to mitigate the impact of the hotel on the urban landscape setting of the World Heritage property. The main concerns of these missions were the fact that the hotel covered almost the entire plot, that in contrast to the original hotel which was built as an assembly of 'pavilions' the proposed building was monolithic, with vertical elements and rigid volumetric masses, and that the proposed materials of glass and steel were in conflict with the surrounding stone and wood structures. The 2007 reactive monitoring mission suggested reducing the height, compactness and volume, and urged a re-design that respected the surrounding streetscape. Two proposed modifications to the design were presented by the State Party in 2008, but the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session and the World Heritage Committee urged the State Party once again to re-design the building in line with the mission recommendations.

Following the decision of the World Heritage Committee, the State Party invited professionals named by ICOMOS and ICCROM to visit the site to propose technical solutions to integrate the hotel into the existing architectural volumes of the urban fabric, in consideration of the larger urban setting and plans for the city. This work took place from 11 to 18 October 2008, and the State Party submitted a report to the World Heritage Centre on 30 January 2009 which included the report of these experts as an Annex.

The experts provided information on a number of aspects of the hotel project and urban context, and in particular, information, in regard to other modern constructions located behind the Ruza Hotel building which would become visible from the bridge site were the height of the hotel lowered. The report, went on to state, however, that the exterior design elements of the hotel should be redesigned, keeping the same height, but adapting and modulating the facade to better fit within the historic fabric of the area. The report also included design guidelines and sketches to suggest how the facade could be redesigned to produce a building that would not compromise the visual integrity of the property, and would, therefore, not be a threat to its Outstanding Universal Value. The State Party report of 30 January 2009, however, did not include any technical drawings on which an evaluation could be based.

After the drafting of the state of conservation documents, on 7 April 2009, the State Party provided additional information in the form of a PowerPoint presentation with more detailed drawings of the proposed redesign.

b) Cracks in the Surface of the Bridge

In regard to the monitoring of the cracks, the State Party reported on the ongoing monitoring that is being implemented at the bridge and indicated that a contract had been issued to LGA Bautechnik GmbH, a German engineering firm, to continue and expand the structural monitoring of the bridge including a three-dimensional survey of the surfaces.

While welcoming the report of the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the State Party did not provide any specific, technical design proposals for the hotel in their submission of 30 January on which a proper evaluation on the new design could be based. Such an evaluation is necessary to determine if the proposed new design is

sufficient to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. At the time of the preparation of this document, the World Heritage Centre has forwarded to the Advisory Bodies the additional information submitted by the State Party on 7 April 2009. It will be necessary for the Advisory Bodies to carefully examine the new material in light of the previous decisions of the World Heritage Committee.

In regard to the structural issues of the bridge, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies commend the State Party for the quickness with which they have instituted a regular monitoring system, and feel that it will be adequate for ensuring the ongoing structural stability of the bridge.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.95

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.85**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Also recalling the results and recommendation of the reactive monitoring missions of 2006, 2007 and 2008,*
4. *Acknowledges the receipt of the report of the experts submitted with the State Party report, as well as the additional information received by the World Heritage Centre in April 2009 after the deadline established by the World Heritage Committee;*
5. *Commends the State Party for the monitoring system that has been put in place to ensure the structural stability of the bridge;*
6. *Requests the State Party to provide the detailed drawings to the World Heritage Centre and also requests the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to cooperate with the State Party to ensure that the best solution be found in the redesign of the Ruza Hotel;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a progress report on the state of conservation of the property including the status of the redesign, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

96. Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 666)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1992

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.94; 32 COM 7B.86

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 50,000 for Emergency Assistance in 2003 (floods).

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

February-March 2008: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Development of high rise constructions on the Pankrác plain;
- b) Lack of effectiveness of existing planning, management and conservation measures for the property.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/666>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to improve the effectiveness of its existing planning, management and conservation measures in order to further reduce negative impact of high-rise construction in the property and its buffer zone, in line with the 2008 joint mission recommendations. The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on the Historic Centre of Prague on 28 January 2009, which addresses these issues:

- a) *Strengthening the authority of the National Heritage Institute to enable it to orient the main decisions affecting the integrity of the Historic Centre*

A redefinition of the functions of this Institute are currently being discussed.. The most significant changes include transfer of some power from the Ministry of Culture to Regional Offices; increased penalties for breach of legal obligations; and the empowerment of municipalities to take general measures to protect heritage sites through Protection Plans. The content and intentions of Protection Plans will come into effect on 1 January 2009. The Ministry of Culture is considering creating a new Act on State Heritage Protection.

- b) *Clarifying and integrating the rules presently in force to manage processes such as infill, reconstruction, rehabilitation and conservation in a unitary code to improve the ability of the responsible authorities to maintain the integrity of the original fabric of the city*
- c) *Urgently completing and approving the conservation plan for the Historic Centre in order to provide an effective zoning and planning tool for the conservation process in the Historic Centre*

In December 2008, the Prague City Council approved the updated City of Prague Strategic Plan for the period 2009 - 2015. It also approved the elaboration of City Wide Significant Changes of the Land Use Plan, including limits of the protected areas, the way they are

protected, and a methodology for height regulation of structures. This will be submitted to the City authorities for approval in 2010. The 2002 Prague Heritage Site Urban Planning Study is expected to be completed by the end of 2009.

- d) *Completing the management plan of the property in 2008 as a comprehensive tool for the coordination of all the different regulatory and policy frameworks existing or foreseen for the Historic Centre, for eventual review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies*

In 2008, the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic introduced a new central grant programme called "Support for UNESCO Monuments". A new management plan is currently in preparation within the framework of this programme, and a draft version was received by the World Heritage Centre in January 2009. Its final version will be submitted to official bodies for approval by 2010. Details of principles, and a conception strategy for the management of the historic centre, will be incorporated into the Plan by 2012. Updates and refinement are planned for every 4-5 years thereafter, with the first update due in 2015.

- e) *Conduct an evaluation of the present buffer zones of the Historic Centre in order to assess their effectiveness in protecting the visual integrity of the city and, if needed, extend these and adopt appropriate related zoning regulations*

Prior to the approval of the Land Use Plan in 2010 the potential new borders of the buffer zone, will be officially forwarded to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for assessment.

- f) *Limit, in the case of the Pankrác Plain, the height of the new high-rise constructions to a maximum of 60-70m, in order to avoid visual impacts on the historic urban landscape of the property*

The existing 80 and 104m-high structures, which were approved prior to the World Heritage Committee meeting in July 2008, are currently subject to discussions. An appeal on procedural and factual grounds against the zoning permits was refused by the appeal authority, and the zoning permit has taken legal effect. However, considering the importance of the proposed structures, court proceedings objecting to the zoning permits, is expected to take place as a next step. Any new structures proposed will comply with the decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session and will not exceed the recommended height of 60-70m.

The World Heritage Centre received in during January/February 2009 numerous letters from Czech NGOs informing that the local authorities approved the construction of two new buildings in the Pankrac Plain area. These buildings are planned to be 80 and 104m-high, despite the Decision of the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session. On 9 March 2009, the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to provide additional information on this issue. At the time of the preparation of this document no answer has been received.

The State Party also submitted descriptions of the most important larger restoration works, changes and new buildings within the preserved area that have occurred in Prague during 2008, listed 29 major rehabilitation and restoration, including the Charles Bridge and Noblewoman's Home in Prague Castle, and more than 20 planned constructions.

The State Party also raises the problematic issue of historic railway stations. Statements regarding concerns over new traffic proposals, changes to Wenceslas Square, and the possible creation of Prague's "Museum Mile" are also included.

In addition, the World Heritage Centre was informed, in January 2009 that construction of a traffic expressway within the boundary of the property and its buffer zone started in 2007. The project consists of three tunnels segments, linked by four multi-level overpasses/tunnel exits accompanied by large underground parking lots and several exhaust chimneys situated in residential areas. Named the Blanka Tunnel Complex, the combined length of 6.4 kilometres creates the longest city expressway tunnel in Europe. There is stated concern that due to the tunnel construction the baroque city walls, which are part of the northern border of

the property, will be damaged. There is also concern that two pre World War II villa's have already been demolished in the buffer zone, and that the felling of hundreds of trees and the destruction of other greenery in the City is taking place.

Independent traffic calculations suggest an increase from 36,000 vehicles a day to 54,000 a day on the surface, and a further 111,000 vehicles a day in the tunnel by 2015, with consequential health concerns regarding noise and pollution. No study of its impact on the property has been carried out, nor has the project been subjected to an Environmental Impact Assessment.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note the positive steps that have been taken to address the concerns expressed at the last session, in particular that the content and intentions of Protection Plans will come into effect on 1 January 2009, that in December 2008 Prague City Council approved the updated City of Prague Strategic Plan for the period 2009 – 2015, and that, in the longer term, the Ministry of Culture is considering creating a new Act on State Heritage Protection. They also welcome the possibility of legal action to limit high-rise buildings on Pankrác Plain. Threats emerging to the city's railway heritage, as set out by the State Party are noted. They would welcome being notified at an early stage about proposals for Wenceslas Square and Prague's 'Museum Mile'.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are however extremely concerned that information on the proposed Blanka Tunnel Complex was not made available to the Mission in 2008 nor has been mentioned in State Party reports. From the details so far available, it appears that this project could impact on parts of the property such as the Castle, walls and urban green areas and overall on its integrity. It appears that that no Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out. As a matter of urgency, full details for this project need to be supplied, in order that an assessment of its impact can be made.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.96

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.86**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes the information provided and progress made by the State Party in the preparation of the new Land Use Plan and the management plans;*
4. *Expresses its deep concern at the potential impacts of the Blanka Tunnel Complex on the property, on the lack of information so far provided and on the apparent lack of an impact assessment of this project on the attributes and value of the property, and requests the State Party to urgently provide full details of this project;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the implications of the Blanka Tunnel Complex, the concerns over new traffic proposals, changes to Wenceslas Square, the possible creation of Prague's "Museum Mile and the issue of historic railway stations;*
6. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2010**, a detailed progress report on the above mentioned issues, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

97. Historic Centre of Cesky Krumlov (Czech Republic) (C 617)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1992

Criteria

(iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.101; 30 COM 7B.83; 31 COM 7B.109

International Assistance

Total amount allocated to the property: Emergency Assistance (USD 50,000) in 2003 for the restoration of the Historic Centre of Prague and the Historic Centre of Cesky Krumlov which were severely damaged by the floods of August 2002.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

January 2005: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

Revolving 80-seat theatre transformed into a permanent building

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/617>

Current conservation issues

The 2005 reactive monitoring mission strongly supported the removal of the revolving theatre from the 17th century's garden, which has a major detrimental impact on this part of the property.

In its report on the state of conservation of the property dated 28 January 2009, the State Party reiterated the necessity to have the opportunity to produce open-air theatre performances until a new location for the revolving theatre has been resolved.

The report also informs that the surveys and analyses of the area of interest and the wider surroundings were submitted to the Municipality of Český Krumlov in the second half of 2008 and the first changes to the Land Use Plan of Český Krumlov will be discussed in 2009. It was stated in the Decision dated 29 October 2008, issued by the Building Authority of the Municipality of Český Krumlov, that with regard to the current character of the construction, a

change of use of the revolving amphitheatre construction in the castle gardens of the Český Krumlov State Castle and Chateau is permitted.

a) *Date for dismantling of the existing theatre*

The report confirms that the deadline for use of the existing revolving amphitheatre has been extended to 30 September 2009, the deadline for dismantling the revolving amphitheatre has been extended to 31 December 2009 and the deadline for rehabilitating the affected areas into the original condition has been extended to 30 April 2010.

b) *Timetable for transferring the theatre to the buffer zone*

No timetable has been provided, but the report states that it was always the intention to continue playing theatre in the open air until the new theatre is built.

c) *Impact of a new theatre*

The State Party underlined that it is fully aware of its obligations to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, its integrity and authenticity. However, the preparatory stage for the entire project as well as its tender stage or the architectural competition would require time for undertaking the necessary steps, including the modification of the Land Use Plan of the Municipality of Český Krumlov. The National Institute for the Protection and Conservation of Monuments and Sites is setting the safety and technical conditions, so that the negative impacts of the revolving amphitheatre operation on the castle garden environment are minimized.

d) *Conservation issues*

The State Party provided also very detailed information, in particular on problems concerning current issues in monuments conservation identified by the state administration authorities, site management issues, land use and planning and management and protection of monuments in the historic centre of the town and castle of Český Krumlov, principles and territorial development of the South Bohemian region, plan of restoration of buildings within the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, the programme of preservation of the municipal heritage site of Plešivec- Český Krumlov for the period of 2004-2010; an action plan of development of the Town of Český Krumlov for the period 2008 – 2010; a concept for the restoration of the state castle and chateau in Český Krumlov (2004-2010), demolitions within the buffer zone of the municipal heritage site, protection of the landscape, green skyline horizons and parks in the Historic Centre of Český Krumlov; and structural restoration of the Upper Castle facades. The report included a description of all major restoration projects, works, and any new buildings proposed in the protected area according to Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The State Party also mentioned in the report that the state administration with the responsibility for local and material monument conservation had previously made certain mistakes in the decision-making which would be avoided in the future.

e) *Management plan*

The State Party underlined that, in 2009, the elaboration of the management plan is the main priority of the Strategic Plan for Town Development. It will be financed through the programme "Support Programme for UNESCO Monuments" by the Ministry of Culture. In addition, the "Plan of Protection of Heritage Sites and Heritage Zones" is expected to start on 1 January 2009.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that although progress is being made towards removal of the revolving theatre from the vicinity of the Bellaria Pavillon (summerhouse) in the castle garden, more information on the proposed location of the replacement revolving theatre and proposed plans are required, as well as a full impact assessment.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.97

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.109**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes the efforts of the State Party to ensure the protection and management of the World Heritage property;
4. Also notes that the dismantling the revolving amphitheatre is extended to 31 December 2009 and the deadline for rehabilitating the affected areas into the original condition is extended to 30 April 2010 and requests the State Party to submit the detailed project for the new theatre location and its exact position as well as an impact assessment;
5. Further notes with serious concern that the State Party plans to continue using the property for open-air theatre activities;
6. Reiterates its request to the State Party that in accordance with Paragraph 119 of the Operational Guidelines, the State Party should ensure that the sustainable use has no negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, an up-dated report on progress made on the measures taken to address the above issues, for review by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

98. Jelling Mounds, Runic Stones and Church (Denmark) (C 697)

Year of Inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(iii)

Previous Committee Decisions

N/A

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2008: ICOMOS advisory mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/697>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre was informed about concerns over the surface deterioration of two runic stones, part of the overall property which includes a ship burial, two burial mounds, a manor, palisade, burial chamber and, as a later addition, a church with its churchyard. The setting is an open landscape.

Due to the conditions of the two carved Jelling runic stones, which stand in front of the church, the National Museum of Denmark was requested by the Diocese of Haderslev in March 2003, to propose a programme of non-destructive scientific studies. Funds became available in January 2006, and the National Museum obtained permission from the Heritage Agency of Denmark, the Diocese, and from Jelling Church Council to carry out the programme. The Danish National Committee of ICOMOS was informed.

The objectives of the programme were a) to provide an assessment of the state of conservation of both runic stones and b) to identify the imminent and long-term measures required in order to preserve the stones for posterity. The programme was initiated in October 2006, and a report of March 2008 described the findings. It concluded that there was a need for urgent intervention and some degree of protection.

The Director of the Danish Ministry of Culture asked the World Heritage Centre for advice, and requested an expert mission to discuss relevant conservation findings. This advisory mission, consisting of two ICOMOS experts, visited the property on 15 November 2008. The advisory mission report is available at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/fr/sessions/33COM/>

Although the mission findings focus on the condition of the runic stones, the stones cannot be considered separately as they are an integral part of the whole property and any remedial activities must be judged accordingly. The mission found both stones to be in a precarious condition, requiring urgent action. Cracks have appeared in the stones, the carvings are seriously eroding, and the surface is foliating. There is evidence to suggest that regular mechanical cleaning has also harmed the surface. Positioned and unprotected in the open air, the stones are exposed to the effects of serious weathering, with active surface and sub-surface biological activity enhanced by nearby trees, and with the real potential of surface water in the cracks and fissures causing significant surface loss of stone and carvings during winter through ice expansion. Combined with direct human contact, tree root penetration on the "original" archaeology, and the possibility of vandalism and mechanical damage caused by machines, they are under significant risks that need to be addressed as a matter of urgency.

The mission considered that the stones should remain in their current position and not be moved. Furthermore, the mission recommended that the stones should be protected by an

environmentally appropriate building attached to the church's porch. Details of the proposed building should be provided to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS at the earliest opportunity, and before any firm commitments have been made. The proposed building should be conceived as an addition to the church, be visually differentiated from the main church structure, have climatic control and should have managed visitor access.

As the church and the church yard including the runic stones are protected under the Churches and Church Yards Consolidated Act of 1992, any alteration to the church or church yard requires approval by the diocesan authorities after consulting the National Museum.

The mission further recommended that traffic between the church and the museum should be restricted and follow a different route, according the proposed plan for the area; Consideration should be given to extending the buffer zone to include the palisade and the adjacent lime trees to the stones, which should continue to be pruned, but not felled.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.98

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Takes note of the results of the ICOMOS advisory mission to the property;*
3. *Requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *Urgently provide information on any conservation and development plan to address the issue of an environmental covering for the stones to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS,*
 - b) *Consider extending the buffer zone in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS;*
4. *Also requests the State Party to submit a report on the steps taken to implement the advisory mission recommendations to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011** for review by ICOMOS.*

99. Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia) (C 822)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.84; 31 COM 7B.95; 32 COM 7B.87

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 14,600 for Training assistance (1998)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 4,279 for an expert mission in December 2005 (Italian Funds-In-Trust)

Previous monitoring missions

December 2005: upon the request of Estonian National authorities, UNESCO expert mission to Tallinn

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of an integrated management plan;
- b) Extension to Viru Hotel;
- c) Development of the Skoone Bastion;
- d) Construction of new buildings adjacent to the Town Wall between Suurtüki and Rannamäe Streets;
- e) Impact of the transportation of hazardous materials to the Old Town;
- f) Framework for high-rise buildings.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/822>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) regretted that no progress had been made in developing a comprehensive management plan for the property and its buffer zone, and requested the State Party to submit the property's Development Plan and ensure conformity between the two plans. The World Heritage Committee also asked the State Party to submit a progress report on the status of the proposed thematic plan "Framework for High-rise Buildings", all for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The State Party submitted a report on 1 February 2009, which addresses the issues raised above and also provides a number of general comments on the state of conservation of the property.

a) *Development plan*

The State Party report suggests that the character of the Development Plan is such that it performs all the functions of a management plan. It notes specifically that the Development Plan of Tallinn Old Town incorporates the components of a comprehensive management plan: overview and prerequisites of the object, including historical development, heritage

protection and cultural heritage, conservation and reconstruction, Old Town as World Heritage site, different environments within the Old Town and essential factors having an impact on it, zoning, vision for the development and guidelines for the future, goals and sub-goals, the executors of these goals, the necessary means for meeting these goals, time schedule and the budget for keeping the time schedule.

The State Party also informed that it considered that an essential task is to prepare a framework for addressing urban development and other threats, for fostering sustainable development of Tallinn Old Town as an authentic and holistic city space, for regulating the rights and obligations of different owners, and for guaranteeing efficient administration. It noted that concerns have been addressed in the adopted "Development Plan of Tallinn Old Town" and in the other existing legal documents such as "Statutes of Tallinn Heritage Protection Area (Decree of the Government of Estonia 155, (20 May 2003), and that it seems to share all of the characteristics of a management plan".

The State Party report also notes that the concept of a management plan does not exist in the Estonian legal framework.

b) Framework of high-rise buildings

The State Party report also describes progress in review and implementation of the *Framework for high-rise buildings*. This has now been approved by the National Heritage Board and the Tallinn Department of Cultural Heritage; the process of approval by the Harju County Government and the Tallinn City Council is underway. The State Party further notes that the *Framework for high rise buildings* is supported by the Statutes of the Tallinn Old Town, which in their turn exclude any harmful building activity in the buffer zone, view sectors and corridors of the Old Town, and that on 6 March 2008, the "Regulation of Tallinn Central City Milieu Protection Areas, Boundaries, Protection and Usage Conditions" was approved, which covers the main area of the Tallinn Old Town buffer zone and regulates building activity in the historical suburbs has been in place.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the issue of high-rise buildings adjacent to World Heritage properties or in their buffer zone is being discussed for many cases and that policy advice is being developed, including with a proposed UNESCO Recommendation relating to Historic Urban Landscapes (see Document WHC-09/33.COM/7.1).

c) Other matters

The State Party report also provides additional information about the amount and focus on investment in the Old Town over the last ten years, demonstrating that investment has been directed to many projects of important social value, including schools. The report also documents successful efforts from 2002 to maintain the "Tallinn Church Renaissance" and more recent efforts dating from 2008 and still ongoing to refurbish and enhance Vadabuse (Liberty) Square.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the Development Plan of Tallinn Old Town is a very comprehensive document introducing and analyzing many of the key issues important in the long term development of an historic town interested to protect its heritage, and also to maintain its living character and its ability to act as a meaningful source of identity for its residents.

However, even taken together with existing heritage protection statutes, this is very far from the "Management plan" requested on several occasions by the World Heritage Committee. The Development Plan does not stress the need to root all actions within the Old Town in a defined Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, it does not provide or present such a Statement; nor does it show how the various actors will integrate their actions and capacities

around respect for the defined Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Finally, it does not define what actions will be necessary to adapt the existing management system to these goals. As noted in the state of conservation report prepared for this property last year (2008), the Development Plan seems to be a strategic master plan focused on physical and functional improvements rather than a fully developed, process-oriented contemporary heritage management plan. The Development Plan analyses options for change, but does not show how decision-making in all sectors and at all levels will need to adapt to ensure respect for the Outstanding Universal Value that lies at its heart, for all concerned.

The State Party report notes that “the difference between a management plan and a Development Plan in this context is rather a question of wording than substance”. However, ICOMOS and World Heritage Centre consider that this distinction involves much more than semantic differences, and would note that the management plan requested by the World Heritage Committee is neither a protection plan nor a master plan shaping future developments and physical changes and use, but a process based planning instrument meant to ensure that decisions in all sectors and at all levels give priority to respect for the property’s defined Outstanding Universal Value. The State Party’s Development Plan does not put in place such a management framework.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.99

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.87**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes the quality and usefulness of the Development Plan for Old Tallinn in exploring future development and conservation scenarios to preserve the Old Town, developed by the State Party;*
4. *Strongly regrets that the State Party has not yet put into place an adequate management plan/system for the Tallin Old Town requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006), 31st (Christchurch, 2007) and 32nd (Quebec City, 2008) sessions respectively;*
5. *Suggests that the State Party invite, a technical advisory mission, if necessary, to assist local authorities in initiating work on the requested management plan / system;*
6. *Also notes the progress made in implementing the thematic plan “Framework for high-rise buildings”, and the commendable progress made by the State Party in strengthening the conditions for conservation of the World Heritage;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a progress report on the state of conservation of the property and on the above issues, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011,*

100. Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (France) (C 85)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late scientific committee meeting)

101. Bordeaux, Port of the Moon (France) (C 1256)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Activation of the Reinforced monitoring mechanism)

102. Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.64; 31 COM 7B.96; 32 COM 7B.90

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 19,000 for the preparation of a heritage and tourism master plan for Mtskheta.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2003 and June 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a management mechanism;
- b) Insufficient coordination between the Georgian Church and the national authorities;
- c) Lack of definition of property and buffer zones;
- d) Privatisation of surrounding land;

- e) Natural erosion of stone;
- f) Loss of authenticity in recent works carried out by the Church.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/708>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee, at its 32nd session (Quebec City, July 2008), expressed its serious concern about the privatization processes of land situated in the vicinity of the property, and urged the State Party to immediately halt these before the boundary clarification and the preparation of a "Special Statement on protection of World Heritage properties in Georgia" are completed. The World Heritage Committee reiterated its request to give highest priority to development of an integrated management plan for the property, and invited the State Party to establish a Special State Commission on World Heritage. Expressing its serious concern about the state of conservation of the archaeological components of the property, the World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to develop a special programme on protection of all archaeological components and indicated that, in the absence of substantial progress, it would consider the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The State Party state of conservation report was received on 29 January 2009 and covered:

a) *Conservation*

The main Church, the northern small Church, parekklession and southern building of the Jvari Monastery: Damaging impact of aggressive natural conditions on stones is still a problem during 2008. Parts of the bas-reliefs have completely disappeared. Construction issues are still the same: the damaged cupola pillars, threshold stress and cracks in the carrier structures. Some building stones around the eastern arches and around the foundation of the main church are damaged - mould, sooty walls, and cracked building stones are reported. The tiles of cupola's roofing needs immediate renovation. The small Church remains without roofing. The report underlines that the small Church has partially lost its authenticity due to the use of inappropriate materials during the "restoration" works. The conservation project for the small Jvari Church has been prepared. These existing damages are only planned to be addressed in 2009. The joint ICCROM project on conservation of the Saint Cross Monastery is still under implementation. In 2008, the Small Jvari Church Site Development Plan was completed and works were started to develop a conservation plan.

Svetitskhoveli Cathedral, the Bell Tower, Catholicos-Patriarch Melchisedec Palace, Catholicos-Patriarch Antony Palace, The Defence Wall: The report noted that parts of the Cathedral walls are disintegrating and in a wrecking state, some building stones of the northern façade are partially demolished, the tiles of roof are partially cracked, the increased humidity damaged the frescoes. The state of conservation of wall paintings should be studied. The XVIIth century Bell Tower was demolished; the gates of Catholicos- Patriarch Melchisedec Palace urgently need rehabilitation_works. The State Party is monitoring Svetitskhoveli Cathedral to assess its structural state and develop a detailed plan to ensure conservation of the frescos. The report states that the Palace of Catholicos - Patriarch Anton II in the South-Eastern part of a courtyard, reconstructed between 2001 – 2004 has partially lost its authenticity.

Samtavro Nunnery: The report informed that the problem of roofing of the Cathedral still remains unresolved. The original tiled roofing should be restored. In the Cathedral, archaeological research has not been completed. The northern and southern annexes of the Cathedral need archaeological research, as well as the territory inside the defence wall. The Bell tower significantly bended to the Cathedral needs comprehensive research and

conservation works should be implemented on the remains of the King Mirian Palace. In 2008, the restoration works were concluded, which aimed at restoring the bearing wall adjacent to the Tower of Gabriel the Monk and damaged by natural conditions. As the project design had stipulated, a cobble-stone wall with regular sandstone quartz was constructed in front of the concrete wall. In order to prevent accumulation of water in the rear of the wall, drainage of plastic pipe work was arranged in the wall. In order to prepare for conservation of the Samtavro St. Nino Church existing damages were studied and assessed, which led to a plan to construct a new roof to the church.

Armaztsikhe-Bagineti, The roman-type bathes, the "Column Hall", Fortification system: The report also noted that the six-Apse Church has lost its authenticity due to the reconstruction works conducted with unacceptable methods. The roman-type bathes and the "Column Hall" need conservation. There is a risk of destruction of the building due to the aggressive influence of climatic conditions. Conservation works on the Fortification system should include different construction periods and layers and a conservation and rehabilitation plan should be developed. In September 2008 a competition was announced, aiming at drafting a development concept of Armaztsikhe-Bagineti. Its results are to be announced in spring 2009. Recommendations have been prepared on issues comprising site development, monument conservation and planning of tourist infrastructure.

b) Boundaries

Concerning the boundary issues, the State Party underlined that the Law of Georgia on Cultural Heritage has defined a special protection area for all components of the property of a 1 km radius and that the protection zones such as Construction Regulation Zone, Archaeological Heritage Zone, Landscape Protection Zone are currently being adjusted and expanded based on the requirements. The protection zones also regulate new constructions. As a result, there were no incompliant buildings constructed during 2008.

In 2008, the development plan process aiming at restoring the geographic and historical connection between the Jvari Church and Svetitskhoveli Cathedral started, including the rehabilitation of historic routes.

c) Inventories

The State Party also mentioned that the Ministry of Culture, established a regular monitoring exercise for all World Heritage properties, as well as recorded a full inventory of archaeological and architectural monuments in Mtskheta. The creation of the data base of the Historical Monuments of Mtskheta was initiated by the National Agency. Monitoring missions are regularly visiting all properties and are producing summary state of conservation report every year.

d) Management

The State Party created in 2008 an *ad-hoc* "Committee of World Cultural Heritage" established under the National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation to be in charge to define functions and liabilities of state agencies, regulate national, local and religious rights in order to ensure a protection and management of the World Heritage properties. This *ad-hoc* Committee shall deal with issues existing in the usage of monuments between private owners, the state and the Patriarchate as well as with privatization-related problems. The Mtskheta Museum-Reserve was reorganized and transformed into the Greater Mtskheta State Archaeological Museum-Reserve and affiliated, in 2008, with the aforementioned National Agency.

The State Party informed that the *Mtskheta Heritage and Tourism Master Plan* developed in collaboration with UNESCO and UNDP is under examination for formal approval by the Ministry of Culture.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS remain greatly concerned by the state of conservation of this property and that some monuments may no longer be authentic.

The report provides very limited information concerning the preparation of a legal and technical basis to address the threats. The State Party did not provide any detailed responses to the World Heritage Committee's key requests such as the land privatization issues, development of an integrated management plan for the property, establishment of a Special State Commission on World Heritage issues, development of a special programme on protection of all archaeological components, monitoring of Svetitskhoveli Cathedral. No document clarifying the exact boundaries of protected areas of the property and its buffer zones, or any boundary modification proposal, has been provided by the State Party. The State Party did not provide any comments concerning the eventual inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that the State Party has been unable to take into account the World Heritage Committee's decisions or to carry out the necessary preparatory activities to address existing and any new potential threats.

Considering Paragraphs 177 – 179 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note the absence of substantial progress, which could lead to the possible inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. They furthermore consider that the progress, if exist, cannot be evaluated on the basis of the report submitted by the State Party, and therefore suggest a reactive monitoring mission to the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.102

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.90**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Expresses its serious concern about the state of conservation of the different components of the property, and urges the State Party to provide necessary financial and administrative support and to give highest priority to the conservation and restoration works;
4. Reiterates its request to the State Party to finalize and approve an integrated management plan for the property;
5. Also reiterates its request to the State Party to prepare the boundaries clarification document, and if relevant, the boundaries modification proposal;
6. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission to the property in early 2010 to assess any progress made in implementing its decisions;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a progress report including all above mentioned documents, as well as the monitoring of the state of conservation of all components of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010, **with a view**

to consider the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

103. Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.75; 31 COM 7B.96; 32 COM 7B.91

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2003 and June 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) General need for interior and exterior conservation work on the monuments;
- b) Insufficient coordination between the Georgian Church and the national authorities;
- c) Lack of co-ordinated management system;
- d) Major reconstruction of the structure of Bagrati Cathedral.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/710>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee, at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), strongly urged the State Party to immediately start preventive conservation work on the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Complex, as well as to develop, in coordination with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, a long-term programme for the systematic conservation of the mural paintings and mosaics with the involvement and collaboration of international specialists in

this domain. The World Heritage Committee noted the State Party's intention to prepare a new reconstruction project for Bagrati Cathedral and requested the State Party to provide assurances that no reconstruction work shall commence until the State Party has provided complete and detailed documentation concerning this project for review by the World Heritage Committee. The State Party was requested to urgently prepare, approve and provide to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, the management plan of the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Complex, including the boundaries clarification document clearly indicating its buffer zones. The World Heritage Committee encouraged the State Party to organize an awareness-raising campaign for all World Heritage properties in Georgia and invited the State Party to prepare relevant documentation in order to initiate an international donors conference designed to address the major problems identified for all World Heritage properties in Georgia.

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report dated 29 January 2009 which provides a summary of some activities accomplished and little information relevant to the state of conservation of the property. The State Party report underlined the main factors affecting the property which are the lack of a fast solution to the long-standing problems, the scarcity of the resources, as well as the unavailability of a flexible management; the negative climatic and environmental affect on the monument; the lack of qualified specialists in the domain of conservation, restoration and management of properties and unorganized visiting of the property.

a) *Preventive conservation work on the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Complex*

The State Party informed that monitoring activities at the property have been undertaken and provided the list of the accomplished works without any detailed report. On the basis of the evaluation of the stability of the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery, the State Party proposed technical measures aiming to increase the stability of the structures. The State Party also informed that the database, containing information on Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery has being created.

b) *Reconstruction project for Bagrati Cathedral*

In 2004, ICOMOS noted that any reconstruction must be carried out in keeping with the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and its authenticity and therefore it would be more appropriate to retain the property as a ruin.

In January 2008, the President of Georgia and the Georgian Orthodox Church initiated the reconstruction project of the Bagrati Cathedral with the intention of restoring the initial religious use and functions of the Cathedral, which was previously discussed at the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee (Suzhou, 2004).

The World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, July 2008) urged the State Party not to carry out any reconstruction work which may adversely affect the Outstanding Universal Value and its authenticity and strongly urged the State Party not to commence any constructions before consideration of the project by the World Heritage Committee.

The reactive monitoring mission in 2008 informed the authorities of the provisions in the *Operational Guidelines* concerning authenticity and, in particular that the reconstruction of historic buildings is justifiable only in exceptional circumstances, and only on the basis of complete and detailed documentation and to no extent on conjecture.

The authorities confirmed that the final decision will only be made after an analysis of reconstruction possibilities for the Cathedral has been completed, and following a review of the project by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, and examination by the World Heritage Committee.

In the report, the State Party underlined that the rehabilitation of Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery is a priority. The 2009 budget resources for the conservation of the monuments highlight the State policy regarding the preservation of the cultural heritage.

The report mentioned some works accomplished. While these works mark the initial stage of the conservation process of the Bagrati Cathedral, they seem to be preparatory activities of its reconstruction :

- Technical status of the surface and underground bearing structures assessed and studied (laboratory research and analyses, fixation of micro and macro cracks, study of their length, width, depth and gaps, mapping and drafting passports of damages).
- Research of construction materials, laboratory analyses (recommendations on compliance of the materials existing on the site with the materials to be used).
- Preliminary art history research (bibliography, on-site research and recommendations, drafting reference and archive material list).

The detailed rehabilitation / reconstruction project of the Bagrati Cathedral has not been provided by the State Party as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008).

c) *Management plan of the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Complex*

The State Party informed that all necessary documents have been prepared in order to start the elaboration and implementation of the management plan of the property. No documents have been submitted by the State Party in the report for review.

d) *Boundaries clarification issue*

The State Party underlined that the Law of Georgia "On the Cultural Heritage" determines a 1 km special protection area for the property. The protection zones of the monuments are being adjusted and expanded. No documents have been submitted by the State Party in the report for review.

e) *Awareness-raising campaign and international donors conference*

The State Party did not provide any view concerning the eventual preparation of the international donors conference designed to address major problems identified for all World Heritage properties in Georgia.

The World Heritage and ICOMOS noted that the State Party should provide the detailed information on any accomplished works. Taking into account the brief summary report it would be necessary to obtain further detailed information concerning each element of the report, especially concerning the rehabilitation project, management plan and the conservation and monitoring work progress report, as well as the information on boundary issues.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS remain greatly concerned by the scope of the problems, in particular the Bagrati Cathedral reconstruction project and the absence of the detailed report responding to the World Heritage Committee requests.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS recall the recommendation that the work programme designed to address the major problems identified with this property and the preparation of the donor's conference for all World Heritage properties in Georgia should be included in the Georgian Cultural Heritage Programme.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.103

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,

2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.91**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Reiterates its request to the State Party to urgently prepare, approve and submit to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies the management plan of the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery, including the boundaries clarification document clearly indicating its buffer zones;
4. Requests the State Party to provide detailed and complete information concerning the monitoring of the state of conservation of property as well as the rehabilitation project and a progress report on works carried out;
5. Invites the State Party to prepare relevant documentation in order to initiate an international donors conference designed to address major problems identified for all World Heritage properties in Georgia;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a progress report, including the complete and detailed documentation concerning the new reconstruction project for Bagrati Cathedral, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

104. Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late submission of complementary information)

105. Old Town of Regensburg with Stadtamhof (Germany) (C 1155)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2006

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 8B.45; 31 COM 7B.98

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

Urban development pressures

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1155>

Current conservation issues

On 22 January 2009, the State Party submitted a detailed updated report on the state of conservation of the property addressing a) the restoration and construction projects reviewed by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), as well as b) informing about the statutes of a Steering Committee to be set up for the World Heritage property.

a) Restoration and construction projects.

The project to convert parts of the Thurn and Taxis Castle into a hotel has been put on hold for reasons of economic viability. However, a construction permit was issued for the project in October 2007; it will remain valid until October 2011 meaning that the project could be implemented in the coming years.

The State Party reports that the Stone Bridge was entirely closed to motor traffic in August 2008 in view of restoration works to be carried out until 2014. The City Council further decided to restrict the bridge to pedestrian and bicycle traffic after the restoration. This decision however results in seeking alternative traffic solutions in other parts of the property and its buffer zone.

The State Party confirms that two tunnel options have been dismissed due to financial considerations. They are now considering two bridge options:

Option 1: The first option would be for a new low bridge located inside the buffer-zone to the East of the Stone Bridge with a small part also adjacent to the Eastern part of the property itself; it is considered to have little impact on the monument ensemble while however involving environmental concerns.

Option 2: The second option would be for a bridge located West of the Stone Bridge in the Western part of the property, requiring access ramps on each side of the Danube River; the regional authorities of Bavaria consider that it could be a problematic intrusion into the area.

The State Party intends to hold a competition for designs for both route options to enable their evaluation and clearly states that any binding decision in view of the construction project will await the World Heritage Committee's examination of the project proposals in order to ensure that the final project is accepted as respecting the property's Outstanding Universal Value. The State Party therefore solicits the World Heritage Committee to give guidance on the above-mentioned bridge proposals and approval for the competition.

The Donaumarkt is an area of fallow land due to earlier demolitions to the east of the early medieval core city. The proposed development will reconstruct the former street and alley system aligning with the height of surrounding buildings. It will accommodate a mix of offices, housing/hotels, service facilities and restaurants. At the first meeting of the Steering

Committee on 11 February 2009, a correction was requested in relation to building heights and roof shapes.

The Karmeliten Hotel's southern façade is the historic link for the creation of Dachau Square, which is otherwise defined by the façade of the former Minoriten Church convent and the New City Hall of the 1930s. However the work is not proceeding at this time.

The Dachauplatz parking garage is also located on Dachau Square. The façade has been redesigned and archaeological remains have been preserved in the basement. ICOMOS notes that the building is now largely complete and can be accepted.

Arnulfplatz is a square in the old town in which there is a central bus stop. A line interchange allows transfer from one bus line to another. A new integrated bus shelter is proposed to be relocated to the southeast. The relocation has been criticized by the Bavarian State Office for the Preservation of Monuments as it would lead to a stronger disturbance of the northern façade of the Theater-und Gesellschaftshaus.

The Peterstor construction project was approved in 2001 but has not been commenced and the permit has lapsed. ICOMOS previously agreed that a new development of the property would be possible as long as the dimensions and height of the building followed the scale of the surroundings and did not dominate them. The City has now made clear to the developer that any new proposal must comply with the general condition as devised by ICOMOS.

b) Steering Committee

In November 2008, the World Heritage Centre received a proposal of the statutes of the Steering Committee to review all development proposals which potentially could impact the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property. The results of this screening process would be provided to the World Heritage Centre based on the requirements set out in the *Operational Guidelines* and specifically Paragraph 172. However, several options are proposed for channeling the communication and information flow among all German authorities, the Steering Committee and the World Heritage Centre. The Steering Committee includes members of ICOMOS International, and State Party, regional and local authorities. The State Party asked the World Heritage Committee for further guidance on the process.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that concerning the Stone Bridge, the City Council's decision to restrict the bridge to pedestrian and bicycle traffic after its restoration is to be welcomed. World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note the City's identified need for a new transport route across the Danube and its proposal to hold a competition for the two bridge options.

However, it is considered necessary that a) an Environmental Impact Assessment taking into account the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and a traffic study be carried out for the 2 basic locations as a first step before a competition is launched; b) based on the results of the Environmental Impact Assessment to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre, a competition could be launched for the preferred option if appropriate; c) that the preferred designs should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for review. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note that inputs to the jury could be provided, however not as members of the judging panel.

It is also noted that the State Party's report including the proposals for the new river crossing were not included in the agenda of the first meeting of the Steering Committee on 11 February 2009.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.105

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.98**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes the detailed report submitted by the State Party;
4. Welcomes the initiative and progress made on setting up a Steering Committee for the World Heritage property and recalls the procedures stipulated by the Operational Guidelines in view of responsibilities, information flow and review requirements between the State Party, Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, an updated report on the planning process for a new bridge, including relevant impact assessments and on the experiences gained with the work of the Steering Committee, for review by ICOMOS.

106. Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape (Hungary) (C 1063)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2002

Criteria

(iii) (v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

26 COM 23.13; 26 COM 23.14; 32 COM 7B.95

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2001: International Workshop on vineyard landscapes

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1063>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), in response to information about development projects within and in the vicinity of the property, including in neighbouring Slovakia, the World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to provide as soon as possible full details of a proposed energy plant in the buffer zone, and of the proposed heritage impact assessment, in order to evaluate the potential impact of the plant, and also encouraged the State Party to collaborate with Slovakia over a possible transboundary extension, as requested by its 26th session (Budapest, 2002). Concerns had been raised about a pumping energy storage power plant in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property in the Zemplén Mountains, a coal-fired power plant in Slovakia about 20km from the property and a power plant in Szerencs.

In its 2008 report, the State Party had already covered the first two plants. On 1 February 2009, a report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage properties was submitted by the State Party which provides a response to most of the remaining issues.

a) Details of the proposed power-plant in the buffer zone

The planned power plant would be located on 6.5 ha of land in the Eastern Industrial Park of Szerencs, an area designated for industry in the plan. Its precise location is not provided in the report. It would generate electricity from primary agricultural products and by-products such as straw, rice straw, corn and sunflower stalks). Annual consumption would be 250,000 tons per year (the output of approximately 70,000 ha of agricultural land). Supplying the plant would generate significant increase in traffic through the property.. It is noted that plant is unusually large even by international standards. The plan is supported by many people on the basis that it would provide economic development but is opposed by others for its perceived impact on the property and its wider environment. It has divided opinions amongst local authorities formally loyal to the aspirations of the property. There is strong pressure to demonstrate in an explicit way how 'the area's *responsibility for preserving its values and its opportunities for development* can be harmonized with one another'.

The developers have valid construction permits. However in response to public opinion and awaiting the results of the impact assessment, the developers have suspended construction;

b) Details of the proposed heritage impact assessment of the power-plant

A comprehensive impact assessment, under constant independent expert supervision, was completed in December of 2008. The State Party report provides a summary of the main findings in relation to emissions, traffic and visual impact, as well as in regards to two further aspects that were brought to light through the impact assessment – public health and changes in the ground cover.

Emissions: The impact assessment has indicated that the possible impact of the plant – indirect in certain cases – was not fully measured and taken into account by the official licensing procedures, although the required technical studies were undertaken. Studies of further direct and indirect impacts should have been undertaken and a wider area of impact considered, including effects on traffic, the region, and the cultural landscape.

Traffic: The planned deliveries of straw indicated in the licensing documentation would occur from 8 collection area units between 8 and 98 km away from the power plant on public highways. At the entrance into Tokaj on Highway 38, this could mean additional daily traffic of 107 trucks. This has to be set into the context that traffic in the property has significantly increased in recent years, and at several points has reached a critical amount (such as through the city of Tokaj). The impact assessment considered that the full impact could not be determined with the available information and called for a more detailed logistical plan.

Visual impact: The reduction of the visual impact of the power plant on the landscape of the property through the creation of “micro-relief features” and a sheltering forest, as well as the lowering of the blocks below ground – using the current building plans as a base – was considered to be the maximum achievable. However, even with the planting of mature plants the beneficial screening impact could only be achieved after a period of 20 years.

Ground cover: The impact assessment reinforced the idea that the cultural landscape has preserved its defining character even though there have been changes in particular parameters and within certain limits; such changes can be monitored and managed to allow interventions at the proper time and in the proper manner in the interest of preserving the Outstanding Universal Value and its attributes. The impact assessment stressed that to maintain the balance in the landscape that has resulted from the interaction between people and nature over time, it is absolutely necessary to monitor these changes in detail as the percentage of areas in and around the property transformed into towns/settlements has already reached the critical level, and its further increase would represent a danger to the sustainability of the property’s Outstanding Universal Value. Therefore major development of this type should be avoided and attention paid to rehabilitating recently neglected areas, such as terraces on higher ground in order to conserve water stability. The present impact assessment – even though it would need to be supplemented with further analysis, evaluations and more refined conclusions in certain areas – has provided a great deal of worthwhile methodological information that can be applied to the other Hungarian World Heritage properties as well.

The report also states that energy crops are newly cultured commercial plants raised for energy that will grow in areas unfavourable for grain production. This means that the power plant could encourage cultivation in previously uncultivated areas bringing about a major change in ground cover. The impact assessment draws attention to numerous ecological, environmental conservation and potential public health problems connected with the utilization of energy crops. On the basis of the precautionary principle, it suggests that the cultivation of energy crops must be suspended, or must be prevented within the property, due to the unknown ecological risks.

The impact assessment in its conclusions formulates feasibility conditions and recommendations concerning the Szerencs straw-burning power plant and more generally regarding the sustainable utilization of the property. These recommendations will form the basis for discussions with the affected parties. The State Party will inform the World Heritage Centre about further developments.

c) Collaboration with Slovakia over a possible trans-boundary extension:

On this issue, nothing has been reported.

d) Review and reform of the National Country Planning Act in 2008

Amendments to the National Country Planning Act (2003) adopted on 19 July 2008 introduced new regulations for World Heritage properties, their buffer zones and sites on the national Tentative List. The amended law contains the boundaries of every Hungarian World Heritage property and properties on the Tentative List, and states that the manner and extent of land use must be in harmony with the objectives defined in their management plans. At the same time the “law also classifies all Hungarian World Heritage properties and sites on the tentative list as *cultural heritage zones*.”

e) Hungarian World Heritage Act

The drafting of a *Hungarian World Heritage Act to strengthen protection and management of World Heritage properties in Hungary* is underway and the Hungarian Parliament is expected to debate it in the middle of 2009. Its planned date of enactment is 1 January 2010.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note with satisfaction the thorough impact assessment carried out for the proposed straw burning power plant. The analysis of the impact within the framework of the wider landscape around the property, and the way that this landscape has developed over time, has produced the basis for a dialogue on how the property might be developed in a sustainable way. The State Party is optimistic that if certain conditions are met, it might also show how concerns and demands of both, the preservation of heritage values and of development can be reconciled and could serve as a foundation for a revision of the management plan. The drafting of a "World Heritage Act" should also considerably strengthen the legal environment for the preservation of World Heritage properties in Hungary.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies urge the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed of all developments related to the powerplant given the potential considerable negative impact its development could have on the visual, environmental and ecological aspects of the property if its design and concept are not considerably modified.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.106

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.95**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the thorough impact assessment carried out for the proposed straw burning power plant;*
4. *Also notes that this assessment has produced a basis for dialogue on how the property might be developed in a sustainable way and how the Outstanding Universal Value and development might be reconciled;*
5. *Urges the State Party, in view of the considerable potential visual, environmental and ecological impact of the proposed straw burning power plant on the property, to reconsider and significantly modify the design of the project and eliminate all traffic impacts on the cultural landscape values and integrity of the property;*
6. *Further notes that the drafting of a World Heritage Bill could considerably strengthen the legal environment for the preservation of World Heritage properties in Hungary;*
7. *Recalls its Decision adopted at its 26th session (Budapest, 2002) to encourage collaboration with Slovakia concerning a transboundary extension;*
8. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a progress report on the negotiations over the possible development of the power plant, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

107. Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400 and 400 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987 and 2002 (extension)

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

26 COM 23.10/11/12 ; 27 COM 8C.2 ; 32 COM 7B.94

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO and Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2005 : World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission ; November 2007 : ICOMOS advisory mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Demolition and inappropriate development in the buffer zone known as the ‘Jewish Quarter’;
- b) Inappropriate use of public areas and street amenities;
- c) Lack of conservation of residential housing in the area inscribed as World Heritage;
- d) Increased traffic volume .

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/400>

Current conservation issues

Since 2005, the World Heritage Centre has been alerted to concerns over the demolition of existing buildings and construction of new buildings in part of the buffer zone, significantly altering the character of the area.

Erzsébetváros (the section within the Grand Boulevard of the District, Erzsébetváros), is commonly referred to as the “old Jewish quarter of Pest” due to the concentration of Jewish cultural heritage that developed there over time – and for the ghetto that was established there from 1944 to 1945.

On 1 February 2008, a report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage property was submitted by the State Party. It addresses the concerns of the World Heritage Committee and also points out that damaging changes have occurred although the entire property and its buffer zone, has been designated as an “historic district” and 51 buildings

within the “old Jewish quarter of Pest” are individually protected. The report explains that there are two main reasons for this: first the regulations did not enter into force until 2005 and secondly existing local building regulations, as well as the financial/economic regulations worked against conservation. The issues are in particular:

a) Demolition and reconstruction

The report indicates that no further demolitions have taken place – but there are still existing permits not yet acted upon. As for the quality of new buildings, there is little that can be done for existing structures.

b) Re-examination of existing demolition permits

Consultations began at the October 2008 meeting of the Hungarian National World Heritage Commission, when the 7th District Erzsébetváros Municipal Government expressed its willingness to participate in ensuring the financial resources for possible compensation in collaboration with the state and the Capital City Government. The present international financial crisis may improve the conditions for negotiations aiming at the retraction of demolition permits that have been issued.

c) Urban conservation and development plan for the buffer zone

When the District’s urban planning and building regulations were prepared by the Budapest Capital City Head Architect’s Office and the National Office of Cultural Heritage, the principal architectural and urban values of the area were taken into consideration. However, before being adopted by the Budapest Capital City Assembly, the heritage section of the regulations was detached and postponed until new regulations for the preservation of historic value are drafted that will have jurisdiction over the other districts of Budapest as well.

d) Funding for rehabilitation and restoration

The Capital City Assembly has proposed the drafting of a government bill and recommended legal amendments to address economic/financial problems. These initiatives could be enacted at the earliest in the 2010 tax law. Currently other opportunities to promote interventions of a rehabilitative nature are being investigated.

e) Archaeological survey of the ancient ghetto

A condition survey of the former ghetto wall has been performed, and the documentation prepared. It is however pointed out that except between November 1944 and January 1945, there was never a walled ghetto at the territory of Budapest. The so-called “old Jewish quarter of Pest” is an example where Jewish residents lived together with others including Hungarians and Germans, from the second half of the 19th century. The area was never a homogenous district inhabited only by Jews.

f) Conservation measures for the “Jewish quarter”

The report highlights the importance of the involvement of civil organizations and individuals in promoting an understanding of the character and value of the quarter. The above responses are supplemented by details of strategic measures being considered to establish a regulatory system that encourages and provides incentives for interventions aimed at rehabilitation in the property and its buffer zone. These measures are still at the initial planning stages. They include:

- A review of the management plan by the Capital City Mayor’s Office and the formation of a Management Body;
- The drafting of a *World Heritage Act* to promote the better preservation and sustainable development of the Hungarian World Heritage properties. The Hungarian Parliament is expected to debate this in the middle of 2009, and the scheduled date for its enactment is 1 January 2010.

In response to a better understanding of the overall urban landscape and threats to its integrity, consideration is being given to an extension of the buffer zone and a reassessment of the relationship between the property and the buffer zone.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note the specific measures taken to contain the demolition and redevelopment and the limitations of these processes given the validity of formal demolition permits. They consider that the strategic response now being considered by the State Party are a valuable way forward and particularly the introduction of a World Heritage Act.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.107

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.94**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes the specific measures undertaken to re-examine demolition permits and promote a fund for rehabilitation, and urges the State Party to continue with its vigilance in preventing further losses and inappropriate development in the buffer zone of the property;
4. Welcomes the various strategic measures being planned, in particular the revision of the management plan, the establishment of a management body, the reassessment of the buffer zone, the assessment of the relationship between the property and the buffer zone, and the drafting of a national World Heritage Bill;
5. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a progress report on the issues above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

108. Rock Drawings in Valcamonica (Italy) (C 94)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(iii) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.73; 29 COM 7B.65; 31 COM 7B.112

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

September 2004: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Construction of roads and high voltage power line in the immediate vicinity of the property;
- b) Absence of boundaries for the property;
- c) Lack of a management plan that addresses conservation issues, development control, tourism management, and future rock art research;
- d) Construction of metal walkway.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/94>

Current conservation issues

Following the Decision of the World Heritage Committee at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004), a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission took place in September 2004. The main aim was to assess the general state of conservation with particular reference to the management of the property, the infrastructure development in its immediate vicinity and the presentation of the property. Progress was subsequently reported on a number of the mission recommendations. However, the World Heritage Committee, in its Decision **31 COM 7B.112**, urged the State Party to clearly define the boundaries of the property and its buffer zones, and to provide an updated report on the state of conservation of the property on all actions taken in response to the recommendations of the 2004 mission.

On 30 January, 2009, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the Valcamonica rock art sites together with a list of the 182 monuments, a map identifying their locations, as well as sample maps of six parts of the property.

Of the 2,400 engraved rocks, collectively located in the 182 locations noted in the 2005 management plan, the largest density of them occurs in the 6 mapped areas, spread over seven Archaeological Parks.

The mapping of all sites by the responsible official bodies is reported to be almost complete. This has involved an exhaustive scientific revision of the information and documentation, in addition to pursuing administrative and tutelage processes. When these processes are complete, the results of the mapping will be provided to the World Heritage Centre.

The State Party reports that the state of conservation of the engraved rocks is being constantly monitored by officials. In addition to routine maintenance of weed removal and cleaning paths and roads, conservation works have been carried out and coordinated inside the Parks with the aid of ministerial, regional and council funding. This unspecified work is

stated to have followed the defined methodology and protocol as set out in the management plan.

A coordinated research programme has been developed and agreed with all appropriate organisations operating on the property, and has been forwarded to the World Heritage Centre as an enclosure to the management plan. On the submitted list of locations, 69 sites are noted as having been partly or entirely survey recorded, whilst the others have only been reported on and, at present, lack topographic survey documentation.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that:

- Progress has been made on the mapping of rock art sites towards the establishment of the boundaries of the World Heritage property and its buffer zones although the requested maps have yet to be completed and submitted;
- While some conservation work has apparently been carried out, details of this are not provided;
- A coordinated research programme has been submitted, and some progress with this is noted;
- Information has not been provided on progress made in the implementation of the other recommendations of the 2004 reactive monitoring mission report, in particular the following: to conduct a geo-chemical analysis to examine the effect of air and water quality on the rock surfaces as well as to monitor the extent of the red algae and exfoliation problems on the rock surfaces; to evaluate the effect of the use of chemicals and metal brushes in their conservation work and to consider alternative conservation methods; to engage in activities to enhance tourist experience and at the same time to raise public awareness including visitor education on rock art etiquette; to replace the metal walkway at Rock 27 by a wooden structure that will be in harmony with the surrounding landscape, using non-intrusive and reversible methods; and to consider rerouting the power lines in order to enhance the visual integrity of the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.108

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.112**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes the progress made with mapping of the rock art sites with view to delimiting the 182 parts of the property and their buffer zones and requests the State Party to submit the completed plans as soon as possible;*
4. *Also requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed on further progress with actions identified in the Management, Conservation and Research components of the management plan, in particular those applying to the recommendations of the 2004 reactive monitoring mission report.*

109. City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy) (C 712 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994, extension 1996

Criteria

(i) (ii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.66; 30 COM 7B.85; 31 COM 7B.113

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2005: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Construction project of a highway extension in the vicinity of Villa Saraceno
- b) Uncontrolled development and urban encroachment in the Veneto region

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/712>

Current conservation issues

In compliance with Decision **31 COM 7B.113**, the State Party submitted on 29 January 2009 an updated report on the status of planning of the highway Valdastico-South, section Vicenza-Rovigo and activities related to the property, as well as maps with the proposed buffer zones of the parts of the property and additional copies of the final version of the management plan.

The State Party informed that the management plan including conservation plans and buffer zones was formally approved on 30 May 2007 by all authorities concerned, and copies were provided to the World Heritage Centre for review by ICOMOS in June 2007; the World Heritage Committee was informed during its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007). The State Party's report further provides detailed information on all activities and interventions carried out since the approval of the management plan.

Concerning the highway A31 Valdastico-South, Section Vicenza-Rovigo project, the State Party reports that the project was revised to take into account the recommendations of the 2005 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS monitoring mission. The technical solution "Planning Revision lot 7" has been chosen and proposed to the Town Hall of Agugliaro for approval in September 2008. The State Party anticipates the revised plan to be approved.

Upon approval, expected in early 2009, expropriation procedures would begin for the areas of the motorway section, and the National Highways Authority would give final authorization for a tender. It is reported that the construction works are scheduled to start no later than mid-2009.

While the State Party report states that the revised project would comply with the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission's recommendations for the minimization of visual impacts of the highway, non-governmental organizations informed in September 2008 that the motorway section would include up to seven exits as well as additional stops for a length of 54 km. The density of highway facility infrastructure is likely to cause encroachment on the Veneto landscape around some of the Palladian villas, and could therefore contribute to uncontrolled development in the vicinity of parts of the World Heritage property.

On 31 March 2009, recent documentation was received from an NGO informing about construction works for a partly elevated highway section, which started in the municipality of Albettone and neighbouring municipalities, and questioning the legal base of the project through an official inquiry submitted to the Regional Council of the Veneto on 20 March 2009.

Given that the State Party did not provide the revised plans for the motorway section, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS strongly recommend requesting the submission of the revised plans and halting any construction works until the evaluation of the plans by the Advisory Bodies.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.109

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.113**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes with appreciation the submission of the final management plan of the property and the activities towards its implementation;*
4. *Notes with concern the advanced stage of the highway project, and urges the State Party to submit as soon as possible the revised plans to ensure that they are in line with the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission of 2005;*
5. *Requests the State Party to halt the project until an assessment of the revised plans has been made to ensure that they are in line with the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission of 2005;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit, to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, an updated report on the implementation of the project of the A31 motorway Valastico-South for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

110. Historic Centre of Naples (Italy) (C 726)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

N/A

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

December 2008: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/726>

Current conservation issues

At the invitation of the Italian authorities, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission was carried out from 9 to 13 December 2008. The mission team had meetings with stakeholders, reviewed existing documents, several projects and plans and visited a number of selected sites in the Historic Centre of Naples.

The mission concluded that the values for which the site had been inscribed and its overall authenticity, the complex urban structure, architectural masterpieces and historic fabric, the townscape and surrounding landscape have been retained. In relation to integrity, which had not been examined as part of the inscription process, the mission team observed that there seems to be a high degree of integrity of the property – the threats to be noted currently are the lack of continuous maintenance of the urban fabric and major traffic plan interventions.

A number of achievements have been noted in restoring monumental buildings, and in fundraising for projects. The major challenges identified by the mission included weaknesses in coordinating the complex safeguarding and development processes, lack of a participatory approach, absence of a management plan and lack of a holistic approach with clear priorities and criteria on the basis of which any major restoration projects and programmes for the property could be evaluated and set up.

The large scale of the property and its complex character call for continuous monitoring and follow up on strategic decisions. This needs to be addressed in the future management plan

and management system. The property could benefit from involvement of additional expertise on specific issues and in the coordination process, and regular missions. The mission, considering the size of the site, its remarkably long history, number of inhabitants, percentage of unemployment and considerable challenges with infrastructure recognized the complex challenges confronting those involved with the conservation of this living city,. The mission recommended that a shared strategic vision is needed specifically for the management system, and welcomed the intention to use many new programmes and projects as a motor for local economic and social development.

The mission team reviewed the overall state of conservation of the property and concluded that it was satisfactory, since the values, and authenticity for which it had been inscribed are still there. The interventions at major monuments (e.g. Certosa di San Martino, San Lorenzo, Castel Nuovo, Castel dell'Ovo) were up to international standards and even exemplary. The mission concluded that one of the key issues is finding the right balance between attention paid to the monumental buildings and to the continuous maintenance of the urban fabric, in particular of the non-monumental buildings (and the infrastructure) that conserve the traces of the rich history, carry the spirit of place (combining its tangible and intangible heritage, its values, and the authenticity for which the property had been inscribed). The mission addressed a series of recommendations to regarding:

- Maintenance and continuous monitoring of the urban fabric, and encouraging the process of engaging stakeholders to actively participate in caring for their environment;
- Implementation of the Grande Programma (EU Funding of 200 Million Euro and 80 Million from national sources for 2007-13) as a chance for a new approach, partnerships and methodology;
- Development of a management plan originally foreseen for December 2006 (as per Periodic Report of 2005), but that had not been prepared;
- Delivery of formal clarifications concerning the delimitation of the property, maps, an indication of the surface area of each component of the inscribed property in hectares and an official presentation of the recently approved buffer zone as a minor boundary modification;
- Presentation of new discoveries, extensive research and excavations and important findings;
- Potential development projects outside the property and the protected area, such as in the port area;
- Rehabilitation projects and the extension of this successful approach (e.g. *Albergo dei Poveri*) and the creative re-use of major historic buildings (*Museo d'Arte Contemporanea Donna Regina Napoli*);
- Damaging effects of traffic (air pollution, noise, vibrations) requiring that the overall traffic concept be included in the future management plan;
- Considerable increase in cultural tourism, requiring a special chapter in the management plan based on a specific study of needs and potential threats;
- Setting up a system of regular evaluation and follow-up in accordance with international standards.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies emphasize the importance of balancing investment in monumental and non-monumental buildings both of which contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Achieving this balance is a key challenge to be addressed in the preparation of the management plan.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.110

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Notes the report of the World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS advisory mission carried out in December 2008 at the invitation of the State Party;
3. Welcomes the State Party's efforts to obtain major funding for restoration projects at the Historic Centre of Naples for key monuments and encourages the State Party to ensure funding for the overall conservation of the vulnerable urban fabric;
4. Regrets that the management plan announced by the Periodic Report in 2006 has not been prepared and urges the authorities to commence its preparation in full consultation with all stakeholders, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS;
5. Requests the State Party to consider the conclusions of the advisory mission and to take into account the detailed recommendations;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed progress report on the implementation of the recommendations as well as the management plan for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

111. Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia) (C 852)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1997

Criteria

(i) (ii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.78; 31 COM 7B.58; 32 COM 7B.97

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 129,500 including Preparatory and Technical assistance

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: France-UNESCO Co-operation Agreement expertise mission activities in 2002, 2004, 2005, 2007, 2008 – 45,000 Euros

Previous monitoring missions

March 2008: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) High-rise building projects located in the buffer zone threatening the visual integrity of the property
- b) Regulations for building permissions and guidelines for new construction projects within Riga and its buffer zone

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/852>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee expressed its appreciation to the State Party for the general success of its efforts to halt high-rise developments in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property with the exception of the development plan of the Southern Kipsala zone.

While acknowledging the State Party's contention that the development plans at Kipsala were in place at the time of inscription in 1997, and were then not challenged, the World Heritage Committee regretted their implementation including construction of a 20 storey tower and also regretted that the new Conception project proposal for the left bank of the Daugava River (as presented to the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission of March 2008) did not deviate greatly from previous submissions, and would result in significant negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property. The World Heritage Committee also endorsed the recommendations of the 2008 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, and requested the State Party to implement them.

The State Party provided the report requested by the World Heritage Committee on 30 January 2009. The report addresses in turn the principal recommendations of the joint mission:

a) Revised, "Conception Project", taking into consideration the visual integrity of the World Heritage property

The State Party report notes that the "Daugava Left-bank Development Concept" was completely reviewed once again in 2008, and that the initial project has been significantly changed, reducing the density and height of several high-rise buildings to 121m (maximum authorised), moving away the new buildings from the River Daugava and the buffer zone of the property and refusing building permission to several high-rise building projects. However, the report indicates that it is not possible to refuse completely the high-rise buildings in the Conception as some projects were approved before the inscription of the property in the World Heritage List. This concerns three high-rise buildings in the southern part of Kipsala (buffer zone), for which no reduction in height seems to be proposed by the State Party, although requested by the World Heritage Committee.

The State Party further notes that the economic recession has limited planned construction activity, and that the public may be favouring low-rise construction for future housing. In addition, an analysis by international consultants has pointed out the inadequacy of many of the planned investment projects, particularly from an

infrastructure and traffic management perspective. The consultants' report suggests limiting construction on the left bank of the river Daugava. The report notes that several construction projects are already suspended, such as the competition winning project for high-rise buildings on the island Klīversala.

The State Party analysis of the visual impact of the River Daugava Left bank silhouette – suggests that from some view points, the Historic Centre of Riga panorama is already disturbed by existing buildings – especially by the Swedbank (former Hansabanka) building. While it is not possible to correct this mistake, the State Party's analysis of the visual impact of current projects as seen from view points in the territory of the Historic Centre of Riga), suggests that the revised River Daugava Left bank silhouette composition does not impact significantly the view corridors of the city.

b) Implementation of the legal framework for the preservation and development of Old Riga and review of projects

The State Party report notes that Latvia “is the only country in the world to adopt the highest level World Heritage protection rules (national legislation, Cabinet of Ministers regulations, municipal regulations, etc.)”. The report informs about provisions, laws and regulations to ensure that tall buildings are kept at distances from the historic core, to protect views to the Historic Centre.

However, the State Party report does not comment directly on the degree to which these important laws are being implemented, or on the efforts of the Council on the Preservation and Development of the Historic Centre of Riga on the review of projects for impacts on Outstanding Universal Value and integrity. Furthermore, it's necessary to specify how the “Daugava Left-bank Silhouette Development Concept” project revision is implemented in terms of the existing legal framework for the preservation and development of Old Riga and in the amended territorial planning regulations.

c) Historic setting and urban fabric

The State Party report notes several recent initiatives and seminars which have focused on this design challenge and that in recent years the quality of projects has improved. The firm position of the State Inspection against copies and replicas is noted, as well as its efforts to defend established public open space from being built up. Finally the report notes that new projects within the property and its buffer zone are now the subject of international competitions, and a multi-level project evaluation system, assuring significant public discussion.

d) Programme for Preserving the Wooden Architecture of Riga

The State Party notes amendments to the legislation in January 2008 which preserve and protect characteristic wooden architecture in the Historic Centre of Riga by requiring that replacements of “lost” buildings maintain original size and materials. As well, the State Party notes that in spring 2008, the Ministry of Culture adopted “The Strategy of Wooden Architecture preservation 2008-2011” to facilitate awareness raising in this area and to support particular projects.

e) Co-operation between the Municipality, the State Inspection and other stakeholders

The State Party report notes recent initiatives to provide greater exchange between stakeholders in project review, including initiation of a “multilevel project evaluation system”. The report also notes the public dimension of the meetings of the Council for the Preservation and Development of the Historic Centre of Riga, whose members include representatives of all sectors and levels: national and municipal authorities, the UNESCO National Commission, the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Regional

Development and Local Government, as well as professional associations. The report also informs about the important work of the Riga City Architect Office in evaluation and control of contemporary architecture projects.

f) Awareness-raising, presentation, signage and promotion of the World Heritage area

The State Party report notes the success of recent efforts to improve local heritage awareness, citing the example of initiatives in the Latgale district, the involvement of the mass media in developing television programmes which promote cultural heritage exploration and understanding, the development of the State Inspection web page, and the value of the use of the panorama and silhouette of the Historic Centre of Riga as European Heritage Label site in July 2007.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the State Party has made a strong effort to respond fully to the decisions by the World Heritage Committee and the recommendations of the 2008 reactive monitoring mission in modifying the Daugava-Left-bank Development Silhouette Concept by reducing the density and height of several high-rise buildings and moving several new buildings further away from the buffer zone. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies agree with the State Party's analysis that the revised Daugava-Left-bank Development Silhouette Concept does not significantly impact on view corridors from the City. There are still concerns however that such high-density development in this area could have a major socio-economic impact on the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the issue of high-rise buildings adjacent to World Heritage properties or in their buffer zone is being discussed for many cases and that policy advice is being developed, including with a proposed UNESCO Recommendation relating to Historic Urban Landscapes (see Document WHC-09/33.COM/7.1).

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.111

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.97**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes with appreciation the comprehensive efforts made by the State Party in the last year to respond to the decisions of the World Heritage Committee and the recommendations by the 2008 reactive monitoring mission;*
4. *Acknowledges the efforts of the State Party to modify the "Daugava Left-bank Silhouette Development Concept" in reducing the height and density of planned buildings, and re-locating these buildings farther from the water's edge, in ways which reduce the visual impact of the planned projects on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property;*
5. *Requests the State Party to provide a report on:*
 - a) *How the revised "Daugava Left-bank Silhouette Development Concept" project is implemented in terms of the existing legal framework for the preservation and*

- development of Old Riga and in the amended territorial planning regulations and how control mechanisms are guaranteed,*
- b) The progress on the five recommendations of the Council for the Preservation and Development of the Historic Centre of Riga on the Daugava river left-bank Silhouette Development conception as specified in the State Party's report,*
 - c) The progress on the additional view points of the visual analysis as suggested by the Council for the Preservation and Development of the Historic Centre of Riga as specified in the State Party's report;*
6. Encourages the State Party to apply a holistic planning approach for the city, at both a large and a small scale, fully taking into account the socio-economic impact of projects;
7. Also requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 mission report.

112. Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania) (C 541)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.79; 30 COM 7B.86; 32 COM 7B.99

International Assistance:

Total amount provided to the property: USD 114,550, including the organization of training workshops by ICCROM

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: Within the framework of the Revitalization Strategy for Vilnius, UNDP – SPPD provided USD 64,000

Previous monitoring missions

1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000: World Heritage Centre project missions; May 2005: World Heritage Centre site visit; December 2006: on-site regional seminar

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) High rise buildings which have an impact on the visual integrity of the property;

- b) Lack of an integrated management plan/system
- c) Need for adequate legal protection

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/541>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee, at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), while noting the State Party's efforts for the development of a Master/General Plan for the City of Vilnius; regretted that an integrated management plan for the property requested at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006) had not been produced, and reiterated its request that this integrated management plan be developed "to govern and co-ordinate all decisions affecting the Old Town development and conservation, through participatory consultation processes". The World Heritage Committee's Decision also requested that the State Party provide the "new Regulation on the Protection of the Vilnius Old Town, as well as the Master/General Plan and updated documentation on the development of high-rise buildings in the buffer zone for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies".

The State Party provided a report on 2 February 2009 which describes efforts undertaken in the last year to respond to the World Heritage Committee's request to develop an "integrated management plan" through development of an overall set of guidelines to develop mechanisms for improved co-ordination and integrated management of World Heritage properties in Lithuania, and an accompanying document for improving co-ordination and integrated management of the Vilnius Old Town World Heritage property. The report does not, however, contain the text of the Regulation on the Protection of the Vilnius Old Town, the Master/General Plan approved in 2007, nor updated documentation on the development of high-rise buildings in the buffer zone as requested in Decision **32 COM 7B.99**.

a) Development of the integrated management systems for World Heritage Sites in Lithuania

The State Party has organized a working group under the authority of the Prime Minister, to draft guidelines for the development of integrated management systems for all World Heritage sites in Lithuania. The guidelines entitled *Principles of the Coordination and integration mechanism for the World Heritage sites in Lithuania*, are now waiting to be approved by the government. The purpose of the guidelines are to define the roles of government institutions, civil society, and individuals which are involved in management of World Heritage sites in Lithuania.

The draft guidelines were submitted as an annex to the report of the State Party. These guidelines include the following steps:

- Understanding the existing management system in place,
- Ensuring integrated management with attention to four main areas: territorial integration of management; horizontal, inter-institutional, and multidisciplinary interaction; vertical coherence of management; and coherence between state institutions and local government and civil society,
- Developing "Statements of Significance" to understand the values, integrity, and authenticity of the site

- Developing day-to-day management tools such as regular monitoring, risk preparedness, capacity building, information and awareness activities, and determining necessary resources for those institutions participating in the site management.

The guidelines set up a commission for each site made up of the main responsible government authority at each property and other institutions who have involvement in some way in the management of the site, complemented by NGOs and civil society organizations. This commission is meant to meet at least once every three months to discuss issues arising from the management of the property. This commission is charged with monitoring and reporting on actions undertaken for the management of the property as well as discussing ways to mitigate impacts of potential threats. Finally an annual report is to be prepared to assess the effectiveness of activities undertaken, assess any changes that have occurred during the past year, and propose any necessary changes to improve the management system.

b) Development of the integrated management system for the Vilnius World Heritage property

Key information on how the guidelines are being applied in the Vilnius Historic Centre was provided in a document entitled: *Coordination and integration mechanism of the management system of Vilnius Historic Centre – a World Heritage Site*.

The document states that a, “Commission for Supervision of the Site Values and Coordination and Integration of Management of the Site” has been set up to oversee the management of the Vilnius World Heritage property. It also states that the commission has decided to respond to the needs of improving coordination and integration of the current management system by a continuously developing mechanism of collaboration instead of creating a one-off management plan.

The document provides basic information on the legal framework for planning in Vilnius and a framework for the territorial, vertical, and horizontal integration, without giving specifics of the institutions/organizations concerned. The document goes on to describe a number of the plans and strategies that have been developed in the last 15 years for Vilnius.

The document also describes the need for a better understanding of the significance of the site and proposes that an exercise be carried out in 2009 to create a more in-depth Statement of Significance.

Finally, the document outlines a workplan for 2009 which contains the three following activities: Elaboration of a the statement of significance, authenticity and integrity for Vilnius Old Town (to be completed by January 2010); Analysis of the current management system in Vilnius to evaluate its cohesion and its implications for the safeguarding the World Heritage site (no timeframe given); and Organization of the necessary institutional collaboration framework according to the Government-approved Guidelines for Coordination and Integration of the Management of the World Heritage properties in Lithuania (no timeframe given).

c) Other issues

As mentioned above, the requested texts of the “Regulation on the Protection of the Vilnius Old Town” and the updated documentation on the development of high-rise buildings in the buffer zone were not included in the State Party report. The State Party did report, however, that a broader bill concerning the protection of the UNESCO World Heritage in the Republic of Lithuania has been drafted and is currently in the process of being approved as per national procedures. No further details were provided about this new legislation.

Although regretting that the State Party has not submitted the requested information on the “Regulation on the Protection of the Vilnius Old Town” and the updated documentation on the development of high-rise buildings in the buffer zone, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies view the new guidelines as a positive first step to the provision of integrated management for the World Heritage properties of Lithuania, and in particular the Vilnius Old Town. While not constituting a management plan, the approach developed provides an ongoing means to monitor and adjust the complex local management system to ensure protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property. This approach is yet in the early stages of development but its principles and comprehensive approach to integration are highly commendable. Once tested, this approach may be a very useful model for management of other World Heritage cities.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies would like to clarify, however, that rather than a “Statement of Significance” as mentioned in the report, the State Party should be working on a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value as currently defined in Paragraph 155 of the *Operational Guidelines*. This Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be the basis for all of the conservation and management decisions taken at the property. Further, there is concern that while the State Party Guidelines for World Heritage properties in Lithuania promote the importance of citizens being given periodic opportunities to debate and redefine the particular heritage values, it is important to understand that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of a World Heritage property must be based on the values recognized at the time of inscription, including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, and can not be adjusted after inscription without the approval by the World Heritage Committee.

The World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies further point out that while the framework established by the State Party is a very positive first step, there is a need for the commission to begin its regularly scheduled meetings every three months, as described in the guidelines. The new commission would also need to establish a set of clear, conservation-based objectives and procedures, as well as a decision-making process which emphasizes the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Work on the development of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the additional analysis and evaluation of the existing management system are also necessary on a priority basis, in order to give the newly established commission the necessary information for discussion and decision-making. Finally the relation between the deliberations and decisions of the commission and the various plans and strategies in force (as described in the report) needs to be established with the aim of reconciling the various planning instruments to ensure an integrated approach to the management of the site.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.112

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.99**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not provide the documentation on the “Regulation on the Protection of the Vilnius Old Town” and the updated documentation on the development of high-rise buildings in the buffer zone as requested by the Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008);*

4. *Commends the State Party for the innovative quality of the guidelines proposed to improve coordination and integrated management of all World Heritage properties in Lithuania and the World Heritage City of Vilnius in particular, and encourages the State Party to continue to explore and develop this mechanism for full implementation;*
5. *Requests that the new commission for the property begin its regular work as soon as possible, with a clear set of conservation objectives and procedures, as well as a decision-making process which emphasizes the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
6. *Encourages the continued work on the development of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, based on the values recognized at the time of inscription, and the additional analysis and evaluation of the existing management system, and a proposal for reconciling the various planning instruments to ensure an integrated approach to the management of the property;*
7. *Reiterates its request for the State Party to submit the information requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session related to the legislation covering the property (including any new legislation), the planning instruments in force for the protection of the property, and the regulations concerning the construction of high buildings which may have an impact on the visual integrity;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the further development and implementation of the guidelines proposed to improve coordination and integrated management of World Heritage properties in Lithuania with particular reference to the Vilnius Old Town for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

113. City of Valletta (Malta) (C 131)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(i) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

N/A

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20,000 for Technical assistance for the preparation of a Master Plan for the City of Valletta, 1999

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

This property has never been reported on under State of conservation reporting; however, the following issues were mentioned in the Periodic Report of 2006

- a) Lack of definition of a buffer zone
- b) Changes in building heights might alter the city's skyline
- c) Major potential development of the new City Gate and the Opera house
- d) Development, visitor/tourism pressures
- e) Change of use of resident houses for business

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/131>

Current conservation issues

A state of conservation report was provided by the State Party on 3 February 2009 in response to a request from the Director of the World Heritage Centre, following information and complaints received by members of the Valletta community about a recently constructed 16 storey building on the Tigne peninsula. The State Party's report also refers to correspondence of 12 September 2007 and 1 July 2008 concerning the boundaries of the property and development within this boundary. It reiterates information provided the previous year.

The State Party report informs about conservation and restoration work that has been carried out by the State Party on important buildings and churches in Valletta since its inscription in 1980, leading to a revival of the city. It notes that substantial European Union Structural Funds will be dedicated to the restoration of part of the 16th century defenses of Valletta. Protective measures resulting from the enactment of the Planning Development Act and the Cultural Heritage Act are described, including the declaration of Valletta as an Urban Conservation Area, the scheduling of the most significant buildings and monuments and the designation of an Area of High Landscape Value, which includes the surrounding harbour fortifications.

The State Party advises that two large scale developments are proposed within the World Heritage property – an underground museum near St. John's Cathedral and an underground car park beneath Palace Square. Also, the State Party will begin plans for the rehabilitation of the entrance to the Capital City and the site of the Old Opera House.

A map showing the boundary of the property as implied in the Justification is provided. The boundary follows the outside line of the fortifications enclosing the city on its peninsula down to the shoreline.

Outside this is a designated Area of High Landscape Value but its extent is not clear in the documents as provided because the colouring does not show up. No buffer zone as such for the property is provided.

The 16 storey building that was the subject of the complaint is located in residential and commercial development on the Tigne peninsula across the harbour from the property. It is outside the property and outside the Area of High landscape Value. A photograph was

provided in the 2007 documentation taken from the Bighe peninsular looking across Valletta to the high building to support the State Party's claim that it does not detract from the intrinsic and immense cultural value of Valletta. The image as provided is insufficiently clear to enable any conclusion. The State Party refers to Local Plan policies in relation to views from Valletta and to the fact that the height of the proposed development was reduced to accord with these.

No reference is made in the State Party's report to height increases within the World Heritage property. However the 2007 documentation referred to the addition of penthouses to buildings within the boundaries of the property and a photograph showing some cases where this had been allowed was provided to support the State Party's claim that these height increases had marginal or no negative impact on streetscapes and views. The image as provided is insufficiently clear to enable any conclusion.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider:

- a) The information provided is insufficiently clear to allow an understanding of the impact of the recently constructed 16 storey building on the property, or of the proposed underground museum and car parks;
- b) There is a need for an overall declared buffer zone for the property, in which height restrictions are established on the basis of key views and vistas from within, and from outside across Valletta from adjacent peninsulas. The State Party should be invited to undertake a Views and Vistas Analysis from strategic viewing points as a basis for such height controls;
- c) There is a need for clear policies relating to height controls within the property in key areas, in order to protect streetscapes that contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of Valletta. The State Party should be invited to undertake a "Views and Vistas Analysis" within the property as a basis for such policies;
- d) Such analysis needs to be based on a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and identification of the attributes that carry that value.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.113

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Notes the boundary definition of the property as provided in the report by the State Party;*
3. *Requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *Provide a clear map showing the boundary of the property,*
 - b) *Establish a declared buffer zone in accordance with Paragraph 103 of the Operational Guidelines, with height controls around the property as a means of protecting the skyline configuration of the city and prepare a "Views and Vistas Analysis" from strategic points within and outside the property,*
 - c) *Establish clear policies in relation to height controls within the property as a means of protecting the skyline configuration of the city, by means of a "Views and Vistas Analysis" covering key areas and streetscape,*

- d) *Submit detailed information on the proposed large scale developments within the property to the World Heritage Centre in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
4. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2010, a state of conservation report on the issues above and in particular on the progress made with the establishment of a buffer zone and height controls within the property, together with information on the proposed large scale development projects.*

114. Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro) (C 125)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii) (iv)

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

1979-2003

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.84; 31 COM 7B.100; 32 COM 7B.101

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 46,000 (and Participation Programme 2002-04, USD 47,000)

Previous monitoring missions

2003: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission; January 2006: management planning Course; February 2008: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Earthquake damage
- b) Lack of management planning/system
- c) Inadequate legal system
- d) Accelerated urban development and urban pressure
- e) Proposed major bridge at Verige
- f) Lack of buffer zone –requested since 2003

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/125>

Current conservation issues

The main reason for the 2008 joint World Heritage Centre /ICOMOS mission was to consider the impact of the proposed Verige bridge across the estuary some 2.5km from Kotor. The mission also considered the overall conservation of the property and confirmed the accelerated pressure for development, noted after the mission in 2003, particularly from tourist facilities out of scale with traditional buildings. It also noted the lack of legal instruments, plans, resources, capacity and coordination between authorities to respond to this and the lack of a buffer zone (first requested after the 2003 mission) to protect the backdrop and wider foreground to Kotor, both areas that are so interrelated to the property that they should be considered together with it as an overall integrated cultural landscape. The World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) requested the State Party to respond to these issues.

The mission noted the potential damage that the proposed bridge would cause to the visual integrity of the property and requested that no further approvals should be given before a visual impact study has been undertaken and an adequate buffer zone has been put in place. It also requested the State Party to consider other options.

The State Party submitted a report dated 2 February 2009 which included a detailed progress report and also included 'location studies' on a proposed bypass road and locations for tourism development which have been reviewed by ICOMOS.. The State Party requested a response on the location studies to move forward with their decisions. A summary of ICOMOS's comments is included in this report.

a) Buffer zone

The progress reports recalls that no buffer zones were delineated during the nomination process and that Kotor and its bay covers a complex property including municipal territory, Kotor and Risan Bays and areas from three neighbouring municipalities. The boundaries were examined in 2008 and a working group has been set up under the authority of the Board for the World Natural and Cultural Heritage, which includes representatives of relevant ministries, institutions, and NGOs. This group will elaborate the boundaries of the buffer zone. No timescale has been set out. However it is said that a necessary precondition for the development of the buffer zone is the new Law on Cultural Heritage that is expected to be adopted in 2009.

The authorities also inform that following the report of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission of February 2008, a series of activities were initiated including a visit of two experts who came to Kotor on 22 January 2009.

b) Cultural Landscape

The World Heritage Committee, in 2008, invited the State Party to consider the possibility of nominating a wider area as a cultural landscape. The report states that this has been noted as a long-term goal.

c) Verige Bridge: environmental impact assessment

The States Party notes that a new project developed by the Ministry of Tourism with the German technical Cooperation Agency (GTZ) "Integrated Spatial Planning and Landscape Protection of Boka Kotorska Bay" includes environmental impact assessments of infrastructure projects. The report emphasized that the Ministry for Culture, Sports and Media will issue the official assessment of the Visual Impact Study of the Verige Bridge project which will then be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies.

The GTZ will also provide 50% of the funds for the study estimated at 50,000 Euros. An initial meeting was held on 23 January 2009 to coordinate the project at political and operational levels. At the time of the preparation of this document the study has not been received.

d) Verige Bridge: other options

The report does not detail any consideration of alternative options.

e) management plan

The State Party report also informed about the status of the management plan, which was submitted in February 2007, and was reviewed by the Advisory Bodies and by the February 2008 joint reactive monitoring mission. The mission recommendations are now being taken into account; however the coordination body for management has not yet been established as proposed.

f) Legal Framework

The legal and financial framework for the adoption and implementation of the management plan is expected to be established in 2009 and this should provide a basis for the management system. A new advisory group will be created to advise on urbanization issues and to ensure coordination between different development plans.

g) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The report noted that a draft statement for Outstanding Universal Value is in preparation.

h) Resources

It is anticipated that, in the future, the Regional Institute Kotor will receive national funds of 14,000 Euro per year. Approval for this is expected shortly. Its responsibility has been defined to cover all activities for cultural heritage conservation for the territories of Kotor, Tivat and Herceg Novi, in particular for research and conservation of the 516 registered monuments. The institute will also issue conservation guidelines and participate in the elaboration of development plans. The lack of staff still seems to be a serious problem, in particular in view of major foreign investments and planning activities of the municipalities.

The report concludes with an overview of archaeological research, movable heritage issues and restoration activities at monuments, including the St Pauls Church in the Town of Kotor, St Tryphon's Church in Morinj, Church of St Francis, Smekja and Sestokrilovic Plalaces in Perast as well as the cleaning of the city walls.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies welcome progress made, and note that a number of issues still have to be taken into account to fully implement all recommendations of the February 2008 joint mission. However they remain very concerned that the lack of adequate frameworks for conservation and management, as recommended by the mission, in the light of the continuing pressure for development.

ICOMOS has reviewed the material sent by the State Party on the proposed bypass and locations for tourism development.

i) Proposed bypass

The proposed road would run around all bay of Kotor and Risa, cutting through the vertical structure of the landscape approximately 90 meters above the existing road. It appears from plans provided that further tourist development would be associated with the road.

If it is carried out, the road would conflict irreversibly with the structure of the cultural landscape in the immediate setting of the property and could have a profound impact on its integrity.

ICOMOS notes that in spite of the decision by the Regional Institute to reject a hotel project at Morinj, the Municipality of Kotor has approved a new project with more hotels on the same site. It also notes that there are further developments planned for nearby bays. A full

delineation of the buffer zone needs to be completed before impact studies can be undertaken for future development projects.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.114

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.101**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes the follow-up activities to the February 2008 World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission to the property taking into account the key recommendations concerning the proposed bridge at Verige, the adoption and implementation of the management plan, and the coordination of conservation activities and development planning for the whole area of Kotor Bay;
4. Regrets that no coordination body has been established yet as recommended and requests the State Party to fully implement all recommendations in accordance with Decision **32 COM 7B.101**;
5. Welcomes that funding has been obtained to carry out the visual impact study of the proposed bridge at Verige with the German Technical Cooperation Agency (GTZ);
6. Expresses great concern at the proposed bypass road and associated tourist development and urges the State Party to suspend further consideration of this until a buffer zone has been established, with adequate protection, and management mechanisms have been put in place to allow full impact studies to be undertaken;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a copy of the visual impact study and information on the management system, including the establishment of a coordinating body as well as the implementation of the management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

115. Auschwitz Birkenau

German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp (1940-1945) (Poland) (C 31)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.88; 31 COM 7B.101; 32 COM 7B.102

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 20,000 (preparatory assistance, 1998) for the organisation of an international expert meeting on the planning and protection of the surroundings of the World Heritage Site Auschwitz Concentration Camp

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 10,000 from Israel

Previous monitoring missions

July 2001: joint Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee/World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; December 2006: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS site visit during the management seminar; May 2007: site management meeting

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of management plan;
- b) Slow process of consultation with local communities.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/31>

Current conservation issues

The State Party provided a report on 28 January 2009 in response to the World Heritage Committee's decision **32 COM 7B.102** including on the following issues.

Status of the management plan for the World Heritage property and its surroundings: The reported noted that the draft management plan, formally adopted by the Ministry of Culture had been provided to the World Heritage Centre in April 2007. The coordination of its implementation was entrusted to the National Heritage Board of Poland. As the authorities of Oswiecim objected to the document, it was decided to prepare a summary of the draft management plan and review areas of greatest concerns and reservations by stakeholders of Oswiecim and Brzezinka. Advice was sought by international experts and a meeting was held in May 2008 in Kraków and Oswiecim, which provided a detailed report for further action.

Despite the lack of an agreed and adopted version of the management plan, work continues, including on the preparation of a conservation strategy, to include principles of the protection and conservation of the World Heritage property and its surroundings on the basis of the valorization of structures and the landscape of historic significance; on the preparation of a comprehensive tourism management plan; and on areas of agreement and for building confidence among the stakeholders responsible for the protection, conservation and presentation of the World Heritage property and its surroundings. Efforts have been

undertaken for the development of a new web-site, a monthly magazine, TV information programmes and local cultural and educational activities. The establishment of a good collaboration between the conservator and local authorities and inhabitants has to be noted with a number of meetings held in September, October and November 2008. Negotiations with the Mayor also took place in December on procedures to enter further monuments into the register of monuments including preparatory activities for the potato and cabbage warehouses, the Birkenau railway siding and other areas. Work is in progress on the preparing of record cards for structures and sites based on the conservation strategy. The site contains 155 brick and wooden buildings and about 300 permanent ruins.

The presentation of this site is important, as the property was visited in 2008 by 1.1 million people. An international consultative group was established to set up a new exhibition, and to create an introductory exhibition as well as an art exhibition. A 3,5 ha area of a bus depot adjacent to the site was purchased for visitor services and a new car parking system will be established. Numerous educational and publication projects are under way, in particular by the Auschwitz Museum.

Concerning the construction of an expressway near the property, which was of concern to the international expert group of May 2008, the views were taken into account and a new variant of the expressway has been prepared (variant VI of S1) which would have little impact on the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.115

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.102**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes progress made with the conservation strategy and the negotiations concerning the register of additional areas in the register of monuments to further enhance the protection of the authenticity and integrity of the property;*
4. *Welcomes the new variant of the expressway S1 which takes into account the values, integrity and authenticity of the property and does not adversely impact on its Outstanding Universal Value;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to continue stakeholder and local community consultations towards the finalization of the management plan;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the status of the consultations, the management plan as well as the implementation of the conservation strategy.*

116. Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (C 723)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.81; 30 COM 7B.89; 31 COM 7B.116

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2000 and March 2006: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring missions;

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of comprehensive management plan;
- b) Lack of conservation of parks and palaces;
- c) Rapid encroachment by urban and infrastructure development;
- d) Tourism pressure;
- e) Lack of institutional coordination.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/723>

<http://www.parquesdesintra.pt/en/>

Current conservation issues

At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the World Heritage Committee took note of the Action Plan 2007-2009 provided by the newly designated management entity Parques de Sintra-Monte da Lua (PSML), supported by all public territorial institutions concerned. It also requested the State Party to ensure the continuous political and financial support of the site management entity so as to advance the preparations and elaboration of an integrated World Heritage Site management plan for 2010-2014 and to adopt improved measures to control urban encroachment in the core and buffer zones of the World Heritage property. The joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission of 2006 had reported that the conservation of the major palaces had been considerably improved while the main threats identified continued to exist.

The State Party provided an updated report on 19 March 2009 prepared by the responsible site-managing entity of Parques de Sintra-Monte da Lua (PSML). The report recalls the structure of PSML being a public company regrouping shareholders from all responsible national institutions as well as the Municipality of Sintra in its Board. It is further recalled that the company is in charge of the major palaces and parks of the Cultural Landscape of Sintra, to which the Palace of Pena and the hotel of Seteais have recently been added, corresponding to 40% of the territory of the World Heritage property

Based on its Action Plan 2007-2009 presented to the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), the responsible site-managing entity of PSML reports on a number of activities implemented over the last 2 years:

a) Legal and institutional framework

PSML has started a coherent analysis of land-use planning instruments, including an analysis of the forest management plan, in view of reviewing the boundaries of the property, delineating an urban development strategy for the World Heritage cultural landscape and its buffer and transition zones and defining their articulation with the protection requirements of the property;

b) State of conservation of the palaces and parks

PSML reports on continued conservation and restoration works carried out, which include rehabilitation of buildings in the parks, cleaning of forests and restoration of major palaces, partly funded through private grants;

c) Opening and interpretation of the parks and palaces

PSML reports on the increase in visitor numbers over the last years, about the development of site interpretation plans for visitors and additional tools being developed for improved visitor management.

While being a public company, it is noted that PSML is required to raise its own funds according to private company-principles. Mechanisms such as maximizing resources by increasing visitor numbers bear a considerable risk of over-exploiting the parks and palaces. The goal of PSML to increase visitation of its palaces and parks in the future has to be seen as potentially detrimental to their quality, and should therefore be reconsidered.

While there are commendable efforts to attract additional funding from Foundations and other sources for the rehabilitation and restoration of parks and palaces, in order to comply for example with the necessity for fire-prevention measures, it is however essential to ensure that any rehabilitation and preservation works be based on thorough scientific evidence and research.

It also needs to be underlined that the State Party report only covers activities carried out on a smaller part of the World Heritage property (40% of its territory), while no information is provided on activities and developments in the remaining part of it.

The analysis of the different territorial planning instruments carried out by PSML complements and updates the analysis done by the mission team in March 2006, showing that there is a variety of relevant legally binding documents which are not sufficiently coordinated.

The World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN consider that the coordination of all responsible entities continues to be deficient, bearing a continuous risk of incoherent decision-making. It is therefore suggested to set up a Steering Committee for the World Heritage property functioning as a platform for all stakeholders and as a clearing-house for World Heritage-related matters and decisions on the entire territory of the World Heritage property and its buffer-zone.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further inform that the municipality of Sintra has engaged into setting up a cooperation network with other World Heritage cultural landscapes, and to that purpose hosted an international conference in September 2008.

As emphasized by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in their reports in 2006 and 2007, continuous political and financial commitment as well as enhanced coordination mechanisms are required to ensure the coherence of the conservation work in the different parts of this World Heritage cultural landscape. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are concerned about the continued lack of such coordination mechanisms, requested since the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, representing an ongoing potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Lastly, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have been made aware of the continued rapidly growing urban encroachment both from the Lisbon area (neighboring municipalities) and from urbanization of the coastal areas (on the territory of the Sintra municipality) with increased traffic and large-scale infrastructure. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies express concern about their impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and the integrity of the property and recommend sending a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to assess the overall state of conservation of the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.116

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 7B.89** and **31 COM 7B.116**, adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006) and 31st (Christchurch, 2007) sessions respectively, and the detailed recommendations made by the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission of March 2006,*
3. *Takes note of the progress made in the implementation of the short-term Action Plan 2007-2009, in particular in the restoration and gradual opening of the palaces and parks;*
4. *Notes with serious concern the uninterrupted urban encroachment both on the territory of the property and its buffer zone and beyond it, as well as the pressure caused by increased visitation;*
5. *Expresses its concern about the continuing lack of coordination mechanisms involving all relevant stakeholders responsible for the management of the property and its buffer zone;*
6. *Strongly encourages the State Party to consider establishing a Steering Committee for the property in order to enhance coordination and coherent decision-making among all relevant stakeholders on the territory of the property and its buffer zone;*
7. *Urges the State Party to amplify its efforts, to set up a comprehensive management plan for the property clearly defining the roles of all relevant stakeholders, the conservation measures and development objectives for the property as well as the appropriate financial resources;*

8. *Further encourages the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property, as a sound basis for its management;*
9. *Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission to the property to assess the overall state of conservation of the property;*
10. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2010, a report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

117. Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1990

Criteria

(i) (iv) (v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.72 ; 31 COM 7B.88; 32 COM 7B.104

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 29,540 for Emergency Assistance (2003)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1992, 1993, 1994: ICOMOS mission; 2002: UNESCO/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission and on-site workshop; 2007: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Structural integrity of the Church of the Transfiguration
- b) Absence of an integrated management plan that addresses overall management of the World Heritage property
- c) Tourism development pressures affecting the property

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/544>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee, since its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), has requested the State Party to begin immediately necessary repair and restoration works for the Church of Transfiguration, and to confirm arrangements delegation of authority for these restoration works, as well as their funding. The World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) requested that the State Party provide a detailed progress report on the restoration works, and the draft integrated management plan for Kizhi Pogost including a tourism strategy, risk preparedness measures and maps indicating the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, all for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009, with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The State Party report, received on 30 January 2009, provides a comprehensive summary of activities which have taken place on the property during 2008. This report highlights the following positive actions undertaken by the State Party to benefit the property:

- Decree № 1633-p (7 November 2008) The Schedule of Measures on Preserving Kizhi Ensemble and developing infrastructure of the “Kizhi” Museum aimed at preservation (restoration, conservation and integral protection) of the monuments on Kizhi including those in the World Heritage property, including spending provisions to improve reliability of the Island’s power supply;
- Order № 282 (December 2008) concerning the preservation of the Kizhi Pogost architectural ensemble and development of infrastructure for the “Kizhi” Museum”;
- The report claims that these documents provide a basis for a plan for museum management including strategies of tourism development, risk preparedness and determination of the buffer zone borders, all now being realized;
- A Republic of Karelia Executive Order (to be approved in 2009) regulates the protected area borders, conditions for building use and management within the protected zone limits in order to protect the territory adjacent to the monuments from illegal activity.

The report also notes the following work carried out at Kizhi Pogost monuments in 2008:

Church of the Intercession: Weatherproofing of the octahedron and shingles, heat treatment of the damaged parts of the framework in the cellar and the refectory attic of the church, and improvements to the ventilation system in the attic;

Bell Tower: Heat treatment of the elements damaged by wood-borers, repair of the northern porch, and the cleaning of the space between two log frameworks to improve ventilation and prevent biodeterioration.

Church of the Transfiguration: Improving attention to monitoring and risk preparedness (fire control) equipment and systems, including creation of a working group focused on risk management, charged with preparation of a Disaster Risk management plan for Kizhi Pogost.

The report also makes reference to the publication of a set of guidelines (*“Maintenance of wooden architectural monuments”*), summarizing site experiences in adoption of the monitoring system and maintenance of wooden architectural monuments, and increasing attention given to exposing site news through all forms of local media.

However, as with reports submitted in previous years, this report prepared only by the site’s local management authority without any involvement of the national authorities, does not respond to the concerns and issues raised by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008).

The suggestion in the State Party report that the late 2008 Executive Order and Decree of the Russian Federation provide a basis for development of the requested integrated management plan illustrates that as in past years, the State Party has not understood the nature of the management instrument requested by the World Heritage Committee, nor the urgent need to prepare a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to ensure management decision-making and planning is rooted in respect for the site's World Heritage values.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are very concerned that the Federal authorities are still not involved in the process concerning the preparation and implementation of a comprehensive management plan for this property, which should include tourism development, an overall vision for the property as well as clear boundary and buffer zone definition (including the potential revision).

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies underline that the State Party did not establish a Special State Group requested by the World Heritage Committee and remind the importance of the participation of all stakeholders concerned at all levels to the process of the safeguarding, protection and management of the property, as well as the preparation of the state of conservation reports requested by the World Heritage Committee.

Given the ongoing severe structural deterioration, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies believe that it is of the utmost urgency that the State Party launches the necessary restoration works requested by the World Heritage Committee for more than a decade.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the values recognized in this property at its inscription are threatened by the lack of restoration actions and that this property should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.117

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.104**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Appreciating the continuing efforts by the Kizhi Museum Reserve to improve maintenance, monitoring and presentation of the World Heritage property,*
4. *Regrets that the State Party has not implemented any requested activities and strongly urges the State Party to establish a Special State Group in charge to coordinate the implementation of all World Heritage Committee's decisions concerning this property;*
5. *Expresses its deep concern over the continuing deterioration of the structural fabric of the Church of the Transfiguration;*
6. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to progress on all issues mentioned over a decade including the following documents:*
 - a) *Detailed report on the main restoration works,*
 - b) *Three copies of the draft integrated management plan for Kizhi Pogost including a tourism strategy (in particular with an accent on any eventual threat to the property from the fluvial tourism), risk preparedness measures,*

- c) *Revised and approved documents concerning protected areas of the Kizhi Museum Reserve including the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone;*
7. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, with a progress report on the implementation of the above mentioned activities, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010,*
8. ***Decides, in conformity with Paragraphs 177 and 179 of the Operational Guidelines, to inscribe Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) on the List of World Heritage in Danger;***
9. *Also requests the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a Desired state of conservation, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, a set corrective measures, as well as a timeframe for their implementation and to submit them to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

118. Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

119. Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

120. Historical Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation) (C 1170)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission)

121. Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1984; 2005

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.108

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

Construction of a high-speed train tunnel next to Sagrada Familia

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/320>

Current conservation issues

It is considered that the development of a large public infrastructure, the high-speed train tunnel, could threaten the structural stability of the Church of Sagrada Familia. The World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008) requested that the State Party halt the construction of the tunnel section in the vicinity of the Sagrada Familia and consider changing the route of the proposed high-speed train tunnel to avoid any potential adverse impact on the structural stability of the Church. The World Heritage Committee also requested the State Party to submit a detailed report on the measures taken to ensure the protection of the property.

On 22 January 2009, the State Party provided a detailed report describing the technical solution for the segment of the Sants-La Sagrera Tunnel in proximity to the Sagrada Familia Cathedral. The purpose of the report was to describe and demonstrate in detail the measures that have been adopted for the tunnel construction project with the purpose of safeguarding the integrity of the Cathedral. As background material, the report presents an administrative record of the project, details of the technical analysis carried out to date, contact details of four experts who were consulted, and the results of detailed contacts with the representatives of the Building Committee of the Cathedral.

The technical analysis was undertaken to guarantee the technical feasibility of the proposed solutions to allow the construction of the tunnel to occur in the immediate vicinity of the

Sagrada Familia Cathedral. It presents the evidence of the geological-geotechnical studies that were carried out; details behind the selection of the intended construction procedure using an earth pressure balance boring machine; details on the construction of the intended tunnel lining; the methodology and study of the potential for ground settlement; a study of the effects produced by vibration, and what is intended to be adopted to ameliorate these effects; details of a hydro-geological study in order to assess any possible casual effects on the level of the water table; and details of the ground survey plan which defines the type of measurement instrumentation required, and the placing of these, to monitor a variety of real measurements as work progresses in order to ensure that the movements are within predetermined quantitative limits.

The report also states that all of the consulted renowned experts confirmed the technical feasibility of the proposed solution. In addition, contact with the representatives of the Cathedral Building Committee was made to obtain the best possible background information for the project, and with the purpose of determining a solution based on consensus of all parties involved.

In offering a description of the solution which is to be adopted to minimise the impact of expected surface settlement in the vicinity of the Cathedral, the following characteristics have been determined: A tunnel boring machine is to be used for the excavation work, the railhead depth is located at 33 metres, while the crown of the tunnel is located at a depth of 25 metres, a retaining wall of casing piles, with an overall length of 230 metres, will be created on the side of the tunnel in closest proximity to the Cathedral, and the construction of an emergency exit is planned at the intersection of calle Mallorca and calle Sardenya diagonally across from the Cathedral.

The report emphasises that, due to the unusual loads transmitted by the Cathedral to the surrounding ground, during the preparation of the project special attention will be paid to the tunnel segment passing in near proximity to the Cathedral. In addition, particular attention was paid to the analysis of the surface movement and a number of options were studied to minimise, as much as possible, the potential of surface settlement at this point on the tunnel route.

As a result of analysing four different scenarios, the construction of screening piles on the side of the tunnel in closest proximity to the Cathedral was considered to be the best solution. It is intended that the piles will have a diameter of 1.5 metres and have a 2 metre separation between their centres. The piles are joined at the head by a beam with a thickness of 2 metres which, in turn, rests on a concrete block measuring 3 metres by 3 metres, resting on ground treated with an injected consolidating material. Noting the success of this solution in similar circumstances elsewhere, it is argued that this approach will lessen movement at the head of the piles (and in the immediate vicinity of the Cathedral).

From computerised theoretical and technical studies, it is expected that the level of vibrations from passing trains is within the restrictive levels required by legislation. In addition further mitigating measures, involving the installation of elastomers along the immediate length of the tunnel between the slab and the tracks, will further reduce the propagation of vibration.

The report concludes that all necessary administrative steps and technical analysis were implemented for the tunnel project. It also indicates that the study findings were satisfactory in all respects with special attention being paid to the results in the proximity of the Sagrada Familia Cathedral.

In addition, in order to ensure the integrity of the structures surrounding the work site an inspection of buildings in the proximity of the tunnel is currently being undertaken. Combined with proper monitoring protocols, in addition to the supplementary measures aimed at minimising the effect of the tunnel boring machine, it is concluded that the project is technically feasible. The submitted report concentrates on technically proving that the proposed alignment of the tunnel, its construction phases, the tunnel boring technology that will be used, and its eventual train running operations will not cause any significant damage

to the structure of the Sagrada Familia. No mention is made in the report of the possibility of halting the construction of the tunnel section in the vicinity of the Cathedral, or of the possibility of re-routing the tunnel further away from it.

Two staff of the World Heritage Centre had the occasion to visit the Cathedral jointly with the Chief Architect and the staff responsible of cultural heritage of the UNESCO Catalunya Centre during their mission to the World Conservation Congress (Barcelona, October 2008) and were informed of great concerns by the Chief Architect of the Cathedral about potential impacts due to vibrations and the instability of the ground.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that while the computerized studies may show a potential to bore a tunnel at this location, it should be a precautionary principle to avoid any potential threats to the World Heritage property. They encourage the State Party to consider alternatives and discussions with the responsible authorities of the project to avoid irreversible damage to the monument and any impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further note that no overall planning schedule or overview maps of the entire tunnel crossing of the city of Barcelona has been provided.

ICOMOS experts reviewed the technical material provided in the State Party report as a desk analysis. The construction techniques used by Gaudi for the Sagrada Familia reflect technology almost forgotten at the time: The Hangig Model which uses cords. It is known that such structures are very sensitive in case of differential settlement because of the change of geometry and thus the reserves of the structure are very limited. The Sagrada Familia, being a unique structure, should not be expected to be safe when vibrations are held within tolerances established for contemporary structures. Again such tolerances should not be left to computer simulations alone: in situ tests are also necessary. Detailed conclusions of the desk analysis have been sent to the State Party.

The only way to safeguard the Sagrada Familia with any degree of certainty is to move the location of the tunnel. Assuming however that such a recommendation is not feasible due to the planning and capital that has thus far been expended, it is essential that the proposed Tunnel Boring Method in connection with the Earth Pressure Balancing method should be described in more precise detail, and, as installation of the proposed retaining wall in itself may use damaging vibrations, this part of the project should be reviewed and monitored with the same detail as the tunnel installation.

Overall, it would be desirable for tunnel experts to carry out an independent check of the proposed solution.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.121

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.108**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008)*
3. *Regrets that no consideration has been given to halting the construction of the tunnel or to re-routing it further away from the Cathedral;*
4. *Urges the State Party to halt the tunnel project in order to allow a thorough analysis of its potential adverse impacts and possible alternative routing solutions;*

5. Encourages the State Party to invite an independent technical expert mission to the property in 2009, to review the project, its potential adverse impacts, possible irreversible damage to the structure of the Cathedral, possible alternative routing solutions, and if necessary, **the possibility of inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in conformity with Paragraphs 178-179 of the Operational Guidelines;**
6. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2010**, a detailed updated report on the project and possible alternative routing solutions for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

122. Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.92; 31 COM 7B.119; 32 COM 7B.109

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

March 2002: ICOMOS mission; February 2009: joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressure
- b) Lack of comprehensive management plan

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/381>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee expressed its concern about the lack of progress made with the integrated management plan for the property and about the changes made to the “Huerto de las Adoratrices” project. It requested that the State Party suspend the “Huerto de las Adoratrices” project until the results of an expert mission are available, and develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity.

On 29 January 2009, the State Party submitted an updated state of conservation report for the property. This report provides detailed background concerning the State Party’s efforts to initiate the integrated management plan requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session. The report further provides a detailed analysis of a thoroughly designed methodology intended to provide a flexible and practical planning instrument based on the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property. In its report the State Party informs that it has already launched the project and expects its completion at the end of 2009: *“Its objective is to be an integrative instrument that serves as a common reference framework for the actions to be taken by all the participating agents, and especially the Public Administrations. It will ensure the proper coordination of actions and take into consideration any possible problems that could arise. It will also incorporate the mechanisms required for self-assessment and error correction.”*

However, while the State Party provides project documentation for the projects at the “Huerto de las Adoratrices”, the report does not address the World Heritage Committee’s specific requests that the State Party suspend the las Adoratrices project until the results of an expert mission were available, and to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission took place from 11 to 13 February 2009 to evaluate the overall state of conservation of the property, its management requirements including clarification of its boundaries, as well as the “Huerto de las Adoratrices” project.

The mission noted a generally satisfactory state of conservation of the property, particularly as compared to the first mission in 2002, and significant planning and conservation efforts by the responsible local and regional authorities. The mission also noted that work on the integrated management plan is underway, coordinated by the Regional Government of Castilla and Leon, which also includes the preparation of the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

Concerning the revised project of the “Huerto de las Adoratrices”, the mission welcomed the efforts made by the developer and architects to reduce the volume and height of the building project but also considered that the project, despite its adaptation, would still negatively impact the integrity of the World Heritage property. The mission therefore recommended that the State Party be asked to *“seek another location for this project, the utility of which is not disputed”* as requested by the Committee in its Decision **26 COM 21B.69** (2006).

The mission further pointed out the need to base the management plan on research into the important attributes of the property in order to preserve its integrity and authenticity, and avoid unsuitable future alterations to its historic fabric including façadism.

The mission formulated the following specific recommendations:

- The mission recommended that the “Huerto de las Adoratrices” project be definitively stopped at its currently proposed location due its potential negative impacts on the

surrounding urban structure and monuments, and thus on the integrity and Outstanding Universal Value of the property;

- The mission recommended that the underground parking project at the “Plaza de los Bandos” be abandoned given the potential negative impact an increase in automobile traffic would have on the integrity of the property and its Outstanding Universal Value as well as the potential impact on the authenticity of this archaeologically sensitive area of the former Via de la Plata. The mission also suggested setting up an integrated traffic plan for the old town.

The mission further recommended:

- that the State Party consider possible modification of the boundaries of the inscribed property to include those urban areas which are related to its Outstanding Universal Value and which were previously omitted (a draft plan is included in the Annex of the joint mission report);
- that the State Party consider modification of the boundary of the buffer zone to fully include the historic town within the town walls of the middle ages, as well as the urban sector across the Rio Tormes with its important views of the World Heritage property, so as to increase protection of the property;
- that the State Party, in line with the binding regional legislation, elaborate a “*Special Plan*” which includes more restrictive measures for proposed modifications to the built environment. (The mission notes that Article 43 of the Law of 11 July 2002 and article 94 of the accompanying decree stipulate that towns should adopt “*Special Plans*” which guarantee maintenance of urban structure, architectural qualities and landscape silhouettes; the mission noted the importance of integrating the requirements of the Special Plan and the integrated management plan requested by the World Heritage Committee);
- that the State Party finalize as soon as possible the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value as a basis for the integrated management plan of the World Heritage property;
- that the local and regional authorities enhance the information flow and communication with local communities;
- that the local and regional authorities reinforce their efforts to promote the importance of the transmission of traditional restoration craftsmanship, in particular in relation to the city’s characteristic masonry work.

The report of the joint mission is currently being transmitted to the State Party for comments.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.122

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.109**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Requests the State Party to abandon the projects of the “Huerto de las Adoratrices” and the “Plaza de los Bandos”, given their potential negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property;

4. *Notes the work undertaken towards setting up the requested integrated management plan for the property, and asks the State Party to ensure the full integration of this planning instrument with the “Special Plan” for urban management mandated by regional legislation (2002);*
5. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to prepare, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, and to ensure that the draft Statement is fully taken into account in the preparation of the integrated management plan;*
6. *Urges the State Party to implement the recommendations made by the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission of February 2009;*
7. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a progress report on the efforts of the State Party to respond to the requests of the World Heritage Committee on efforts to implement the recommendations of the February 2009 mission report, and on the preparation of the integrated management plan, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

123. Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late information about potential threat)

124. Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission)

125. Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission)

126. L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C 865)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

127. Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

Criteria

(ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.74; 31 COM 7B.90; 32 COM 7B.112

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Construction proposals in the immediate vicinity of the Tower of London that could harm the setting, related vistas and integrity of the World Heritage property;
- b) Lack of an in-depth visual impact study on possible impacts of development projects, as well as the lack of an approved management plan;
- c) Lack of protection of the immediate surrounding of the Tower of London through an adequate and commonly agreed buffer zone; and statutory protection of the iconic view from the South Bank of the River Thames towards and beyond the Tower.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/488>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee noted the actions taken by the State Party in developing a management plan, starting to prepare guidance on methodology for assessing development in World Heritage views, and progress with protection to the view of the Tower from the South Bank.

However it regretted that no buffer zone with protection had been put in place and that no specific skyline study of the Tower, its setting and views, had been carried out, to allow assessments of the impact of development proposals and that there appeared to be lack of clarity on the management system set out in the management plan for addressing conflicts between conservation and development, particularly in the setting, resulting in large development projects with tall buildings continuing to be approved.

In the light of some progress made, the World Heritage Committee deferred consideration of the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger to its 33rd session in 2009.

The State Party submitted its progress report on the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee on 18 February 2009.

a) Buffer zone with protection

The report recalls that the 2007 management plan includes objectives in relation to managing the immediate setting of the Tower, and states that a sub-group of the Tower of London World Heritage Site Consultative Committee is working with all concerned to develop a design guide for the public realm, and ensure interested parties collaborate to assess the feasibility of preparing an assessment of the local setting. A brief for an assessment of the local setting has been prepared and agreed, funding secured from the sub-group for the first stage, a project manager appointed and a process of appointing specialist consultants in hand for them to be in place by spring 2009. There is no mention of the scope or extent of this local setting or how it will be protected.

b) Skyline study of the Tower, its setting and views

The report states that there is some confusion about the skyline study for the property which has long been overtaken by the work related to the London Views Management Framework and on a dynamic visual impact study (in response to Decision **31 COM 7B.90**). In rehearsing a variety of related initiatives taken during the period of 2001 - 2007 the report notes that the State Party had no discussions with the World Heritage Centre or the World Heritage Committee what form such a study might take, or what purpose it might serve, and had not committed to undertake a Skyline Study. The State Party therefore requests that any reference to "Skyline Study" be omitted from future draft Decisions.

No update is provided on progress with the Dynamic Visual Impact Study, although the report indicates that an explanation of how such a Study fits within the United Kingdom planning system is currently being considered. This has the aim of articulating the process for assessing the potential visual impact of a development proposal on a London World Heritage property within the context of other studies affecting relevant planning applications so that they avoid duplication and maintain clarity. The report notes that the publication of English Heritage's "Seeing the History in View: a method for Assessing Heritage Significance within Views" is underway and applies to heritage sites generally. It included "The City Hall to Tower of London World Heritage Site protected View" case study for information.

The London Views Management Framework, which is supplementary planning guidance, is being reviewed. The review will seek to strengthen and protect a view of the Tower from the south bank and will provide clearer guidance about what type of development should or should not occur in this part of the setting of the property.

c) Management system/management plan

The report notes that all United Kingdom World Heritage properties have management plans, many of which are going through revision. It states that the current Tower of London World Heritage Site management plan has been agreed and endorsed by all relevant stakeholders. They state that it is this group which provides a mechanism to identify and address conflicts

arising that affect the protection and management of the property, although ultimately they need to be resolved through the formal planning framework.

d) Large development projects

The report indicates that when the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited London in 2006 it was demonstrated that the Tower of London was being managed to the highest standard. The State Party also emphasised at the time that the London skyline was a diverse mix of architectural styles, charting the development of the capital over two millennia, and that restricting economic development would be detrimental to London and its heritage. Specifically, in relation to the Tower of London, the State Party recognises the need to protect the setting from development impacts, but notes that they are aware that not all tall buildings are inappropriate. They also state that it is not possible under the United Kingdom planning scheme to withhold final approval if all other stages of the planning procedure have been completed. The State Party reports significant progress with the London Plan Spatial Development Strategy and the London Views Management Framework which takes into account the potential impact of large development proposals on London World Heritage properties and offer more protection to the views of London's landmarks.

e) Continued approval of development projects with tall buildings

The State Party reports that whilst policies for the protection of the property are in place they are still looking for opportunities to reinforce and clarify this level of protection. The State Party notes that in relation to individual applications the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government follows strict proprietary guidance. In taking a balanced approach to all development proposals Communities and Local Government consider that there is a good case for growth and development which need not be at the cost of heritage.

London Bridge Tower (Shard of Glass): With planning permission for the 66 storey tower granted in November 2003, demolition of existing buildings on the site is proceeding.

Potter's field – Southwark: Planning permission was granted in 2006, for a development of eight elliptical tower's ranging between 12 and 19 storeys high on a site, opposite the Tower of London, part-owned by Southwark Council. A new design for a mixed-use development has been prepared, 4 to 18 storeys, comprising up to 500 residential units, non-residential floor space, communal and associated car and cycle parking. It is understood that a planning application is expected to be submitted in 2009.

Bishopsgate Tower (The Pinnacle): Approved in 2006, demolition on site has been completed and piling is well advanced. Subject to available funding it is intended to proceed with construction of the building. There is no information on the completion date.

20 Fenchurch Street (The Walkie Talkie): Permission was granted in 2007 following a public inquiry. Demolition is complete but it has been reported that construction will not commence in the current market.

Aldgate Bus Station Site: In 2007 the Historic Royal Palaces wrote to the City of London noting that the proposed application would appear in the background to views of the Tower of London from City Hall and Queens Walk. The application was amended to reduce the mass of Building 2. The City of London granted planning permission subject to various matters. It seems not likely that work starts in the near future.

f) Protection:

The State Party previously informed of the publication of a draft Heritage Protection Bill but notes that, whilst the Government remains committed to introducing this legislation, it has been delayed until a legislative slot becomes available. In the meantime a number of reforms to the system are being pursued without the need for legislation including:

- Since 1 October 2008, World Heritage properties have been included in Article 1(5) land designation in the General Permitted Development Order. This means that certain

permitted development rights are withdrawn to give more control over small-scale changes which could incrementally have an adverse effect on the Outstanding Universal Value.

- In Spring 2009 specific notification and call-in requirements for significant development affecting World Heritage properties will be introduced where English Heritage have objected on the grounds that a proposed development could have an adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and significance of a World Heritage property and has been unable to withdraw that objection following discussions.
- A new planning circular on World Heritage with an accompanying English Heritage guidance note is due to be published in Spring 2009. These documents will emphasise the key role planning authorities have in protecting World Heritage properties through policies in regional and local level Plans

g) The London Plan

The reports states that the new Mayor of London has since 2008 indicated his commitment to World Heritage properties and that tall buildings will be required to respect the context of the area in which they are to be located, protect and enhance the environment, meets sustainable design standards and be of outstanding architectural quality. Furthermore the Mayor is reviewing the 2004 London Plan to ensure that all new buildings are of a highest standard of design, relevant to their context and sensitive to heritage, archaeology and local character. A draft of the revised London Plan will be published for public consultation in 2009.

h) Counter-terrorism measures

Within the context of the management plan work is underway to enhance the counter terrorism defences at the Tower against vehicle penetration.

i) The White Tower

Conservation and repair work is underway on the White Tower to clean, repair and conserve external elevations and carry out roof repairs. The project will be completed in 2010.

The State Party notes that it is continuing to protect the property, its setting and related vistas, and that the Committee should consider the removal of a reference to "in danger listing" from the Decision on the Tower of London World Heritage property.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that there seems to be considerable continuing difficulty in reconciling the needs of the World Heritage property and that of a functioning city. Misunderstanding or misinterpretations regarding the need or otherwise for a Skyline Study appear to have been running for some time before the State Party has attempted in the current report to have the issue omitted from future draft Decisions. This is argued on the basis of other related work which has progressed. An integrated approach to World Heritage planning considerations in London inevitably links the Tower of London with the Palace of Westminster World Heritage property issues, further adding to the complexities involved.

Although the overall impression from the State Party report is that developments involving high-rise structures will continue to be an issue affecting the World Heritage property, some emphasis is being put on the changes being brought about by the new Mayor of London. However currently there is no clearly defined overall planning structure that would appear to bring together all needed constraints, nor is a protected buffer zone yet in place.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.127

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.112**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes the information provided by the State Party, in particular that the work is progressing on a brief to define a local setting, for the final publication "Seeing the History in View: a method for Assessing Heritage Significance within Views" in 2009, and that considerations are underway on how a Dynamic Visual Impact Study fits within the planning system, and that a draft revised London Plan is to be published for public consultation in 2009;
4. Regrets that a buffer zone with protection has still not been put in place;
5. Also regrets that there is no overall study of the setting of the Tower yet in place that would allow a full impact assessment of proposed development;
6. Requests the State Party to ensure that:
 - a) The original intentions of the suggested "Skyline Study" are incorporated in related work being progressed as part of the Dynamic Visual Impact Study and the London Views Management Framework,
 - b) The new Mayor's review of the supplementary planning guidance, the London Views Management Framework, fully takes into account the relevant views of the November 2006 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission,
 - c) The sub-group of the Tower of London World Heritage Site Consultative Committee, fully considers the need for protection of the immediate surrounding of the Tower of London through an adequate and commonly agreed buffer zone;
7. Urges the State Party to progress towards a buffer zone as soon as possible and bringing together guidance on visual impact in order to put in place a coherent approach;
8. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property and on the steps taken to implement the recommendations set out above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011, **with a view to considering, in the absence of substantial progress, the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

128. Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom) (C 426)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.74; 31 COM 7B.91; 32 COM 7B.113

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Construction proposals in the immediate vicinity of Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church that could have an adverse impact on the setting, related vistas and integrity of the property;
- b) Lack of an in-depth visual impact study on possible impacts of development projects, as well as the lack of an approved management plan;
- c) Need for a protection of the immediate surrounding of the property through an adequate and commonly agreed buffer zone.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/426>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee noted that the State Party had demonstrated its commitment to comply with the requests of the World Heritage Committee (Decision **31 COM 7B.91**) to protect the property, its setting and related vistas, but that the following issues still need to be addressed: the buffer zone with adequate protection; the specific skyline study of the property, its setting and views, to allow rapid in-depth assessments of the impact of development proposals in the immediate vicinity of the property, and lack of clarity on the management system set out in the management plan for addressing conflicts between conservation and development, particularly in the setting of the property. The State Party submitted a progress report on the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee on 25 February 2009 highlighting the following:

a) *Buffer zone*

With regard to the buffer zone and adequate protection, the State Party notes paragraphs 103 and 106 of the *Operational Guidelines* and indicates that it does not believe that buffer zones are necessary in every case, particularly where adequate layers of protection already exist. Noting that this has been endorsed by the World Heritage Committee, in the case of Westminster the State Party will be considering the establishment of a buffer zone in the light of discussions following on from the emerging Dynamic Visual Impact Study (DVIS), and further analysis of the five selected views. The State Party notes that any proposal to establish a buffer zone would be considered as part of the broader spatial planning process, and, if necessary could be supported by the statutory planning framework.

b) Skyline study/Dynamic Visual Impact Study

The State Party provided an update on work being undertaken on a methodology for assessing development in World Heritage views. It notes that a publication "Seeing the History in the View: a method for Assessing Heritage Significance within Views" was published for consultation by English Heritage in April 2008. The final publication is expected by mid-2009, and aims to explain how English Heritage intends to assess the historical significance of views in a replicable, consistent and systematic way – not only for World Heritage properties. This method of assessment is intended to help clarify the heritage aspect of the planning process, and promote national consistency.

The State Party also indicates that an explanation of how a DVIS fits within the United Kingdom planning system is currently being considered. This has the aim of articulating the process for assessing the potential visual impact of a development proposal on London World Heritage property within the context of other studies affecting relevant planning applications, so that they avoid duplication and maintain clarity.

The Westminster World Heritage Site DVIS steering group selected five views considered to best encapsulate the Outstanding Universal Value of the property for assessment using the draft methodology set out in "Seeing the History in the View". Public consultation helped to refine the methodology and five baseline view assessments are currently being considered by the steering group. Work is continuing on the next step to review the existing protection of the Westminster World Heritage property to determine if this needs to be enhanced to sustain and protect the Outstanding Universal Value.

The report states that they believe that there is some confusion about the skyline study for the property. They indicate that this has long been overtaken by the work currently being taken forward as part of the London View Management Framework,(see below) and on a dynamic visual impact study, which will include an assessment of the skyline of the property. The State Party notes that they had not made any commitment to undertake such a skyline study for Westminster although it subsequently undertook to carry out a dynamic visual assessment study to facilitate thorough and rapid assessment of future planning applications for the property. The State Party therefore requests that any reference to "Skyline Study" be omitted from future draft Decisions.

The London Views Management Framework is being reviewed to enhance protection of views of the Palace of Westminster (and one for the Tower of London). The review will seek to strengthen and protect two views towards the Palace of Westminster and will provide clearer guidance about what type of development should or should not occur in these views.

c) Management system

The report notes that all United Kingdom World Heritage properties have management plans, many of which are going through their revisions. It states that the current Westminster World Heritage Site management plan has been agreed and endorsed by all relevant stakeholders. The Westminster World Heritage Site Liaison Steering Group provides a mechanism to identify and address conflicts arising that affect the protection and management of the

property, although ultimately they need to be resolved through the formal planning framework.

d) Protection

The State Party previously informed of the publication of a draft Heritage Protection Bill but notes that, whilst the Government remains committed to introducing this legislation, it has been delayed until a legislative slot becomes available. In the meantime a number of reforms to the system are being pursued without the need for legislation including:

- From 1 October 2008, World Heritage properties have been included in Article 1(5) land designation in the General Permitted Development Order. This means that certain permitted development rights are withdrawn to give more control over small-scale changes which could incrementally have an adverse effect on Outstanding Universal Value;
- In Spring 2009 specific notification and call-in requirements for significant development affecting properties will be introduced where English Heritage have objected on the grounds that a proposed development could have an adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and significance of a property and has been unable to withdraw that objection following discussions;
- A new planning circular on World Heritage with an accompanying English Heritage guidance note is due to be published in Spring 2009. These documents will emphasise the key role planning authorities have in protecting World Heritage properties through policies in regional and local level Plans.

e) Continued approval of development projects with tall buildings

The State Party recognises the need to protect the setting from inappropriate development, but notes that they are aware that not all tall buildings are inadequate. The State Party notes that the policy of the Spatial Development Strategy for London requires Borough's development documents to "contain policies that protect [World Heritage properties] significance and safeguard, where appropriate, and their settings", and requires all development proposals to take account of World Heritage Site management plans. Furthermore it notes that the policy has been reinforced by the London View Management Framework. The report also notes that Westminster Abbey and Parliament Square Conservation Area Audit, adopted in 2008 includes a map to show important views in the conservation area/World Heritage property and that draft supplementary planning documents for Waterloo and Vauxhall recognise the World Heritage property. In addition, the State Party indicates adopted conservation area appraisals designed to assist with the management and enhancement of the conservation areas to demonstrate the Local authorities' commitment to taking account of the Outstanding Universal Value for South Bank, Waterloo, Roupell Street, Lower Marsh, Mitre Road and Ufford Street. The State Party notes that London Borough's are important players in protecting World Heritage properties through Local Development Frameworks and, previously, through Unitary Development Plans they have policies to protect the integrity of such sites. In reaching a decision the Secretary of State takes a balance approach to all development proposals, including consideration of whether there is a good case for growth and development which need not be at the cost of the heritage.

f) The London Plan

The reports states that the new Mayor of London has since 2008 indicated his commitment to World Heritage properties and that tall buildings will be required to respect the context of the area in which they are to be located, protect and enhance the environment, meet sustainable design standards and be of outstanding architectural quality. Furthermore, the Mayor is reviewing the 2004 London Plan to ensure that all new buildings are of highest standard of design, relevant to their context and sensitive to heritage, archaeology and local character. A draft of the revised London Plan will be published for public consultation in autumn 2009.

The report also covers the following specific development proposals:

Doon Street Tower, Lambeth: The original 48 storey residential tower was revised in an application received by Lambeth in early June 2007 when the tower was reduced to 43 storeys. The application was approved in August 2007 and submitted to the Government Office London. In September 2008 English Heritage and Westminster City Council issued a joint legal challenge to that decision, and a Court hearing is likely to take place later in 2009.

Beetham Tower proposal, 1 Blackfriars Road, Southwark: The planning application for a mixed-use scheme including a 68 storey tower block was submitted in 2005, followed by a new application in 2006 which included a reduced height tower of 180m. This was approved by the Council in 2006 and submitted to the Government Office London (GOL) as a departure. Following discussions a revised application reducing the tower height by one story, to 170m, was submitted to the GOL in February 2008. This was called in with an inquiry running during September/October 2008. The Inspector's report has been submitted to the Secretary of State who is currently considering it.

20 Blackfriars, London SE1: Proposals include a 148m and 109m tower, separated by a piazza. The application was submitted to Southwark Council in 2007, and was called in during May 2008. An inquiry ran in September/October 2008, and the Inspector's report has been submitted to the Secretary of State who is currently considering it.

Regeneration proposals for land north of Victoria Station, City of Westminster: The Victoria area is designated as an Opportunity Area in the London Plan. An initial planning application was submitted in July 2007 and, following concerns about the height, a revised proposal was submitted in October 2008. The proposals comprise three planning applications with demolition of buildings, and mixed-use redevelopment with six new buildings, up to 16 storeys. Constraints were imposed by works associated with the Victoria Station London Underground upgrade. Westminster Council considers that the building heights and massing have been significantly reduced from the previous scheme, and resolve to approve the application in February 2009. The Council has advised that, in their view, the scheme has no impact on views of the World Heritage property.

Sky Gardens, Vauxhall: Permission was granted in November 2008 for a scheme comprising a 35 storey tower rising to 120m, with an attached three to six storey tall podium.

Redevelopment of Elizabeth House (adjacent to Waterloo station), Lambeth : Two office towers and one residential tower, "the Three Sisters", has been redesigned with a 33 storey residential tower of 117m, and office towers of 27 and 22 storeys. English Heritage and Westminster City Council has requested call-in, partly because of the potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the Westminster World Heritage property and its setting. The application was called in during October 2008, and an inquiry is due to open on 15 April 2009.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note the progress that has been made to begin to develop a methodology on views which will lead to a DVIS based on five selected views.

However they note that no progress has been made yet with a buffer zone, but that it is stated that this could follow on from the DVIS. The State Party considers that the request for a skyline study is not necessary as they have not committed themselves to this and also that this has been overtaken by the London Views Management Framework. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS do not consider that these two instruments are the same: the skyline study would consider the overall profile of the landscape around the property, while the London Views Management Framework considers a small number of selected views.

The State Party reports that the Westminster World Heritage Liaison Steering Group provides a mechanism to identify and address conflicts arising in relation to protection and management of the property which have to be resolved through the planning process. The

number of outstanding planning issues seem to demonstrate that process does not appear to deliver satisfactory solutions, and the status of the setting of the property remains uncertain.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body consider, notwithstanding the reiteration of the role of London boroughs in protecting the property and the future strengthening of protection for all World Heritage properties outlined in the report that the lack of a buffer zone and of a completed DVIS is working against the protection of the property. Several of the building projects appear to have been approved although they impact negatively on the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.128

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.113**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes that work was at an advanced stage on the visual impact study as requested, that "Seeing the History in View: a method for Assessing Heritage Significance within Views" is expected to be published in 2009, and that the Westminster World Heritage property Dynamic Visual Impact Study Steering Group selected five views considered to best encapsulate the Outstanding Universal Value of the property for assessment using the draft methodology set out in "Seeing the History in the View", and acknowledges that any reference to a "Skyline Study" be omitted from future Decisions;*
3. *Requests the State Party to ensure that:*
 - a) *The original intentions of the suggested "Skyline Study" are incorporated in other related work being progressed as part of the London Views Management Framework,*
 - b) *The review of the supplementary planning guidance, and the London Views Management Framework, fully takes into account the relevant recommendations of the November 2006 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS mission,*
 - c) *In considering the establishment of a buffer zone in the light of discussions following on from the emerging Dynamic Visual Impact Study, further analysis of the five selected views, and as part of the broader spatial planning process, the World Heritage Centre be informed of the outcome, and the agreed and protected buffer zone be submitted for approval by the World Heritage Committee as soon as possible,*
 - d) *The World Heritage Centre receive copies of relevant documents as they emerge, including "Seeing the History in the View: a method for Assessing Heritage Significance within Views" due in 2009, "Metropolitan Views" draft supplementary planning guidance to be revised in 2009, as well as the revised "London Plan" to be published for public consultation in autumn 2009;*
4. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2011**, a progress report on the issues above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

129. Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom) (C 373)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.88; 31 COM 7B.104; 32 COM 7B.114

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of closure of the A344 and the "A303 Stonehenge Road Improvement scheme"
- b) Lack of visitor management

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/373>

Current conservation issues

At the time of the inscription of the property in 1986, the World Heritage Committee '*noted with satisfaction the assurances provided by the authorities that the closure of the road which crosses the avenue at Stonehenge (A344 road) was receiving serious consideration as part of the overall plans for the future management of the property*'. However, a series of delays have since taken place regarding the road closure and in long overdue improvements to visitor access to the Stonehenge part of the property, its presentation to visitors, and to the setting of the monuments. In consequence, the World Heritage Committee has repeatedly urged the State Party to address these issues as a matter of priority.

On 31 January 2009, the State Party submitted its report. It had announced in December 2007 that it intended to deal with progress on the closure of the road, visitor management and access as a matter of priority. A Project Board chaired jointly by the Minister for Culture and the Minister for Roads was then quickly formed to oversee the development of the revised management plan for the property, and to develop firm proposals for environmental improvements, new visitor facilities and the closure of the A 344 road past Stonehenge itself, stating its commitment to complete these improvements by 2012.

a) Visitor facilities

Since cancellation of the previous scheme for a large visitor reception building outside the property at Countess East in December 2007, (as a result of the dropping of the A 303 road improvement scheme due to increased costs), the report states that considerable progress has been made to expedite the long overdue improvements to visitor access to the Stonehenge part of the property, its presentation to visitors, and to the setting of the monuments. No details are provided.

However it is stated that the Project Board in January 2009 made an agreed recommendation to Government Ministers on the way forward. This is now being considered, and Ministers hope to make an announcement shortly. The World Heritage Centre will be updated on progress, as and when it occurs.

b) management plan:

Facilitated by English Heritage a revision of the management plan had been carried out by the Stonehenge World Heritage Site Committee during 2008. The revision process involved a wide stakeholder group through the Stonehenge Advisory Forum, and included a three-month public consultation period involving an exhibition, a questionnaire, a website, and a mailing to local residents. Published in January 2009, the stated priorities for the period 2009 - 2015 including to:

- Maintain and extend permanent grassland to protect buried archaeology, and to provide an appropriate setting for upstanding monuments;
- Remove or screen inappropriate structures or roads, in particular the A344, and keep the A303 improvements under review ;
- Enhance the visitor experience by 2012 by providing improved interim facilities

The State Party confirmed that conservation works to Silbury Hill were completed on 6 May 2008, and an archaeological monograph, setting out the repair methods and associated archaeological discoveries is in the course of preparation.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS acknowledge that progress has been made, but that this has principally been administrative, involving the production of a revised management plan, consultation procedures, the setting up of developmental groups, and Ministerial consideration. Little physical progress to resolve the concerning issues has occurred on the ground in the property. A revised target date of 2012 has now been set to achieve them, with promises to keep the World Heritage Centre informed of progress as it occurs.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.129

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.114**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Regrets that the State Party continues to make little progress in the urgent resolution of the significant A344 road closures and visitor facility issues at the property, despite assurances made as long ago as 1986;
4. Requests that the State Party keeps the World Heritage Centre informed of any progress, particularly the Ministerial announcement, as it occurs;

5. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011** a report on progress made on the road closure and visitor facilities, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

130. Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.93; 31 COM 7B.121; 32 COM 7B.115

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

October 2006: World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressure;
- b) New constructions in the area surrounding the property;
- c) Lack of strategic plans for future development that set out clear strategies for the overall townscape and for the skyline and river front taking into account the townscape characteristics and important views related to the property and its buffer zone;
- d) lack of awareness of developers, building professionals and the wider public about the World Heritage property, its Outstanding Universal Value and requirements under the *World Heritage Convention*;

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1150>

Current conservation issues

At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) the World Heritage Committee noted the progress that had been made in developing supplementary planning guidance which will clearly

establish and respect prescribed heights; define the townscape characteristics, wider values (building density, urban patterns and materials) and sense of place; suggest how design briefs can incorporate characteristics and qualities of the property. The World Heritage Committee also noted that work has been undertaken to raise the profile of the property and inform the general public about its Outstanding Universal Value and its management. It urged the State Party to complete and approve the Supplementary Planning Document as soon as possible, and to supplement this Document with the development of strategic plans for the overall townscape and for the skyline and river front – as highlighted by the 2006 World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and reinforced by the comments of the Urban Panel – in order to achieve the highest quality, and to ensure sustainable development.

The State Party submitted a report on 1 February 2009 which offered an update on the developments of the new Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Liverpool. The report confirms that proposed buildings which are tall in relationship to others in the immediate vicinity should not be allowed within the World Heritage property. It noted that this formalises the policy that had been applied in practice since inscription, and fulfils the condition of inscription under paragraph 3a) of the World Heritage Committee's Decision **28 COM 14B.49**. It also states that the public consultation draft SPD provides guidance on developments within the defined setting of the World Heritage property and recognises that the emerging cluster of tall buildings to the north-east of the Pier Head, and on the southern gateway to the city, should be regarded as acceptable locations for further tall buildings subject to strict criteria on the basis that they will not have an adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, nor on key views of or within it, and are therefore likely to be permitted. The guidance in the SPD is that tall buildings in other parts of the setting will be inappropriate and discouraged.

The State Party indicates that the SPD also addresses the management issues raised by the Committee in paragraphs 3(b) and 4(b) of Decision **31 COM 7B.21** and paragraph 3b and 3c of Decision **32 COM 7B.115** concerning the analysis and description of townscape characteristics relevant to the Outstanding Universal Value, important views and the need to adhere to these characteristics, wider values and sense of place.

The detailed character analysis and supplementary planning guidance for Lower Duke Street and the wider Ropewalks areas, published in 2005 will be cross referred to the SPD for the wider World Heritage property. The work confirms that the World Heritage properties do not have an overall harmony of urban design and that this is an important characteristic as it represents the organic growth of the city over 800 years, thereby embracing a wide range of building materials and styles. The SPD adopts the challenge of setting out a policy framework which will allow this diversity of character to flourish whilst being sufficiently robust to ensure that development does not respond adequately to the historic context is not allowed.

The State Party reports that action is being taken to ensure that Design Briefs and Master Plans for new development take into account the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property. Much successful work along the waterfront has already been based upon comprehensive master plans for large development sites. This issue is partly covered by the SPD in relation to the overall townscape, and the protection of the skyline and waterfront, through offering principles to inform the preparation of development briefs and design proposals. In addition, the SPD places responsibility on applicants to demonstrate that their proposals have responded to the appropriate context.

Initiatives taken by the Liverpool City Council and other partners during 2008 include -

- Publication of books by English Heritage on Liverpool's Historic Environment;
- Organization of a major international conference on Culture, heritage and regeneration of port cities, held in November 2008. Proceedings will be published in due course;

- Participation in International World Heritage Day with tours and the launch of a "Uncover a UNESCO World Heritage" interactive CD;
- Joining a network of 10 European cities in the EU funded URBACT project Heritage as an opportunity aimed at developing and sharing good practice in the preparation of integrated cultural heritage management plans;
- Holding a Royal Institute of British Architects symposium in April 2008 to help architects understand the implications of World Heritage inscription;
- English Heritage's continued commitment (exemplar Historic Environment of Liverpool Project);
- National Museums Liverpool's commemoration of the involvement in the Trans-Atlantic slave trade and in opening the new International Slavery Museum at Albert Dock. It is currently developing World Heritage content for the forthcoming Museum of Liverpool.

The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was commissioned by Liverpool City Council in 2007 with financial support of others at a cost of £110,000. When available in March 2009 a copy will be sent to the World Heritage Centre.

The State Party reports that whilst it was not possible to finalise the draft SPD in time for the World Heritage Committee's 32nd session a text-only draft has now been approved by Liverpool City Council in December 2008 for public consultation in March 2009. In the interim, the draft SPD has been adopted for the purposes of development control, and a fully illustrated final version is expected to be sent to the World Heritage Centre in March 2009. The State Party notes the World Heritage Committee's Paragraph 4c of Decision **31 COM 7B.121** concerning public understanding about the management of the site, and will allow appropriate time for public consultation on this statutory document. On the current programme, the final version of the SPD is expected to be formally adopted by Liverpool City Council before the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee in June 2009.

The SDP guidance which relates to the property and its buffer zone covers the following issues: General Design Guidance, Public Realm, Views to, from and within the property, Riverside Development, Tall buildings, Dock Water Spaces;

The guidance which relates solely to the property covers: Building Heights in the property; Replacement of existing buildings; Re-use of historic buildings; Historic Buildings at Risk; Roof-scapes and Attic Extensions; Archaeology; Conservation Works.

The State Party reports that the SPD provide specific guidance on the need to consider the waterfront as a whole and to protect the skyline. It also confirms that the relationship between the River Mersey and the property is a fundamental aspect of its Outstanding Universal Value.

The State Party also reports on progress on the improvement of the protection of World Heritage properties in England through changes to the planning system, including the draft Heritage Protection Bill. In the meantime a number of reforms to the system are being pursued without the need for legislation including:

a) From 1 October 2008 World Heritage properties have been included in Article 1(5) land designation in the General Permitted Development Order. This means that certain permitted development rights are withdrawn to give more control over small-scale changes which could incrementally have an adverse effect on Outstanding Universal Value;

b) The Department for Communities and Local Government will introduce in Spring 2009 specific notification and call-in requirements for significant development affecting World Heritage properties where English Heritage have objected on the grounds that a proposed development could have an adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and significance of a World Heritage property and has been unable to withdraw that objection following discussions. This will bring cases of potential international significance to the attention of government ministers;

c) A new planning circular on World Heritage with an accompanying English Heritage guidance note is due to be published in Spring 2009. These documents will emphasise the key role planning authorities have in protecting World Heritage properties through policies in regional and local level Plans;

d) An announcement on timetable regarding the development of new overall guidance on protection of the historic environment is currently being drafted. A draft Historic Environment Planning Policy Statement will be put to public consultation in 2009.

The State Party indicates that Liverpool City Council, working closely with English Heritage, is committed to ensuring that these respect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Account is taken of local, national and international planning frameworks.

The State Party reports that a new Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West, was published in September 2008. This includes policy statements on Historic Environment, Landscape and Historic Areas.

The State Party reports that on addressing the concerns regarding omissions from national statutory lists, during 2008 a further 6 listings have been made, adding a further 17 buildings to the list of protected buildings in, or immediately adjacent to the property.

The State Party also intends submitting an expanded Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for consideration of endorsement.

Regarding the interim report following the joint mission in 2006 the State Party wished to report progress during 2008 on a number of schemes and other proposals, including:

Museum of Liverpool: Following a late 2007 decision to clad the building with Jura limestone a new planning application was submitted and approved. Cladding the building with the new material has now almost been completed;

Princes Dock: With planning permission for the 22 storey Alexandra Tower in Plot 12 given in 2004, construction was effectively completed during 2008. This approval set a precedent for tall buildings in the Princes Dock complex, resulting in further approval being given for a 34 storey building on Plot 3A in June 2007. Whilst the view of the State Party was that this did not damage the Outstanding Universal Value, the proposal has been abandoned for the foreseeable future due to the current economic climate. There are no further proposals for tall buildings on Princes Dock, and none are anticipated. A proposed development, New World Square, for Plot 7 has been approved following a full consultation but its height has been kept below the cornice of the Liver Building. Before any site work has commenced, it is understood that this proposal has also been abandoned for the foreseeable future;

Mann Island: The commercial development on Mann Island on the south side of the Pier Head has commenced. The 2006 mission concluded that this development would not compromise the Outstanding Universal Value;

Pier Head: The new Mersey Ferry Terminal building is nearing completion, and has been clad with limestone to match the Cunard Building. The canal link between Princes Dock and Canning Dock is due for completion in January 2009. To complement the canal, Museum and Ferry Terminal, the public piazza has been comprehensively enhanced using natural materials and conserving monuments, and was formally opened in October 2008;

King's Dock Area: The Conference Centre and area to the south of the Pier Head was opened in January 2008;

Liverpool 1 (the Paradise Project): This is the single biggest regeneration project in Liverpool, partly within the property and partly in the buffer zone. Development proposals were shown to the 2006 mission, with Phase 1 opening in May 2008 and Phase 2 in October 2008. This successful project has already received a number of national regeneration and planning awards. The preservation, conservation and interpretation of Old Dock was negotiated as part of the planning permission. Old Dock has now been fully recorded and developers have created access facilities to the below-ground dock. The archaeological information is currently being assessed and analyzed and is anticipated to give further knowledge in support of one of the original criteria for inscription. This knowledge will be shared with the wider community and discussions are currently under way regarding public access to the archaeology;

Concourse House: The 2006 mission commented positively on the proposal to create a gateway at Lime Street through the demolition of a 1960s tower and shops. Demolition commenced in late 2008, but the replacement with a new tall building will no longer proceed being economically non-viable;

King Edward Tower: A planning application for a 54 storey tower in the buffer zone was submitted in June 2007, but has not yet been determined. The City Council is aware that it should be referred to the State Party for consideration. Following expressed concerns, it is expected that the original plans will be significantly amended. The intended site is within the area identified in the emerging SPD as being suitable, in principle, for tall buildings;

Peel Holdings: In spring 2007 Peel published an ambitious vision for the redevelopment of Birkenhead Docks and Central Docks (partly in the property and buffer zone) with a large cluster of tower blocks up to 50 storeys high. The visualisation is only conceptual and much further study and negotiations are required before a planning application could be considered. It is understood that Peel Holdings have continued to undertake studies of the site but the production of the resulting master plan is being deferred until the emergence of the SPD to ensure compatibility with the guidance. The authorities expect the vision to change significantly as a result of this process;

Restoration on historic buildings: It is reported that a number of structures within the World Heritage property and its buffer zone have undergone, or were undergoing, restoration since the 2008 Report, including ongoing restoration of the Port of Liverpool Building, internal restoration of the Cunard Building, internal restoration of the Liver Building, Exchange Flags Building, the former Liverpool and London Insurance Co Building, the former Heywood's Bank Building, several properties in Rope Walks;

Significant progress has been made in dealing with buildings at risk throughout the city including within the property, including the Fruit Exchange, Stanley Dock, and Royal Insurance Building. The Townscape Heritage Initiative for Buildings at Risk is making steady progress on buildings in the Rope Walks area with grant-aided restoration schemes. A priority list of 44 properties has been drawn up and will be subject to consideration for urgent works notices and repair notices;

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that progress has been made with the development of the Supplementary Planning Document, and the final draft version is due to be launched for public consultation in March 2009. A number of positive steps have been taken to address the lack of public and professional awareness regarding the property and its Outstanding Universal Value. Action is also being taken to ensure that future Design Briefs and Master Plans take the Outstanding Universal Value into account.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.130

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.115**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Notes the detailed information provided by State Party and particularly :
 - a) *The development of the new Supplementary Planning Document addresses the management issues raised by the World Heritage Committee in paragraphs 3b and 4b of Decision 31 COM 7B.121 and paragraph 3b and 3c of Decision 32 COM 7B.115,*
 - b) *The final version of the Supplementary Planning Document is expected to be formally adopted by Liverpool City Council in June 2009,*
 - c) *The revised Evidential Report will be provided to the World Heritage Centre when available,*
 - d) *Progress on the improvement of the protection of World Heritage properties in England through changes to the planning system,*
 - e) *Preparation of an expanded Statement of Outstanding Universal Value,*
 - f) *The initiatives taken by the Liverpool City Council and other partners during 2008, particularly regarding the national statutory lists;*
4. Requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed on progress on the issues above.

131. City of Bath (United Kingdom) (C 428)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

32 COM 7B.116

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2008: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/428>

Current conservation issues

In the past few years, proposals have been put forward for a large scale re-development of an extensive flat area alongside the river Avon, in the centre of the World Heritage property. The area is in the bowl of the valley and thus can be seen from higher parts of the city. The proposals to develop the area have met with considerable opposition for the negative impact the development could have on the overall visual and planning coherence of the property in its landscape setting. In addition, the Bath & North-East Somerset (B&NES) Council had also indicated its intention to approve another large-scale project alongside the river, for a new school (the Dyson Academy) which would involve the demolition of a listed building and the construction of buildings with prominent glass facades that could be highly visible when illuminated.

As requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission took place from 5 to 7 November 2008 to assess the overall state of conservation of the property and the possible impact of the proposed developments on the property's Outstanding Universal Value and integrity. Two reports on the state of conservation of the City of Bath have been received from the State Party: a first one on 30 January 2009, and a second one, in response to the mission findings on 13 March 2009.

a) Potential impact of the proposed Bath Western Riverside and Dyson Academy developments on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property:

In its January report, the State Party noted the World Heritage Committee's concern over the proposed developments. It also indicated that it was not possible, under the United Kingdom planning scheme to withhold final approval if all other stages of the planning procedure had been completed.

The Bath Western Riverside (BWR) development: The scheme was proposed to provide office, residential, retail, and leisure accommodation together with extensive infrastructure improvements. It will be dominated by a major new residential quarter providing some 2,000 new private, affordable and mixed tenure dwellings (apartments and houses). The project under discussion has a relatively high density and is divided into three phases, with only the realization of the first phase, which includes about 300 dwelling-units, being secured. According to the real need for residential units in Bath, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS consider that the realization of this first phase should not be stopped. From the standpoint of World Heritage conservation, the realization of this first step will not have a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of this living World Heritage property. The mission team also emphasized the necessity for the first phase to already cover the infrastructure needs, such as kindergarden, meeting and multifunctional rooms for the inhabitants, etc. to make it fully functional on its own.

To explain why this first phase will not have adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of Bath, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS recall that the designated area is the right place (currently a derelict and un-aesthetic industrial site) to integrate this new town quarter. The height of the planned buildings is acceptable, and two of the three 9-storey-buildings have already been reduced to 8-storey-buildings; similar heights can be found in the historic quarters of Bath. The acceptance of heights and masses can be understood if account is taken of the fact that the existing gasometers will be demolished more or less during, or soon after, the completion of the first phase. The new buildings will not have more impact than the existing volume of the gasometers. Furthermore, the new streets planned will be respectful of the urban design in place and will not block views. This project also plans to give the Avon River back its role in the city's life in promoting boat-commuting between the BWR and the city centre; and the development of the banks for leisure purposes.

However, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS recommend that consideration be given to adapting the second and third phases in terms of a re-division of masses and heights of the buildings by any means, such as an international architectural competition, which could give a new impact to the appearance of the project and so as not to add a new barrier within the Northern and Southern parts of the city.

The Dyson Academy project: The mission has received confirmation that this project had officially been withdrawn.

b) Overall state of conservation of the property

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note that the property is currently very well managed, even when during times when the B&NES Council has been short of professional staff. But the Council has recognized the need of a permanent coordinator who was installed recently. At present, there is a good staffing level and financial resources suitable for the proper implementation of the management plan and the objectives set out.

All major buildings and components of the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List (e.g. Roman Baths, Royal Crescent, Circus, Lansdown Crescent, gardens, parks, and public spaces) are in a very good state of conservation and are being closely monitored, as is the landscape surrounding the City of Bath. Indeed, until 10 years ago, Bath has benefited from a 50-year historic building repair programme, respectful of the property's integrity and authenticity. Efforts are also being put into place by the B&NES Council, through various plans, to prevent any further pollution to the property such as atmospheric pollution due to intense traffic in the City, visual pollution due to numerous street posts and signs, noise pollution through commercial activities in the various historic locations of the City.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS also note that a review of the management plan is currently in progress and that it will include an integrated and comprehensive Tourism management plan, an integrated Public Realm and Movement Strategy, respecting both the authenticity and integrity of the property, and an integrated Traffic Control Plan.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS feel that protection of the views to and from the City of Bath could be strengthened. A clear mapping of these important views to be protected is necessary, as well as how those views will be protected from impacts of any future developments. The study developed by the B&NES Council in this sense, including assessment and identification of key views, based on existing and tested methodologies in the United Kingdom, is welcomed. Finally, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are of the view that the State Party act on the reinforced protection of the landscape surrounding the property to prevent any future developments which could have an adverse and cumulative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and its integrity.

c) Presentation of the property

With regards to the interpretation of the property, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS invite the State Party to embark on a reinforced, integrated and homogenous interpretation for all the attributes bearing the Outstanding Universal Value (e.g. Roman baths, Circus, Royal Crescent). The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS also strongly feel that an interpretation centre for this very rich and complex living World Heritage property is very much needed.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.131

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.116**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes the results of the November 2008 joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and the good overall state of conservation and management of the property;*
4. *Expresses its satisfaction that the Dyson Academy Project has officially been withdrawn;*
5. *Strongly recommends that the State Party submit to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, for review, a revised plan showing that all necessary social facilities have been included in the first Phase of the Bath Western Riverside project;*
6. *Urges the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, for review, a time-bound revised plan for the second and third phases of the Bath Western Riverside project, including revised density and volume of the ensemble, so as not to impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, its integrity and on important views to and from the property;*
7. *Also recommends that the State Party enhance the protection of the surrounding landscape of the property to prevent any future developments which could have adverse and cumulative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
8. *Invites the State Party to embark on a reinforced, integrated and homogenous interpretation for all the attributes bearing the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
9. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, for information and by **1 February 2011**, the draft of the revised management plan, including the integrated and comprehensive Tourism management plan, the integrated Public Realm and Movement Strategy, respecting both the authenticity and integrity of the property, and the integrated Traffic Control Plan, before its final adoption.*

132. Old and New Towns of Edinburgh (United Kingdom) (C 728)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995

Criteria

(i) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.101; 32 COM 7B.117; 32 COM 8B.100

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2008: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Impact of fire at Cowgate;
- b) Major development projects, including the Caltongate development.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/728>

Current conservation issues

In response to the request from the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), a World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS joint reactive monitoring mission to the property took place in November 2008. Its purpose was to consider the overall state of conservation of the Edinburgh Old and New Towns, and particularly the impact of the Caltongate development on the integrity and Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property, as well as the outline proposals for Leith Docks, the St James Centre, and other current proposals. The World Heritage Committee also requested the State Party to submit a report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 33rd session in 2009.

The State Party submitted its report on 30 January 2009 noting that it had yet to see the report of the reactive monitoring mission, and subsequently responded to the mission report on 13 March 2009.

The mission found that the overall state of conservation of the property is satisfactory and that inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger would not be required. However in spite of finding that the property is managed adequately in accordance with Scottish and British law, and the use of a consultative skyline study as a planning tool, the mission was

concerned at the lack of a defined buffer zone. The mission report recommends that this be addressed as part of the State Party's proposed forthcoming review of the management plan.

The mission report notes that management of the property would be improved by smoother co-ordination between the relevant agencies; greater involvement of stakeholders in master planning; the use of architectural competitions for key projects, and the awareness raising and information of all stakeholders about the clearly defined Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property, its integrity and authenticity as a critical basis of all future developments.

The mission report makes a number of recommendations in relation to the development projects that have resulted from Edinburgh's success in terms of its commerce, economy and population growth. It notes the need for careful planning for the increased traffic that the large development projects can be expected to generate.

Caltongate

Of the proposed projects within the World Heritage property the mission expresses some concerns about the detail of the Caltongate development. It concludes that to avoid the development having an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the World Heritage property, it recommends the integration rather than demolition of two listed buildings, the total redesign of the town quarter Jeffrey street/Eastern Market Street to keep the interactivity between the urban structure and the open space and important views in the urban landscape, the redesign of public spaces to better respect social needs, and the review of any impacts on views from Carlton Hill.

St James Centre

The mission supports the proposed demolition of the 1970s St. James Centre, whose unfortunate impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property was already noted at the time of inscription.

Cowgate Fire site

The proposed re-development of Cowgate following the fire of 2002 is still in the design and consultation phase. The mission recommends carefully taking into account proper volumes and scale of this re-development and its integration into the town quarter through "translating" the historical pattern of the facades into contemporary architecture.

Leith Docks

Of the projects outside the World Heritage property boundary, the mission report concludes that the Leith Docks re-development will have no major or direct impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property because it is 2.5 kilometres from its boundary.

Haymarket

The mission expressed considerable concern about the height of the proposed hotel in the Haymarket development. The Haymarket project is immediately outside the boundary of the World Heritage property. It was the view of the mission that the proposed 17 storey hotel would have a major visual impact on the property and dominate the St Margaret's church towers from several key viewpoints.

The State Party's response to the mission report agreed that the review of the management plan offers a potential forum for dialogue about the buffer zone, while indicating lack of conviction on the necessity of a buffer zone due to the statutory planning controls already in place. The State Party acknowledged concern over the proposed development at Haymarket and confirmed that the development had been called in for review by Scottish Ministers. A

public enquiry will take place in May/June 2009. The State Party would like the views of the mission to be made available to the enquiry.

The State Party provided update information via letter of 13 March 2009 and will continue to work with developers and the City of Edinburgh to guarantee that projects respect the historic environment and avoid any adverse impact on the property. It also informed that Edinburgh Council resolved to approve the proposals for the Cowgate Fire site, and approved on 4 March 2009 the application for the planning Permission for St James Centre. On 24 April 2009, another letter was received from the State Party informing that the developer of the Caltongate site went into receivership on 23 March 2009 and that solutions are being sought.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider:

- a) There is a need for a declared buffer zone in accordance with Paragraph 103 of the *Operational Guidelines*, particularly in view of the apparent failure of the current planning mechanisms to deter proposals such as the 17 storey Haymarket hotel in the area immediately adjacent to the World Heritage property;.
- b) The recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission should be made available to the forthcoming public enquiry into the proposed Haymarket development;
- c) There is a need for clear policies in relation to height controls within the World Heritage property to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property which should be developed on the basis of key views and vistas from within and outside the property;
- d) There is a need to raise awareness among potential developers and stakeholders about the Outstanding Universal Value of the Edinburgh Old and New Towns World Heritage property, and what this means for future development. The section of the Statement of Significance which says: "The dramatic topography of the Old Town combined with the planned alignments of key buildings in both the Old and the New Town, results in spectacular views and panoramas and an iconic skyline" is particularly relevant in this regard.
- e) There is a need to an overall smooth coordination and management of the property, by the City Council, Historic Scotland, and Edinburgh World Heritage;
- f) It would be desirable to improve the involvement of stakeholders to ensure transparency and particularly best practice consultation in master planning approaches;
- g) That in order to enhance design, quality and diversity, consideration should be given to using architectural competitions for certain projects.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.132

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.117**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes the results of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the Edinburgh Old and New Towns World Heritage property of November 2008 and the State Party's response;*
4. *Urges the State Party to take into account the recommendations by the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, specifically addressing*

improvements for the Caltongate and Haymarket development; and requests that the mission's findings on the Haymarket development are made available to the public enquiry;

5. Welcomes that the St James Centre project improves the integrity of the property with the demolition of a building block impacting on the values and integrity of the property;
6. Also welcomes the skyline study as an important tool in future development and planning of the site to protect important views in compliance with Paragraph 104 of the Operational Guidelines;
7. Also requests the State Party to establish a declared buffer zone for the Edinburgh Old and New Towns World Heritage property in accordance with Paragraph 103 of the Operational Guidelines, in which height restrictions are established on the basis of key views and vistas from within and from outside across the property;
8. Further requests the State Party to establish clear policies in relation to height controls within the property on the basis of key views and vistas from within and outside the property;
9. Requests furthermore the State Party to raise awareness among potential developers and stakeholders of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and the meaning of this for development projects within the property and its buffer zone;
10. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a report on the state of conservation of the property taking into account the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property, and on progress with the review of the management plan and establishment of the buffer zone, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

133. Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

Criteria

(i) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

27 COM 7B.85; 28 COM 15B.108

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2001: UNESCO/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Urban pressure that may affect the original city plan (*Plano Piloto*) that warranted inscription in the World Heritage List;
- b) Lack of a Master Plan.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/455>

Current conservation issues

A report on conservation issues at the property raised by an NGO was received by the World Heritage Centre in July 2008. The evaluation of the information provided raised concerns about actions that could be implemented within the framework of the *Plano Director de Ordenamento Territorial* (PDTO), which was being examined for approval by the *Camara Legislativa do Distrito Federal de Brasil*. The NGO considered that these actions could potentially create a visual impact and affect the integrity of the property. Issues included the creation of new urban areas on the *Paranoá* lake, located on original city plan, the enlargement of the Vila Planalto, the lack of buffer zones with specific regulations, the alterations in commercial areas and the lack of a Master Plan. In September 2008, the World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to provide information on the following matters. Subsequently, the World Heritage Centre requested a state of conservation report from the State Party on the same issues; this report was received on 3 March 2009.

a) The possible approval by the Brazilian Parliament of the Plan for the Territorial Management of the Federal District and its implications on the protected area of the property and its buffer zone

The State Party reports that approval is expected at the end of March 2009 and that following its inception additional measures for the property may be adopted. A *Plano de Preservacao do Plano Urbanastico de Brasilia*, which covers the property, is currently under preparation by the Secretariat for Urban Development and Environment of the Federal District. This will be the management plan for the property and implementation is foreseen in June 2009. Technical project documents have not yet been submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

b) The state of preparation of the regulations for the buffer zone surrounding the protected area, as requested by the 2001 mission

A preparation study has been prepared by the IPHAN (National authority for cultural heritage) and submitted for consultation to the environmental and urban development agencies for the Federal District. Broad consultation is required to meet the conservation needs of the property in balance with environmental regulations and the economic and social development of the Federal District. While the buffer zone is formally established, urban development and construction regulations beyond the protected area are being controlled legally and administratively by the government of the Federal District in consultation with IPHAN to avoid visual impacts at the property.

c) Information concerning the following projects: W3 transportation solutions, Parque Enseada, Concha Acustica (Orla project)

The State Party reports that comprehensive economic and social policies are being adopted for the Metropolitan region to address the magnitude of problems derived from such a city. A tram is proposed for Avenue W3 to address public transportation needs. Other projects such as Parque Enseada and Orla projects are in planning stages and have not been submitted for review or approval. Detailed technical information on the projects has not yet been received.

d) The interventions inside the Plano Piloto, specifically in the superquadras, quadras 700m north and south (settlements and change of use from housing to other activities), urban plans for the surroundings of Lago Paranoa and its public zones, as well as the plans for Vila Planalto

Regulations regarding the occupation of local commerce areas in the *superquadras* were revised in 2008 in consultation with IPHAN to regulate limits of occupation. The State Party reports that urban plans for the Lago Paranoa will most likely not be implemented given the cost and the focus would be in the Orla Project for the orderly occupation of the zone. Vila Planalto was neglected and has now undergone significant transformations, including creation of new restaurants and bars. Authorities are considering the possibility of allowing use as a leisure and restaurant area, associated to housing, while enforcing measures to limit constructions and irregular buildings.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that Brasilia, as a modern city, is constantly under development and in a metropolitan region needs to meet the needs of million of people that both reside there or use its services. There are significant challenges to be met and managing change will require a deep understanding of the values and significance of the place that warranted its inscription on the World Heritage List.

The World Heritage Centre requested in March 2009 additional information as to properly assess any possible impacts of the proposed plans on the property by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.133

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **28 COM 15B.108**, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),
3. Takes note of the response provided by the State Party in regard to current issues of concern and notes progress made in developing the management plan;
4. Encourages the State Party to finalize the delimitation of the buffer zone and submit the proposed new boundaries for the buffer zone, including appropriate cartography and the legal framework, to the World Heritage Centre, for examination by the World Heritage Committee;
5. Takes note of the projects planned for the property and also requests the State Party, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to submit to the World Heritage Committee the technical documentation for Orla project, Vila Planalto development, transportation solutions W3 and changes in land use of superquadras for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
6. Further requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the management plan, as soon as possible, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
7. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, for the examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

134. San Agustín Archaeological Park (Colombia) (C 744)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995

Criteria

(iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

31 COM 7B.124

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 10,400 for Conservation and management.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2006: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) State of conservation of the fabric of monolithic sculpture;
- b) Lack of management plan;
- c) Lack of buffer zone;
- d) Road construction through the archaeological park.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/744>

Current conservation issues

In 2006, a joint UNESCO/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out to evaluate the impacts of the construction of a road through the archaeological park by the Yanacóna indigenous community and the state of conservation of the inscribed property. On 7 February 2009, the World Heritage Centre received the State Party's report, which details progress made to date in implementing the decision made by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007). In addition, the report includes the project outline for the Integral management plan for the Archaeological Park, updated cartography for the San Agustín Archaeological Park, restructuring and intervention project for public use, plans for the interpretative walkway and comprehensive report on communications with national, regional and local authorities.

a) Develop an effective management plan within the framework of a participatory, value-driven approach

The Colombian Institute of Anthropology and History has formulated an Integral management plan for the San Agustín Archaeological Park and the *Alto de los Idolos* site. The resulting plan encompasses 9 programmes and 50 projects focused on environmental management, conservation of archaeological heritage, education and outreach, research, dissemination, infrastructure and administration.

b) Identify precise limits and buffer zones for the sites inscribed in the World Heritage List and formally submit the proposed new boundaries of the buffer zone for approval by the World Heritage Committee

The State Party submitted a preliminary map based on high-resolution aerial photographs and stereoscopic analysis. A project is currently underway using the baseline map to generate a geo-referenced database of archaeological and natural elements inside the park and to assess current land use. It is foreseen that buffer zones will be defined upon extensive consultation with involved entities so as to subsequently include these maps in other planning tools such as land use and development planning.

c) Define adequate uses for the existing infrastructure at the properties

The State Party reports that a zoning project is underway to define appropriate uses for existing structures. A proposal for improving the museum facilities, pathways, fences and protection of the archaeological remains was also included in the report.

d) Close down the built road and forbid vehicular traffic, develop an interpretative walkway to communicate the indigenous settlement, promote its visitation and submit alternative options to improve the road system for local communities

Regional and local authorities and local communities were informed of the World Heritage Committee's Decision **31 COM 7B.124** by translating recommendations from the monitoring mission and the official decision. Measures were implemented to prevent vehicular traffic including fences and signage and collaboration is in place with the Municipality to improve existing roads that provide access to inhabited areas. However, the State Party reports the infringement on these measures and increased difficulties between the Park's administrator and workers and local inhabitants which led to the request to the Municipality, the *Corporación Autónoma Regional del Alto Magdalena* and the Police to implement relevant controls and sanctions. Consultation has continued among different levels of government and the communities to mitigate conflict, reach a consensus and proceed with the development of the interpretative walkway. Permits, plans and materials have already been secured and it is expected that support from the local authorities will allow for the implementation of the project.

No alternative to improve the road system for local communities has been submitted.

e) Continue work and close collaboration with national and municipal authorities, as well as involved stakeholders, to control development at the site and anticipate potential impacts on the World Heritage property

The State Party included in its report several communications among different entities regarding improvement of access to the Archaeological Park and its surroundings, maintenance of protective infrastructure, pollution control, tourism development, education, handicraft sales and services, requests for archaeological research and other issues.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the management plan was not submitted so the adequacy of the methodological approach and the derived proposals cannot be assessed at this stage. It is critical to evaluate interventions planned to mitigate existing stone decay, both directly and indirectly (wind breakers, shelters and drainage). Also, it is important to assess how proposals will conserve and promote the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, an issue which closely relates to planned interventions to enhance public use.

A point of concern is that the plan apparently focuses only on the San Agustín Archaeological Park but the inscribed property comprises also two other archaeological sites, Alto de los Idolos and Alto de la Piedra. Current mapping activities and definition of buffer zones should also consider these sites to promote the integration of the three inscribed properties and regulate land use to preserve existing integrity with the setting, a viable option given the broad collaboration that exists today among different levels of government and other stakeholders.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.134

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,

2. Recalling Decision 31 COM 7B.124, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),
3. Notes with satisfaction the efforts and progress made by the State Party in implementing the decisions of the World Heritage Committee,
4. Encourages the State Party to finalise the delimitation of the inscribed archaeological sites and their buffer zones and reiterates its request that the proposed new boundaries for buffer zones, including appropriate cartography as well as the legal framework, be submitted for examination by the World Heritage Committee;
5. Also reiterates its request to submit alternative roads for the local community;
6. Requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the management plan, as soon as possible, for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
7. Also requests the State Party to continue to implement the recommendations made by the reactive monitoring mission of 2006;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, for the examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

135. Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1990

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.93; 30 COM 7B.94; 31 COM 7B.125

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 82,207 for Emergency measures at the *Palacio Diego de Herrera* in Santo Domingo and for a study on Cultural Tourism in the Historic Centre of Santo Domingo (conservation)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1993, 1995, 1998; August 2001: ICOMOS monitoring mission; 2009: World Heritage Centre site visit

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Undefined and unregulated buffer zone leading to urban development pressure and inadequate control of land use;
- b) Pressures derived from tourism;
- c) Inadequate and inefficient management and conservation arrangements (including legislation, regulatory measures, technical capacity for conservation and service infrastructure);
- d) Lack interpretation and presentation of the property;
- e) Natural vulnerability to earthquakes and hurricanes;
- f) Deterioration of historic structures derived from natural and social factors (including environmental pollution and lack of sensitisation of local residents).

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/526>

Current conservation issues

At its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007) the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to formally submit any proposed modifications to the buffer zone and to provide a draft of the new law for the protection of immovable heritage for consideration by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.

The State Party submitted the state of conservation report on 3 February 2009. The report includes details concerning the methodologies used to define the extension for the buffer zone and the progress made on the developing the legal framework for the protection of cultural heritage.

In February 2009, a World Heritage Centre staff member undertook a mission to the country and during this visit there was an opportunity for informal discussions with the developers of the project Sans Souci.

a) Submission of proposed modifications to the buffer zone and its regulation.

The State Party report included information on the proposed new buffer zones, and draft regulations. The process for adopting these regulations has been finalized and no precise timetable has been provided. The report also states that the steering committee responsible for the Master Plan is working the review and approval of the regulations of the buffer zone.

b) Law on the protection, safeguarding and encouragement of cultural heritage protection.

The proposal for the future law for the 'Protection, safeguarding and awareness-raising of the Nation's Cultural Heritage' has been included in the report; this project is a result of the coordination work of the Office of Cultural Heritage (Secretary of Culture) and the National Directorate of Cultural Heritage. The project was also reviewed by a legal advisor and will be sent to the Government for approval, however, no precise information on the time frame for its final approval was sent.

c) Other matters

The report described interventions that were finalized and others to be undertaken such as: The recent recovery of the *Barrio Chino* with the restoration of the two main entrances, the enhancement of the South Sea shore and the construction of two new tourist docks in the Ozama River. These projects were described in the report but no detailed information on the projects was received.

No updated information was provided on an Integrated Revitalization Plan and the Risk management plan for the protected area that were mentioned in 2006. No other additional information concerning the current management and works undertaken within the protected area were included.

During the informal meeting in February (mentioned above) information was provided by the developer on a large scale high-rise urban development project known as *Sans Souci*, on the opposite bank of the river that has been planned to revitalize the ancient military area facing the colonial centre of Santo Domingo. The intervention foresees a marine construction along the fortifications and entertainment installations, urban areas and a destination port for international cruise ships. No technical plans have been submitted yet.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note with extreme concern the proposed *Sans Souci* development project in the immediate vicinity of the property. They appreciate the fact that the Steering Committee brought this issue to their attention of the World Heritage Centre, but would like to remind the State Party about its obligations under Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* to formally notify the World Heritage Committee about “*new construction which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property*”.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that this project has the potential to impact adversely on the visual integrity of the property and also through the proposed extreme increase in visitor number on the physical fabric and overall management of the property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.135

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.125**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Encourages the adoption, and strict enforcement of the new law on monumental heritage, the Integrated Revitalization Plan and the implementation of the related actions proposed, and the adoption and full implementation of the Risk management plan for the Zona Colonial;*
4. *Requests the State Party to:*
 - a) *Submit to the World Heritage Centre, as soon as possible, the complete technical documentation of the Sans Souci project to be undertaken in the South Area, in conformity with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines,*
 - b) *Withhold any approval of the development until the World Heritage Committee has had the opportunity to fully review the project,*
 - c) *Invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to consider its overall state of conservation and particularly the possible*

impact of the Sans Souci project on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property and to review the proposal for the delineation and protection of the buffer zone ;

5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.*

136. City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission)

137. Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.95; 31 COM 7B.126; 32 COM 7B.122

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 167,825 for the elaboration of the management plan, nomination file, equipment, emergency measures for the protection and rehabilitation of the Maya Site of Copan, replacement of a protective canopy over the Hieroglyphic Stairway at the Maya site of Copan, and a seminar.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1999: monitoring mission; 2003: UNESCO/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; 2005: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) The foreseen construction of an airport in the vicinity of the World Heritage property;
- b) Deterioration of construction materials due to natural decay phenomena;
- c) Risk of structural failure of archaeological buildings resulting from the excavated tunnels for archaeological purposes;
- d) Deterioration derived from uncontrolled visitation and potential to exceed carrying capacity at specific time periods.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/129>

Current conservation issues

In 2006, the State Party informed the World Heritage Committee that it had stopped the construction of an airport in the Rio Amarillo area. In 2007, the State Party informed the World Heritage Committee about the construction of an alternate airport at the old air strip in the village of Concepción

The State Party state of conservation report, which responds succinctly to Decision **32 COM 7B.122**, was received by the World Heritage Centre on 30 January 2009.

a) *Interest in building an alternate airport to access the Maya Site of Copan*

A final decision on the construction of an alternate airport at the old air strip in the village of *Concepción* is still pending. The report indicates that the Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History (IHAH) received 28 January 2009 a copy of the Environmental Impact Assessment including an archaeological and cultural impact study. It was also indicated that the IHAH is reviewing the document and will make an official statement soon.

Although the State Party indicated that the construction of the airport in Rio Amarillo had been abandoned, this site is still mentioned in the management plan of Rio Amarillo.

b) *Finalization of the management plan for the property*

It is stated in the report that the management plan for the Maya Site of Copan was finalized in 2005,. The report sent by the State Party explains that the management plan was published, but it was not specified if it was officially approved and put into action. The State Party indicates that the Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History (IHAH) is implementing the management plan through the organization of committees responsible for different activities prescribed in the Management programs but no details are provided on the programmes currently being implemented.

c) *Extension and limits of the property and its buffer zone*

No precise information on the proposed limits for the property has been sent. The report indicates that negotiations between landowners and the State Party continue, but no information on legal processes has been included nor has a timeframe been defined for clearly defining the existing property, potential buffer zone and extension of the property.

d) *Other conservation issues*

No graphic or technical information concerning the consolidation of tunnels to be continued this year, nor on the ongoing restoration of the Nuñez Chinchilla Group and neither was there any information on the renovation of the *Centro Regional de Investigaciones Arqueológicas* which was finished in March 2008. There is also no indication of how these interventions correlate to the management plan or other actions being implemented under that framework as mentioned previously by the State Party.

Rio Amarillo site: In the light of a proposal for the development of an airport and a road for this area, located 17km from the property, an overall impact assessment was carried out. A "Management plan" for this area was received in 2009.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the Copan management plan is being implemented and the Rio Amarillo Plan has been completed. However it remains unclear as to how these plans relate to each other. However no indication of how the restoration and renovation projects relate to the management plan. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies remain concerned about a number of conservation issues due to the lack of detailed technical information, including on deterioration of construction materials due to natural decay phenomena and deterioration from uncontrolled visitation and potential to exceed carrying capacity at specific time periods.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.137

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.122**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Notes progress by the State Party in implementing the decisions of the World Heritage Committee and invites the State Party to submit further details on the implementation of the management plan and conservation interventions at the property;*
4. *Urges the State Party to officially submit the limits of the World Heritage property and its potential buffer zone, in light of the requirements of the retrospective inventory;*
5. *Requests the State Party to inform the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies on the definitive decision on the location for the construction of the airport and related tourism management issues;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

138. Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.91; 31 COM 7B.127; 32 COM 7B.123

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November-December 2004: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Urban development pressures in areas surrounding the property;
- b) Lack of management plan.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/414>

Current conservation issues

The joint UNESCO/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission in 28 November 2004 assessed the impact of the building of a supermarket in the vicinity of the property. The mission highlighted the need for a management plan. The property was examined during the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee (Quebec City, 2008), where the State Party was requested to: set up an intersectoral working group to analyse the archaeological, environmental and social impacts related to uncontrolled urban development; to collaborate in the management of the archaeological site and its surroundings and finally; to submit the finalised management plan.

In late 2008, several communications were received from a variety of groups, concerning a lighting project "Resplandor Teotihuacano" that would allow for nocturnal visits and light and sound spectacle at the site. The World Heritage Centre requested the State Party to provide official information on the matter in January 2009.

The State Party submitted the state of conservation reported in Spanish in February 2009. The report contained information on the development of the management plan and a summary of activities implemented at the site between 2007-2008. It does not contain substantive information concerning the current status of the property, the intersectoral working group related to the impacts of uncontrolled development, and thus does not respond to all the issues raised by the World Heritage Committee Decision made at its 32nd session (Quebec, 2008).

On the issue of the lighting project, the State Party report provided information, but it was not sufficient to evaluate the situation clearly.

a) *Development projects*

The State Party reports that progress the lighting project has been stopped, due to several requests and complains from several organizations, and that interventions have been carried

out to restore the minimal damage that was caused on the prehispanic structures. apparently on areas that had been reconstructed in earlier times, by the anchoring system used.

On 19 March the World Heritage Centre received additional information on the *Resplandor Teotihuacano* project from the scientific, technical and administrative community of the Ethnical and Anthropological Direction of the INAH. They stressed the fact that the original project was approved by the Archaeological council of INAH without taking into account the 13 500 perforations for the electric project or the daily need to remove and build a heavy stair structure among others.

After a multidisciplinary field evaluation, new technical specifications have been developed for the lighting system which will be applied once the restoration process finishes. An external technical evaluation group, composed by professionals external to INAH, has been formed to review future interventions on that matter and to render a technical and academic opinion about the project. In a third report received by the Word Heritage Centre on 25 March 2009, the Director of INAH stated that no definitive decision would be taken in the following six months until the appropriate studies are carried out.

b) Management plan

The progress report on the management plan shows how certain sections have been completed and how others have yet to be fully developed. After a hiatus in 2007, the State Party began the planning process again in 2008 and expects to continue activities through 2009. No information regarding the inclusion of other programmes (touristic and municipal) has been detailed.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note that the lighting project has been stopped and that there will not be any further developments until impact studies are being carried out. However there is no clear timeframe for this process to take place.

Regarding the management plan the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS are concerned that no documentation has been submitted to date on the approach implemented or the contents of the plan, so the quality or comprehensiveness of proposals cannot be assessed at this point.

As the process begun in 2003, many of the existing conditions at that time would probably need to be revised to be responsive to the current status. Additionally, other planning initiatives have occurred during this long time lapse so this would need to be integrated into the holistic proposal for the site, as requested in Decision **32 COM 7B.123**. The lack of a management plan has allowed for situations like the lighting project to arise, where decisions were made lightly regarding the potential impacts on the site and without using the opportunity of such a project to enhance the understanding and valorisation of the property in accordance with a comprehensive interpretation scheme. Interventions and proposals continue to be made at the site without a clear vision and without integrating major stakeholders and other interest groups in the decision-making process for such a symbolic property. The latest incident has yet again generated social conflict and confrontations between the national authorities and the local governments and communities. The Regional Programme for Tourism Development has yet to clarify specific projects and their potential impact, both positive and negative, on the World Heritage property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.138

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.123**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),
3. Regrets that the State Party did not submit its report in one of the two working languages of the World Heritage Convention (French and English);
4. Urges the State Party to finalize the management plan as soon as possible and provide three printed and electronic copies of the management plan for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
5. Expresses its concern that the lack of a management plan appears to have allowed developments to take place, which have had a negative impact on the property;
6. Notes that the State Party has decided to temporarily halt the implementation of the lighting and sound project but that even so, the initial works have had a negative impact on the surface structure of the pyramid;
7. Requests the State Party to submit full technical details of any revised Resplandor Teotihuacano project together with an impact assessment study to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for evaluation and examination prior to any approval or implementation;
8. Reiterates its request to the State Party to set up an intersectorial working group specifically for the World Heritage property, with representatives from local, federal and national levels to collaborate in the management of the archaeological site and its surroundings;
9. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, for the examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

139. Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv) (v)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.95; 31 COM 7B.128; 32 COM 7B.124

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 5,000 (1999) for the preparation of guidelines for a management plan

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2002: ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Demolition of historical buildings in the protected area of the Historical Centre;
- b) Urgent implementation of the management plan in Xochimilco.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/412>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee examined the situation derived from the demolition of 14 historical buildings in the property during its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008). A joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out from 19 to 23 January 2009 to assess the impacts of these actions on the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property. The Trust for the Historic Centre of Mexico City submitted a report in 27 February 2009 that presents information concerning its projects for the revitalization of the Historic Centre of Mexico City and additional information for Xochimilco.

a) Management

The report states that a new inclusive management model is currently under consideration to develop a model that empowers society through participation. The revitalization process is centred on the regeneration of public space, the consolidation of the needs to guarantee basic public safety standards, the revitalization of cultural and economic activities and the sustainability of the management plan. As such, programmes have been developed and are being currently implemented for restoration of streets, recovery of public spaces, recovery of historical monuments, restoration of property facades, creation of pedestrian corridors, public security, culture and education, and finance and economy.

Actions implemented under the public space recovery programme include the relocation of informal street commerce, which led to the demolition of the buildings in 2007 to create those relocation spaces. Originally, 36 properties were designated for the relocation of commerce. The report informs about the success of implementing the policy for relocating informal commerce in the revitalization of the historic centre and states that the demolitions occurred at a time when there was no coordination between the federal and local authorities. Since then, efforts have been made to develop a cooperation framework and strong agreements between parties. It also highlights the procedural inconsistencies and the lack of updating of the inventory of historic monuments. It reports that only 9 demolitions took place and provides an illustrated report of the conditions of those buildings prior to the demolitions as well as their status, including those considered derelict and unrecoverable and those that posed risks to the population because of the advanced state of decay. An agreement has

been reached between the two levels of government to develop high quality architectural projects in the areas where historical monuments were demolished. In addition, the report indicates that in 2008 more than 400 facades were rebuilt and improved and has created agreements to stimulate housing development through the regeneration of properties. Activities are also being implemented to promote the use of public spaces for educational and cultural activities and also to enhance visitation to the Historic Centre. Additional strategies are also in place to promote the economic nature of the Centre, such as strengthening of enterprises, fiscal incentives, among others. Detailed projects on the future interventions were not sent.

The report also mentions progress made to date in the implementation of the management plan for Xochimilco, including those for water management, territorial ordering and accessibility, sustainable use, and conservation and dissemination of cultural heritage. It also mentions the current operational levels of the Interdependency Commission created in 2007 and progress made in coordinating actions between the federal government, the government of Mexico City and the local governments (*delegaciones*). The creation of the management unit is currently being examined.

Finally, the mission produced recommendations with regard to domestic trade, changes in land use and affectation of heritage properties derived from the programme. Also part of the institutional aspects and sustainability in conservation and development of the Historic Centre of Mexico; there is a need to develop a participatory "Management plan for the Historic Centre of Mexico City", based on the system of heritage values of the property and to design an "Integral System for the Historic Centre in the city of Mexico", which is understood as an essential component towards assuring the property's sustainability. Different planning instruments to facilitate inter-institutional agreements and to strengthen the capacities of agencies mandated with heritage conservation should be the base for the development of these tools.

b) Demolition of historical buildings in the protected area in the historical centre of Mexico

The mission report analysed the impact of the demolitions and the effects the informal commerce relocation, and other programmes, have had on the Historic Centre. It also noted the efforts made to coordinate actions between different agencies to avoid this sort of situation in the future. The mission report notes that until a participative inter-institutional management plan, which integrates and articulates different social, economical, cultural, environmental, urban, architectural and heritage values, is not developed the ongoing intervention process can accelerate the already sensible loss of social memory. It also notes that effective coordination has yet to be achieved among the institutions such as *Instituto Nacional de Bienes Artísticos* (INBA) and *Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia* (INAH) in spite of the creation of the Historic Centre Authority, which is also hindered by the absence of planning instruments and appropriate inter institutional agreements. Inventories need to be updated to promote effective conservation and definition of regulations for buildings considered significant, including those of the XX century. The constraints in financial and human resources at federal agencies contribute to the limited efficacy and promptness to address demands and analyse proposals for intervention at the Centre.

The mission also notes that the authenticity and integrity of the heritage property is threatened by deterioration, structural risk and abandonment of a large quantity of private property heritage buildings that could collapse in a short period of time if not intervened. The existent regulations and administration control structures are not strong enough to apply sanctions due to abandonment; on the other hand, it has not been yet possible to identify financial management channels in order to initiate processes of social and economical recovery to assure sustainability.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS note that although several actions that had an impact on historic monuments are being implemented, the values and significance of the Historic Centre are not at the core of the decision-making processes of the involved agencies. Furthermore, a holistic conservation policy has yet to be established to address both parts of the property, the Historic Centre and Xochimilco.

While progress has been made in regard to Xochimilco, press information indicates that there are works in progress to build a new subway line that might potentially impact in the property and its associated area. Several environmental groups and NGO's have indicated that these works will negatively impact the agricultural vocation of the area, the aquiferous mantles and the foreseen increase in urban development in these areas.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.139

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.124** adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Expresses its concern to the fact that a holistic heritage conservation policy has not been agreed upon to guide the participatory decision making process for the World Heritage property and urges the State Party to develop an integrated management plan;*
4. *Takes note of the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission and requests the State Party to implement them as a matter of urgency;*
5. *Notes with concern that the threats of abandon, collapse and the lack of proper sanctions will affect the authenticity and integrity of the built heritage; and also requests the State Party to submit a proposal for a better implementation of technical and administrative procedures on demolition issues;*
6. *Also notes the progress made by the Comision Interinstitucional in implementing the management plan for Xochimilco and also urges the State Party to finalise arrangements to put into operation the management unit to secure the sustainable application of the management plan;*
7. *Also expresses its concern about the infrastructure works such as the new subway line in Xochimilco, and further requests the State Party in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to submit to the World Heritage Centre, detailed information on any major projects that may affect the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property,*
8. *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, for the examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

140. Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (State Party's report on the state of conservation not received)

141. Archaeological site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panama) (C 790 bis)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add* (Late mission)

142. Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2000

Criteria

(i) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

30 COM 7B.98; 31 COM 7B.123; 32 COM 7B.127

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 75,000 for Emergency Assistance in 2001.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2000: ICOMOS Expert Mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Frequent seismic activity in the region and flooding during the rainy season;
- b) Demolition of houses in the Historical Centre and the restoration of the San Agustín Church;
- c) Material decay and abandonment of buildings, as well as the effect of heavy traffic on historic buildings.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1016>

Current conservation issues

At its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to redefine the limits of the buffer zone, tackle demolition issues, progress in the disaster preparedness plan, documentation and inventory, support community participation and draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value in the light of the recommendations submitted by the reactive monitoring mission report in 2008.

On 3 February 2009, the State Party's provided a report on the state of conservation, detailing progress made on implementing the decisions made by the World Heritage Committee at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008).

a) Redefinition of the buffer zone

The Municipality of Arequipa started work to delimit and declare the Chilina Valley as an environmental reserve and as national cultural heritage to deter further urban development. To enlarge the buffer zone towards the valley, the Technical Office of the Historic Centre is preparing documentation to develop regulatory measures to guarantee the protection of the area at the municipal level.

b) Planning and management system

Authorities at the Municipal level have revised existing arrangements to consolidate Municipal Superintendence for the historic centre and zone of monuments at Arequipa. It is expected that the entity will coordinate modifications to existing instruments, including the Master Plan and Strategic Plan for the city, to meet criteria and regulations set forth in the *World Heritage Convention*. This review process will be carried out in collaboration with the national and local authorities for culture (National Institute for Culture-INC).

c) Demolitions

The Municipality is working closely with the INC to deter illegal demolitions at the city and to apply sanctions when applicable. The new management arrangements have improved communication among different entities involved at the local level to address this issue. No specific information on the application of the technical and administrative regulations process related to demolitions has been provided. The State Party also reports that the INC initiated 27 sanction processes although no details are provided on the specificity of the infringements.

d) Disaster Preparedness Plan

State Party reports that the completion of the plan is foreseen in 2009. Regulations have already been emitted by the Municipality to decrease air pollution and risk prevention and mitigation within the Historic Centre while the plan is being concluded.

e) Inventory

A new programme was started between the INC and the Municipal superintendence to declare buildings as historic monuments, 150 buildings have been identified but full recording has yet to be started.

f) Community participation

Evaluations have been carried out and initial coordination has been established with civil associations working at the Historic Centre. The INC is also preparing an outreach programme to enhance valorisation of heritage. State Party reports that technical assistance will be requested to the World Heritage Fund to create a broad scale participatory programme for the Historic Centre.

The State Party also responded to the following recommendations

a) Pollution of natural water systems

Although no progress is reported pertaining to the recommendation, it is foreseen that it will be included in the environmental reserve.

b) Pollution and traffic congestion

Existing proposal is considered an alternative to mitigate the number of taxis in the city and provide more efficient transportation means. Recommendations will be considered as part of the on-going evaluation to address this issue.

c) Restoration and Reconstruction Techniques and Materials, including Training

Two specialization programmes for professionals in conservation interventions have been developed and the Spanish Cooperation Agency has opened an *Escuela Taller* for technicians. The State Party reports that technical assistance will be requested to the World Heritage Fund for a capacity building initiative to address conservation problems to increase the number of specialized personnel and create facilities.

The report included proposals at four streets for their eventual transformation into pedestrian areas, which include underground cable systems, rainwater drainages, lightning systems, replacement of pavements and panels with heritage information at significant buildings. A similar project is foreseen as a collaborative endeavour between the Municipality and the Spanish Cooperation Agency, which will also include interventions at the facades. Night illumination projects have been implemented and are also planned for particularly significant buildings.

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS remain concerned about the conservation and management efficacy at the historic centre and in the enforcement of legal and regulatory measures. Although the new management structure should assist in addressing overlapping functions, technical capacity is still insufficient to attend to the number of interventions proposed for the historic centre, which range from conservation of historic buildings to new transportation systems. Implementation of recommendations is still in many cases at a planning stage that does not translate to application in practice. No Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been received.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.142

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.127**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008),*
3. *Regrets that the State Party did not submit its report in one of the two working languages of the World Heritage Convention (French and English);*
4. *Notes the progress reported by the State Party in implementing the recommendations from the 2008 reactive monitoring mission report, particularly in regard to starting the revision of the the buffer zone;*

5. Also notes progress in deterring illegal demolitions and in strengthening institutional frameworks for the management of the property and requests the State Party to ensure the regulatory procedures for demolitions are strictly enforced;
6. Also regrets that the State Party did not submit a completed Disaster Preparedness Plan, as requested in Decision **32 COM 7B.127** and notes with concern that it has not been finalised in light of the vulnerability of the place;
7. Takes note of the projects planned for the Historic Centre and also requests the State Party, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to submit to the World Heritage Committee their specific details for consideration by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, for the examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.

143. Chavín Archaeological Site (Peru) (C 330)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1985

Criteria

(iii)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.95; 30 COM 7B.97; 31 COM 7B.129

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 75,550 for Emergency Assistance, Preparatory Assistance and Technical Assistance.

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 1999: ICOMOS monitoring mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Intense temperature fluctuation;
- b) Rain and winds;

- c) Biological and microbiological growth;
- d) Water erosion and destabilisation of one of the main structures;
- e) Lack of a management plan.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/330>

Current conservation issues

Existing conservation conditions and interventions for the archaeological site were examined in 2007 and a request was made to the State Party submit proposals for the emergency and conservation projects to the World Heritage Centre.

In February 2009, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report that responds to the World Heritage Committee's decision and provides additional information on current activities. A draft version of the management plan was also included in the report.

a) Plans for the "Chavín National Museum" project

The State Party report stated that the Chavin National Museum had been inaugurated in 2008 and is currently open to the public. It is located approximately 7 km from the property, in a location that will be further developed according to the existing urban plan for the Town of Chavin the Huantar. The Museum will contribute to the dissemination of the values of the site, to the safeguarding of archaeological collections, to the educational activities at the locality, to its economic development (through increased tourism and job creation) and to the strengthening of the regional identity.

b) Draft Emergency Plan

The report states that emergency work has been carried out based on the outcomes from the evaluations carried out during the management planning process and focused on preventive maintenance inside the galleries and outside buildings A and E. No overall plan has been provided.

c) The "Chavín Conservation" project

As for the conservation project, the State Party reports completion of the interdisciplinary condition assessment that assessed the variety of environmental and cultural factors that influenced the state of conservation of the fabric. A long-term and holistic intervention plan is currently being finalised but emergency actions are being currently implemented to guarantee the stability of elements at risk. These include: coverage and temporary protections to mitigate rain water infiltration, improvement of existing drainage systems, bracing of structurally unstable elements, preventive conservation at galleries currently opened to the public, consolidation of fillings at the Circular Plaza and building A and stabilization of building E. All of these emergency actions were prioritised during the development of the management plan and do not compromise future interventions.

d) Completed management plan

The management plan has been prepared based on a transdisciplinary and participatory approach. The State Party submitted the draft version of the plan and noted that the last stage of formulating specific projects will be finalised mid 2009.

In addition to the specific responses, the State Party reports that additional actions, as identified during the planning process, were implemented to improve conservation conditions and to enhance the preservation of the site and its setting. These include the repair of the perimeter mud wall, inventory and transfer to storage of isolated lithic elements previously subject to weathering, improvement of visitor facilities at the site, particularly the visitor

centre to better meet visitor needs and also house artisans that sell their crafts at the site, and the design of routes and signage system to enhance interpretation. Projects foreseen for implementation in the near future include monitoring of conservation conditions, preventive conservation interventions, building of a bridge on the Wacheqsa river, improvement of river defences against flooding, inventory and conservation of archaeological materials in storage, improvement of security system and the creation of an International Centre for Research, Conservation and Restoration for cultural heritage in the region.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.143

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.129**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction progress made in measures to guarantee the conservation of the property and in developing the management plan and urges the State Party to finalise it to begin its implementation;*
4. *Requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the finalised management plan for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies as soon as possible;*
5. *Encourages the State Party to precisely define a risk preparedness plan in light of the vulnerability of the site;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, architectural plans and specifications for public use facilities to be implemented at the property, as well as projects for river defences and the proposed new bridge, for review by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to keep the World Heritage Centre informed on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations.*

144. Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru) (C 700)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(i) (iii) (iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

29 COM 7B.98; 30 COM 7B.99; 31 COM 7B.130

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 50,000 for Conservation Assistance

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Damage caused by illegal mining and farming activities
- b) Continued vehicle traffic through the geoglyphs
- c) Lack of systematic monitoring of the property

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/700>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Centre received the state of conservation report from the State Party in February 2009, which responds to the decision adopted by the World Heritage Committee in its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007).

a) Implementation of the new Integrated Plan within the framework of the National Programme for the Recuperation of Historic and Archaeological Monuments

The State Party reports that new agreements have been signed for the development of a management plan. No indication is provided as to the implementation of provisions made in prior documents or the reasons to revise the existing document.

b) Construction of roads as well as of developments concerning the Project for the construction of a National Airport in the area

The State Party reports that a portion of the Inter-Oceanic highway (Puquio-Nasca-Marcona) located to the south and within the buffer zone is currently being evaluated. The National Institute of Culture is addressing the issue by examining the existence of archaeological remains to prevent impacts on the property. It notes that the highway will not impact the property directly. As for the National Airport, no studies have been prepared yet and no activities are planned to date.

c) Progress achieved concerning the illegal settlements in the area of La Pascana

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report in February 2008 informing about the actions implemented in defence of the illegally occupied area. Currently the judicial process is being followed and a sentence, under appeal, exists for the removal of constructions in the area, therefore the legal process continues.

In addition to specific issues, the report contains information on activities implemented, including increased control and security at the site, preventive conservation measures on 12 geoglyphs, formulation of an investment project by the Regional Government (currently under review) for the enhanced security and control system, the construction of interpretation centre and the creation of a tourism route. It also notes that there have been forced landings of the light aircraft that fly over the site on the Pan-American Highway; although these have not have a direct impact on the property they need to be addressed.

In spite of progress made, without a management plan all of the activities implemented will continue to be disarticulated and reactive rather than proactive. An important consideration that also remains is the insufficiency of resources to comprehensively manage and preserve such as vast and complex property.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.144

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,*
2. *Recalling Decision **31 COM 7B.130**, adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007),*
3. *Urges the State Party to finalise the development of the management plan for the property and to secure adequate resources to sustain its implementation;*
4. *Takes note of the projects planned that might impact the property, in particular the Interoceanic Highway, the construction of a national airport and the proposed investment by the Regional Government, and requests the State Party, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to submit to the World Heritage Centre their specific details for review by ICOMOS;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, for the examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

145. Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988 extension on 1991

Criteria

(iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

27 COM 7B.99; 28 COM 15B.120

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 48,000 Emergency Assistance request for the *Nuestra Señora de la Soledad* chapel; USD 39,500 for the conservation works.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1994: Systematic monitoring report UNDP/UNESCO; March-April 2003: Reactive monitoring mission ICOMOS.

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Need of formalization of the procedures to set up a Management Coordination Unit to implement the Strategic Plan;
- b) Need of revision of the Master and Strategic Plans.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/500>

Current conservation issues

The World Heritage Committee has examined the state of conservation of Lima in two prior occasions, noting the absence of a management coordination unit to coordinate all actions implemented at the place by the agencies and different levels of government. The lack of information on the implementation of the Master Plan was also underscored. A report on conservation issues at the property raised by NGOs was received by the World Heritage Centre during 2008. The evaluation on the information provided raised concerns that several interventions were being carried out or projected that could have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property. Information was requested to the State Party on these projects during 2008, as per Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

On 11 January 2009, the State Party submitted information on projects pertaining to the Municipal Theatre, *Corredor segregado* for metropolitan Lima, the Cable Car, the Metropolitan Museum and the *Casa de las Trece Puertas* and *Casa del Rastro*. Due to impact that these interventions may have on the property, the World Heritage Committee decided to examine the state of conservation of the Historical Centre of Lima.

a) Municipal Theatre

In August 1998, the Municipal Theatre one of the most symbolic buildings, was severely affected by a fire. Assessment at the time indicated that significant damages occurred in all decoration but that no structural damage of importance was evidenced. In 2001 an integral plan for interventions at the Theatre and the surroundings was presented by a private consortium, which included architects and structural engineers. Within the framework of the project, a new assessment was carried out and structural damages were identified, which

apparently precluded the restoration of certain elements and justified the need for reconstruction. In 2003, the National Institute of Culture (INC) issued a directorial resolution approving the project, including the intervention for the façade. No further information is provided to elucidate whether the project is being implemented or if it was finalised.

b) *“Corredor segregado de alta capacidad” project*

The project is related to the creation of corridor for high capacity urban transport. It was presented originally in 2005. In October 2008, a final Directorial Resolution did not authorise the project. The Protransport Metropolitan Institute submitted a new project proposal in November 2008, in which revisions were made according to the observations of technical bodies throughout the process. In December 2008, the National Technical Commission for Architecture and Urbanism, dependent on the INC, made a series of technical observations to the presented proposal. No additional information is presented on the current status of the project and whether the Resolution of October 2008 that does not authorise the project will be respected.

c) *Cable car project*

In 2006, the Lima Municipality requested the approval for the construction of a cable car to join two parks (*La Muralla and Malecon del rio*) with the *Cerro de San Cristobal* to both create a tourism attraction and to facilitate transportation for local inhabitants in those areas. The cable car will have an extension of 1.43 km and apparently will go over some parts of the Historic Centre and the area currently inscribed in the World Heritage List. However, the maps are not very clear and the actual area cannot be identified. Also, although images were included to assess the potential impact of the cable car on the visual integrity of the place, their low quality make that impossible to ascertain. Given that significant archaeological remains exist in *La Muralla Park*, no infrastructure works are foreseen there but rather in areas where modern infrastructure has already been developed. In January 2008, the INC approved the project by Directorial Resolution and in consideration of the technical assessment of the National Technical Commission for Architecture and Urbanism. No further indications are provided on the current status. Also no impact assessment studies for the project have been sent.

d) *Metropolitan Museum*

Information submitted only includes a brief project sheet. The objective is to remodel 11,300m² of the building where the Ministry of Transport and Communications currently operates. The museum will include six exhibit areas, focused on the heritage of Lima, and will also house the Municipal Library and the historic and film archives of the city. No technical specifications for the interventions or projected architectural views are provided and no indication on whether the project has been authorised was included, which makes it difficult to evaluate the impact of the project in the historical building.

e) *“Casa de las Trece Puertas and Casa del Rastro”*

The report describes two projects to be undertaken in the block 05076 located next to the park *la Muralla* and located within the historical centre. The block 05076 includes five houses, among them *Casa de las siete puertas* and *Casa del rastro* whose intervention projects were outlined. Approval was granted for the interventions at *Casa de las Trece Puertas* in November 2004 to recover the building as a cultural space in the first floor and offices in the second. No detailed information on the project or its actual status was included.

The *Casa del rastro*, is part of the Municipal Programme for the Integral Urban Renovation of Lima, financed by the Municipal Fund for Urban Renovation. It is being developed in a participatory process including the inhabitants of the place. The programme focuses on improving the quality of life on current inhabitants at the historic centre with the renovation of housing developments almost in derelict state. The first phase of the project focuses on block 05076 and specifically in *Casa del rastro*, an area of approximately 2500 m², where 71 housing spaces were developed, in very close location to the central monumental area. Prior

to the construction, archaeological research was carried out. The architectural projections included in the report show a very modern building

The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS remain concerned about the impact that the mentioned projects may have on the historic centre. The World Heritage Centre requested in February 2009 additional information on the state of conservation of the property in order to assess in detail any possible impacts of the proposed projects by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.145

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,
2. Recalling Decision **28 COM 15B.120**, adopted at its 28th session (Suzhou, 2004),
3. Requests the State Party to submit more detailed technical information in regard to current intervention projects.
4. Urges the State Party to reconsider the construction of a cable car, considering the potential impacts on the visual integrity of the property, and to implement the Directorial Resolution so that the Corredor Segregado is not constructed in light of the effects it would have on the Historic Centre,
5. Regrets that no specific information concerning Decision **28 COM 15B.120** was sent; and reiterates its request to provide updated information on the state of the management system, including the implementation of the Master Plan and the operation of the management unit;
6. Takes note of the projects presented by the State Party and also requests the State Party, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to submit additional information on the current status and technical specifications for interventions at the Municipal Theatre, the Metropolitan Museum and the Municipal Programme for the Integral Urban Renovation of Lima, considering the potential impact said programmes could have on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, for review by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS;
7. Also requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010;
8. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2010**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, for the examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010.

146. Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (C 747)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1995

Criteria

(iv)

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

N/A

Previous Committee Decisions

28 COM 15B.105; 29 COM 7B.99; 32 COM 7B.128

International Assistance

Total amount provided to the property: USD 5,000 for the Preparatory Assistance

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: Technical mission financed by the Spanish Funds-in-Trust allocated to World Heritage.

Previous monitoring missions

April 2002 and May 2004: ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions; June 2008: ICOMOS technical mission

Main threats identified in previous reports

- a) Inappropriate architectural and urban design for a marina and hotel-casino in a building block at the old harbour;
- b) Need to strengthen management planning for the historic quarter.

Illustrative material

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list747>

Current conservation issues

An ICOMOS technical mission took place in June 2008 to evaluate the situation and potential impact of the “Marinas de Sacramento” project on the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property.

The World Heritage Centre received the State Party's report on 17 January 2009, which responds to decision **32 COM 7B.128** taken by the World Heritage Committee at its 32st session (Québec City, 2008).

a) Need to improve management planning, Completion of the management plan and establishment of a management authority for the coordination of the activities of the many national and local actors, organisations and stakeholders involved

The State Party reports that the “Consejo Ejecutivo Honorario de Colonia del Sacramento” (Honorary Executive Council for Colonia del Sacramento), a unit of the National Commission of Cultural Heritage, will be responsible for the management of the site,. It will be integrated by a multidisciplinary group with intersectorial participation, including representatives of the

Municipality and civil society. The Council has operating offices and will also serve as a central repository for information, with a planned Geographic Information System (GIS) to manage the data. Operational funding will be provided by the Ministry of Education and Culture to ensure its functionality in response to the new management arrangements. Technical personnel will be contracted to provide specialized and stable expertise to enhance management endeavours.

An official letter to start the process for an International assistance request has been received by the World Heritage Centre on 26 December 2008, currently the official request is on drafting process by the State Party. The request is for the completion of the management plan, and preliminary contacts have been established with the Municipality to ensure their participation in the planning process.

b) Suspension of the development of the project “Marinas de Sacramento” until alternatives without negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property have been identified, and submission of the alternative proposals

The State Party reports that the Municipality of Colonia has accepted the decision of the World Heritage Committee to suspend the project in October 2008 and that a new location will be evaluated. The Municipality has also indicated its commitment to inform on new projects to be developed in the protected area for timely evaluation by pertinent authorities and the World Heritage Committee.

c) Extension of the property to include the “Bay and Islands of the City of Colonia del Sacramento”

The Ministry of Education and Culture intends to request Preparatory Assistance to develop a proposal for the extension of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that the Colonia de Sacramento has experienced significant changes since its inscription on the World Heritage List: on one hand visitation and tourism have increased and in the other the local population at the historic centre has decreased, a situation underscored by the State Party during the Periodic Reporting exercise for Latin America and Caribbean (2002-2004).

Although the fabric of the historic buildings is in a fairly good state of conservation, there are issues that remain unresolved and that could potentially threaten the Outstanding Universal Value, authenticity and integrity of the property. Among these, pressure and decay derived from uncontrolled visitation and from surpassing carrying capacity limits, changes in function and in use of the historic buildings upon abandonment by traditional inhabitants and rise of real estate values, can be highlighted. In addition, management effectiveness and technical conservation efficiency needs to be improved, interventions continue to be carried out in a disarticulated manner and there are no precise guidelines for treatment of facades, colors and other interventions and no mechanisms in place to regulate inappropriate interventions. All of these issues need to be urgently addressed in a comprehensive, participatory and value-driven management plan to derive adequate, efficient and sustainable proposals.

Draft Decision: 33 COM 7B.146

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-09/33.COM/7B,

2. *Recalling Decision **32 COM 7B.128**, adopted at its 32nd session (Quebec City, 2008), and the recommendations of the previous monitoring missions of 2002, 2004 and 2008,*
3. *Takes note of the decision taken by the State Party to halt construction of the planned “Marinas de Sacramento” project;*
4. *Notes with satisfaction progress made in establishing a management authority and encourages the State Party to technically and financially support its efficient operation as a coordinating and regulatory entity;*
5. *Requests the State Party, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, to submit to the World Heritage Committee any new proposed projects potentially affecting the inscribed area, for review by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS;*
6. *Urges the State Party to fully develop and complete a comprehensive management plan for the property, including zoning and land use plans to be integrated into other planning tools;;*
7. *Invites the State Party to submit as soon as possible an International Assistance request to develop a proposal for the extension of the property;*
8. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2011**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and on the progress made in the implementation of the above recommendations, for the examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session in 2011.*

NATURAL PROPERTIES (CONTINUED)

AFRICA (CONTINUED)

147. Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257)

See Document *WHC-09/33.COM/7B.Add*