



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

37 COM

WHC-13/37.COM/7A

Paris, 3 May 2013

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-seventh session

Phnom Penh, Cambodia
16-27 June 2013

Item 7A of the Provisional Agenda: State of conservation of the properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

SUMMARY

In accordance with Section IV B, paragraphs 190-191 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the Committee shall review annually the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This review shall include such monitoring procedures and expert missions as might be determined necessary by the Committee.

This document contains information on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The World Heritage Committee is requested to review the reports on the state of conservation of properties contained in this document. 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/37COM/>

All previous state of conservation reports are available through the World Heritage State of conservation Information System at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Decision required: The Committee is requested to review the following state of conservation reports. The Committee may wish to adopt the draft Decision presented at the end of each state of conservation report.

TABLE OF CONTENT

I. STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS	3
NATURAL PROPERTIES.....	3
AFRICA.....	3
1. Manovo Gounda St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic) (N 475).....	3
2. Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 227)	7
3. Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire/Guinea) (N 155 bis)	7
4. Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63).....	7
5. Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 137).....	8
6. Garamba National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 136)	11
7. Salonga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 280).....	16
8. Okapi Wildlife Reserve (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 718)	20
9. General Decision on the properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo....	20
10. Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N 9).....	20
11. Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257)	20
12. Aïr and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger) (N 573)	21
13. Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153)	21
ASIA-PACIFIC.....	25
14. Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167).....	25
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	26
15. Everglades National Park (United States of America) (N 76)	26
LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN.....	29
16. Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System (Belize) (N 764).....	29
17. Los Katios National Park (Colombia) (N 711)	29
18. Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196).....	32
CULTURAL PROPERTIES	37
AFRICA.....	37
19. Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119rev)	37
20. Tomb of the Askia (Mali) (C 1139).....	37
21. Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) (C 1022)	37
22. Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 144).....	37
ARAB STATES.....	41
23. Abu Mena (Egypt) (C 90)	41
24. Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat) (Iraq) (C 1130).....	41
25. Samarra Archaeological City (Iraq) (C 276 rev)	43
26. Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan) (C 148 rev).....	45
27. Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem (Palestine) (C 1433)	46
28. Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) (C 611)	48

ASIA AND PACIFIC	52
29. Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) (C 211 rev)	52
30. Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Afghanistan) (C 208 rev)	55
31. Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 1208 bis).....	60
EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA	64
32. Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710)	64
33. Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708)	74
34. Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Serbia) (C 724 bis)	78
35. Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1150).....	87
LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN.....	91
36. Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)	91
37. Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works (Chile) (C 1178).....	94
38. Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) (C 366)	94
39. Coro and its Port (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (C 658).....	98

I. STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

1. Manovo Gounda St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic) (N 475)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1988

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

1997 to present

Property subject to the reinforced monitoring mechanism since 2009 (33 COM 7A.1)

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Illegal grazing and uncontrolled poaching by heavily armed groups
- b) subsequent loss of up to 80% of the Park's wildlife
- c) deteriorating security situation
- d) a halt to tourism

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/1761>

Corrective measures identified

Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/1761>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/1761>

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/475/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted : USD 275,488

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/475/assistance/>

UNESCO xtra-budgetary unds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

May 2001 and April 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring missions.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Insecurity;
- b) Poaching;
- c) Mining;
- d) Transhumance and illegal grazing;
- e) Illegal fishing;
- f) Illegal occupation of the property.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/475>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted a brief report on the state of conservation of the property. This report indicates a certain number of measures undertaken by the State Party without clearly referring to the recommendations of the corrective measures requested by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision **33 COM 7A.1**, making it difficult to evaluate progress achieved over the past years. In addition, the report acknowledges that the effective implementation of these measures is closely dependent upon the security situation in the north of the country which still remains unstable. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the present political situation created by the overthrow of the current government by the Seleka rebellion on 24 March 2013, risks once again to prevent the implementation of the corrective measures and the preparation of an emergency action plan, necessary to safeguard the Outstanding Universal Value of the property (OUV).

a) *Restructuring of the Park management, for a simple and effective organization specifically dedicated to the property*

The State Party report makes no mention of a restructuring of the Park management, while the 2011 report indicated a strategy for the north-eastern protected areas and a zoning of the property and its periphery. If, since 2010, the effective establishment of Village Hunting Zones (ZCV) and the Network of Local Associations for the Management of Cynegetic Village Zones (RALGEST-ZCV) may be noted (with support from the ECOFAC Programme), no corrective action is presented as regards the property. In addition, the report recalls that the ZCV now contain the essential biodiversity of the region necessary for any tentative to restore the value of the property.

b) *Strengthening of supervisory staff to ensure the main management missions (planning, surveillance, ecological monitoring, administration, logistics)*

The report makes no mention of the strengthening of supervisory staff but notes that the human, material and financial resources for the management of the property remain very limited.

c) *Increase in number and training of operational staff, essentially concerned with surveillance during this transition period, with support at the outset from the armed forces*

The report specifically emphasizes the lack of guards as well as insufficient means for land and aerial surveillance for such a vast territory. However, it indicates that an anti-poaching campaign is envisaged in collaboration with the RALGEST-ZCV, the Centrafrican Armed Forces (FACA) and the service responsible for National Parks. Consultations are underway with the other stakeholders, including border countries. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that such a campaign is important but remains a one-off activity. They note that with the evolution of the recent political situation, it is unlikely that this campaign will be implemented in the near future.

The report further highlights that military equipment was provided to the teams for the conservation of the protected areas in the north eastern region, including those responsible for the property, but no clear indication is provided as to the nature of this equipment, whether it fulfils the needs or the implementation capacities of the personnel.

- d) *Functional zoning of the Park with a priority intervention zone to conserve to the maximum the components conveying the Outstanding Universal Value of the Park (ecosystems and fauna)*

The report provides no information on the new zoning that was mentioned in its earlier reports of 2011 and 2012.

- e) *An action plan targeting the restoration of security and tranquility in this priority zone*

The report makes no mention of an action plan of this type.

- f) *A provisional budget adapted to these priorities, limited to the most necessary, to initiate at the outset of this phase a reflection on sustainable management*

The report provides no information in this respect.

- g) *A plan to counteract the crisis to be initiated in parallel, through consultation with the different protagonists, in particular from Chad and Sudan*

The report notes that during a session of the Commission of Central African Forests (COMIFAC) that was held in June 2012, a statement by ministers responsible for the fauna of Cameroon, Central African Republic and Chad confirm the need of a common strategy to combat large-scale transborder poaching, improvement of coordination in interventions and the involvement of all the parties concerned for the establishment of an appropriate operational mechanism. Following this official statement, experts from the three countries met on 17 and 18 September 2012 to discuss this subject and prepare a cooperative agreement to submit to the ministers; this agreement has apparently been transmitted to them but has not yet been signed by the three countries.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that an urgent meeting of Ministers of the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) was held from 21 to 23 March 2013 at the invitation of the Cameroon Government, and adopted a Plan of Extreme Emergency Anti-Poaching in the northern zone of Central Africa (PEXULAB). In the meeting statement, the ministers invited the Governments of Cameroon, Chad and the Central African Republic to sign the cooperation agreement of December 2012 as soon as possible.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note that the request for international assistance to organize the workshop to prepare an emergency plan for the property was approved by the Committee Chairperson but unfortunately the organization of the workshop had to be postponed due to the current political crisis in the Central African Republic.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the conclusions on the state of conservation of the property as contained in the earlier report, unfortunately remain current. The state of conservation of the Manovo-Gounda St Floris National Park has not improved since the 2009 mission. It is unlikely that the erosion of the biodiversity has been contained and the new political crisis that is affecting the country again risks rendering the implementation of the corrective measures difficult.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recall their conclusion already contained in the reports of 2011 and 2012 that, on the basis of the ECOFAC/MIKE aerial inventories of 2010, the property has lost its OUV, and that therefore it responds to criteria for the removal from the World Heritage List. However, there still remains a potential for regeneration based on the relict pockets of biodiversity and exchanges with neighbouring zones, but this potential is very fragile. Moreover, they note that without security in the region and an effective control of poaching, even the fauna in the neighbouring zones could quickly disappear.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the workshop destined to develop an emergency action plan once again had to be postponed due to the current political instability

in the region. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee request the World Heritage Centre to organize this workshop before the 38th session in a neighbouring country if the situation does not allow it to be convened in the Central African Republic. They recommend that during this workshop the experts also discuss the feasibility of regenerating the OUV of the property under the current conditions.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the plague of poaching, notably elephants, affects the whole continent and especially Central Africa (see also the introduction of Document WHC-13/37.COM/7B). They warmly welcome the decision of the countries of the ECCAS to adopt a Plan of Extreme Emergency Anti-Poaching in the northern and Central African zone (PEXULAB) as well as the draft agreement for collaboration developed by Cameroon, Central African Republic and Chad and consider that it should be realized without delay with a tangible agreement and actions in the field. They encourage the involvement of Sudan and South Sudan in the process in order to render it efficient.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.1

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC.13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7A.1** adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Takes note with satisfaction of the adoption by the countries of the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) of a Plan of Extreme Emergency Anti-Poaching in the northern zone of Central Africa as well as the agreement being validated between the Central African Republic, Chad and Cameroon to combat large-scale transfrontier poaching and launches an appeal to the States Parties concerned for this agreement to be signed without delay, so that effective actions may be established immediately and that Sudan and South Sudan be associated as soon as possible in this dynamic;*
4. *Reiterates its grave concern regarding the continued insecurity problems within the property due to the political situation in Central African Republic and the collateral repercussions of conflict in the neighbouring countries;*
5. *Considers that the delay in the preparation of the emergency plan to safeguard the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, the prevalence of poaching and the impacts of transhumant livestock, increase the risks of the disappearance of all the flagship species of large mammals in the property, and thus possibly calling into question the OUV for which the property was inscribed;*
6. *Notes, nevertheless, that there still remains a potential for regeneration of the populations of fauna from the relict pockets of biodiversity adjacent to the property, but recalls with concern that this potential, which remains very fragile, and could rapidly disappear if security in the region and an effective control of poaching are not guaranteed;*
7. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to prepare an emergency action plan based on the corrective measures adopted by the Committee at its 33rd session (Seville, 2009) and the guidelines contained in the conclusion of the present report;*
8. *Regrets that the workshop to develop an emergency action plan was postponed due to political instability, and requests the World Heritage Centre to assist in the organization*

of this workshop before the 38th session in 2014, in a neighbouring country, if the situation in the Central African Republic remains unchanged;

9. *Also requests that this workshop considers the feasibility of the restoration of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property under the current conditions of security and draw necessary conclusions on the pertinence of this restoration action;*
10. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2014**, a detailed report on the results of the workshop and the preparation, financing and implementation of an urgent management plan, for the safeguarding of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;*
11. *Decides to continue to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism for the property;*
12. ***Also decides to maintain Manovo-Gounda St Floris National Park (Central African Republic) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

2. Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 227)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late mission report)

3. Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire/Guinea) (N 155 bis)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late mission report)

Note : the following reports on the World Heritage properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) are to be read in conjunction with Item 9 of the present document.

4. Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late receipt of new information)

5. Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 137)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(x)

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

1997 to present

Application of the reinforced monitoring mechanism at the property since 2007 (31 COM 7A.32)

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Adverse refugee impact
- b) Irregular presence of armed militia and settlers at the property
- c) Increased poaching
- d) Deforestation.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

A draft has been developed during the 2009 reactive monitoring mission (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/137/documents>), but the indicators still need to be quantified based on the results of a census of large mammals.

Corrective measures identified

Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4081>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Not yet established

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/137/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 113 870 USD

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/137/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount granted: USD 980,000 from the United Nations Foundation (UNF), and the Governments of Italy and Belgium and by the Rapid Response Facility (RRF)

Previous monitoring missions

December 2009: joint IUCN/World Heritage Centre reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Presence of armed groups, lack of security and political instability rendering a large part of the property inaccessible to the guards ;
- b) Attribution of mining permits inside the property ;
- c) Poaching by armed military groups ;
- d) Villages in the ecological corridor between the highland and lowland sectors of the park ;
- e) Illegal mining and deforestation.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/137>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 25 February 2013. The report provides some information concerning the implementation of the corrective measures:

- a) *Evacuate the armed groups from the property and extend the area of surveillance to the whole property*

The State Party notes that after encouraging results achieved in 2011 in terms of securing the park, the security situation in the area has unfortunately degraded again as a result of the emergence of a new armed militia in the region "Raia Mutomboki" and following the M23 (March 23 Movement) rebellion in the East which started end of 2012. As a result, large parts of the lowland sector are again off limits to park staff and surveillance had to be suspended in the Lulingo, Itebero and Nzovu sectors.

- b) *Close down all the illegal mining extraction operations within the property and officially cancel all the mining concessions encroaching on the property*

The report does not provide any data on the situation of illegal artisanal mining in the property but press reports note that the Raia Mutomboki militia has occupied artisanal mining sites in the region. The report also provides no update on the situation with regard to the mining concessions which are encroaching on the property. However, the recommendations adopted at the Conference organized by the Congolese Government on "Governance and transparency in the mining sector", held in Lubumbashi on 30 January 2013, should be underlined. (See General report on the World Heritage properties of the Republic Democratic of the Congo in document WHC-13/37COM/7A.XX).

- c) *Evacuate the ecological corridor and initiate measures to restore plant species and connectivity*

The State Party notes the dialogue at provincial level to address this issue is continuing with the objective of establishing a single and clear land register which takes into account the limits of the property in order to avoid future illegal land attributions. In December 2012, the protected area management authority also initiated a procedure to request the Governor of the South Kivu province to cancel all farming concessions illegally granted by the services of land rights and the cadaster. No information is provided on the results. The report also mentions that an inter-ministerial committee has been set up at national level to deal with land use disputes concerning protected areas, but that this has not yet produced tangible results.

- d) *Develop, in a participatory manner, and implement a zoning plan to resolve the issue of the villages in the lowland sector, while maintaining the values and integrity of the property*

The State Party notes that most villages inside the park alongside the Mumbili and Nkolo trail have been deserted as a result of the renewed insecurity. The populations of these villages have been displaced to the towns outside the property but community conservation park staff continues a dialogue with them to identify a solution for the land disputes in the park. The State Party further notes that discussions are underway with the communities adjacent to the lowland sector in order to establish a buffer zone for the park.

- e) *Continue the efforts to reactivate surveillance mechanisms, while ensuring control of the whole Park*

As mentioned above and as a result of renewed insecurity, a large part of the lowland sector of the park is again out of the control of park staff, reversing the positive trend reported last year. The State Party notes that a new configuration of the surveillance sectors was decided to facilitate surveillance activities.

- f) *Complete and approve the Management Plan for the property and ensure the means for its implementation*

The implementation of the first phase (2009-2011) of the Management Plan was evaluated using the “Enhancing our Heritage” methodology. The evaluation concluded that while there had been some encouraging results, the global implementation of the work plan of the first three years had been poor, partly because of security problems but also because of insufficient staff numbers and capacity. A three-years operational plan 2012–2014 has been developed.

- g) *Species inventory*

The State Party notes that in November 2012, work had started on the inventory of the sectors located in the lowland but that the activity had to be suspended following the increased insecurity. The State Party stresses that conducting the inventories remains a priority and work will be continued as soon as the security situation allows. Monitoring of the gorilla population and the small residual population of elephants in the high altitude sector is continuing.

- h) *Limit local traffic to the part of Road RN3 crossing the property, ensure the means for control, and envisage a ring road around the property should the route towards Kisangani re-open*

The State Party provides no new information on this issue. It mentions that plans for the construction of the Tshivanga park headquarters and the park stations and patrol posts have been approved by the park authorities but that building has not yet started. The headquarters will be constructed on the boundary of the park but the location of the other infrastructure has not yet been determined.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee express its utmost concern about the renewed insecurity which is again affecting the lowland sector, covering 90% of the park. They recall that this area had been inaccessible for park staff for many years and only recently park surveillance activities had re-started. The renewed infiltration of armed groups and the suspension of surveillance activities are therefore a significant setback for restoring the integrity of the property. They note that there is a significant risk that the progress which had been achieved in implementing the corrective measures will again be lost.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that restoring the security is the pre-condition for implementing the corrective measures and restoring the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They recall the commitment of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in the January 2011 Kinshasa Declaration to create the conditions for the implementation of the corrective measures by securing the properties.

They recommend that the Committee maintain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism be applied.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.5

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7A.5**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*

3. Expresses its utmost concern about the renewed insecurity as a result of the infiltration of armed groups which has led to the suspension of surveillance in the lowland sector, covering 90% of the property;
4. Considers that there is a significant risk that the achievements made in implementing the corrective measures will again be lost and notes that restoring security is the pre-condition for implementing the corrective measures and restoring the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
5. Strongly urges the State Party to take all necessary measures to restore security in the area and evacuate armed groups from the property in line with the commitments made in the Kinshasa Declaration and in order to create the conditions to allow the protected area management authority “Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature” (ICCN) to restore the surveillance in the entire property and continue the implementation of the corrective measures adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010);
6. Takes note of the establishment of an inter-ministerial committee to deal with land use disputes and reiterates its request to the State Party to cancel land rights illegally granted in the property as well as mining concessions encroaching on the property, in conformity with the commitments made in the Kinshasa Declaration;
7. Reiterates its position that mining and oil exploration and exploitation are incompatible with World Heritage status;
8. Also reiterates its request to the State Party to carry out as soon as possible a survey of the main populations of wildlife in the lowland sectors of the property to enable an assessment of the state of the Outstanding Universal Value and the establishment of a timetable for the rehabilitation of the property;
9. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2014**, a report on the state of conservation of the property, including an updated situation on the security situation in the property, mining concessions and land rights granted on the territory of the property, progress accomplished in the resolution of the problem of illegal occupation of the ecological corridor and in the implementation of the corrective measures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;
10. Decides to maintain the Reinforced monitoring mechanism for the property;
11. Also decides to retain the **Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

6. Garamba National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 136)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1980

Criteria
(vii) (x)

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

1984-1992; 1996 to present

Property subject to the reinforced monitoring mechanism since 2007 (31 COM 7A.32)

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Increased poaching;
- b) pressure linked to the civil war, thereby threatening the flagship species of the property

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

A draft was prepared during the 2010 reactive monitoring mission (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/136/documents/>) but indicators need to be quantified on this basis of the results of the main mammals censuses.

Corrective measures identified

Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4082>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Not yet established

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/136/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 262,870

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/136/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount granted: USD 910,000 from the United Nations Foundation, the Governments of Italy, Belgium and Spain and the Rapid Response Facility.

Previous monitoring missions

2006 and 2010: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Armed conflict and political instability;
- b) Poaching by nationals and transborder armed groups;
- c) Unadapted management capabilities.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/136>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/fr/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 25 February 2013, the State party submitted a summary report on the state of conservation of the property with brief information on the implementation of the corrective measures.

The report indicates that the presence of rebels of the “Lord’s Resistance Army” (LRA) continue to disturb the security of the site and the populations, complicate management of the property and lead to an important increase in poaching. On 5 June 2012, an important skirmish occurred at 12 km from Nagero, the Park station, between the Park guards and a group of about 50 armed men of the LRA. This attack has obliged the NGO African Parks Network (APN) mandated by the Congolese Nature Conservation Institute (ICCN) for the management of the Park, to evacuate a large number of its staff for fear of a new assault on the station, similar to the one in 2009, where 15 employees of the Park were killed and the station ransacked. Several fire arms as well as elephant meat was found at the place of the skirmish. With support from the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) and the Congolese Army (FARDC), an aerial reconnaissance of the Park was organized resulting in the discovery of a camp abandoned by the rebels, located at 20 km from where the skirmish took place. Although the staff have now returned to the site, the security situation remains a concern.

The following information is provided concerning the implementation of corrective measures:

- a) *Take urgent measures at the highest level to halt the involvement of the Armed Forces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (FARDC) in poaching activities*

The report indicates that several meetings were held throughout 2012, with the FARDC, notably to raise awareness regarding the anti-poaching combat and to restrain the undisciplined soldiers involved in poaching. The management authority has established an agreement with the FARDC stipulating that the soldiers present in the Park be accompanied by an ICCN agent. In exchange, the Park undertakes to provide rations to the military contingents. ICCN reports a decrease in the involvement of the FARDC in poaching.

- b) *Ensure that the ICCN guard force is correctly equipped, in particular with adequate arms and ammunition*

The State Party informs that the guards at site are equipped with material but indicated that the lack of arms and ammunitions remains one of the biggest challenges to ensure the surveillance of the Park.

- c) *Strengthen disarmament efforts within the communities living around the property*

The State Party informs that the Park is not mandated to conduct disarmament operations within the local communities living around the property. It also informs that during the attack on 5 June 2012, ICCN was unable to respond to the assault by the LRA and that MONUSCO's mandate ensures the security of the populations. The State Party also deplors the lack of collaboration on the part of MONUSCO.

- d) *Renew contacts with South Sudan to strengthen transboundary cooperation with Lantoto National Park*

The State Party informs that contacts with the South Sudan authorities and the National Park of Lantoto have been renewed. Several meetings were held in 2012 that facilitate information exchange and contacts between the parks. Thanks to this collaboration, poachers identified in Garamba were arrested upon their return to South Sudan. Finally, the State Party indicates that an evaluation of the cooperation mechanism will be held during 2013.

- e) *Ensure that a team of at least 200 operational guards are available*

The State Party informs that 134 guards are operational, and that 80 agents have been "recycled" by a team of consultants specialized in security and conservation. In this group, 35 agents have received more specialized training in security to make up a rapid intervention team to respond to increasing pressure from poaching. In addition, 32 agents are on the point of retirement. The State Party indicates that the park is going to recruit 80 guards in 2013 that will increase its staff to 182 agents.

- f) *Gradually extend the surveillance area to include the total area of the Park and at least 20% of the hunting grounds, by 2015*

The State Party informs that the surveillance area of Garamba National Park extends towards the northern part of the Park. Surveillance is now in operation in the north: from the Garamba River to Mont Magunda Molovia and Mont Bawesi, a sector that was abandoned for a long time, and regular aerial surveillance covers the totality of the area of movement of the elephants. According to APN, the surveillance area now covers 50% of the property.

- g) *Establish a conservation strategy for the hunting grounds (DC) so they may fully play their role of buffer zone*

The State Party indicates that the security problems in the hunting grounds prevent the global control of the property and note that currently it is impossible to oversee the 12,500 km² of the property and its buffer zone. A survey on elephant movement equipped with a GPS (global positioning system) collar shows that the elephant population is concentrated in

the property and also in the Gangala na Bodio hunting grounds in the south of the property. This work enables the targeting of surveillance in the zones of interest for elephants, thus all these zones are controlled by regular aerial patrols. In 2012, APN also equipped five giraffe to study their movements and envisage extending this procedure to lions in 2013. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN hope that the bio-monitoring data will be transmitted to them during 2013.

h) Strengthen community conservation activities to improve relations with the local communities

As mentioned in the 2012 report, numerous activities targeting the local communities have been implemented, with support from the Spanish Government and the European Union. Environmental education activities continue with schoolchildren and in the future will be extended to adults and women's associations that appreciate visits to the Park. Furthermore, the Community Conservation Committees (CCC) shows an increasing interest in the Park and the three districts wish to be associated with its conservation. Moreover, the Park supports many social activities, including the school at Nagero, the medical dispensary that will be officially inaugurated in April 2013, and the construction of a water pump.

i) Finalize and approve the Management Plan for the property and ensure the means for its implementation

The State Party mentions that the General Management Plan (GMP) (2011-2015) has been completed and approved at the end of 2012, by the ICCN Directorate General. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN have not yet officially received it.

j) Wildlife status

The report notes that the last survey in 2012 indicated a decrease in the number of elephants and a slight increase in certain species, concentrated in particular zones without providing precise details. Although it was not transmitted by the State Party, the report of the 2012 survey is available in the data bank of the Specialist Group for African Elephants of the IUCN Species Survival Commission. The survey considers the elephant population to be around 1,600 individuals, a reduction of more than 50% compared to the last survey in 2007 (the population was calculated to be 3,600 individuals) and 85% in comparison to the survey in 1995 prior to inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger (the population was calculated at 11,000 individuals). It is evident that the property once again is facing a major increase in poaching of elephants, encouraged by the rise in the price of ivory. In April 2012, 22 elephants were killed in one day from an unidentified helicopter, demonstrating the presence of a network of organized and heavily armed professional poachers. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that an increase in elephant poaching is prevalent throughout Africa, including in several other World Heritage properties. Finally, it is noted that during the survey, no Northern White Rhinoceros were recorded.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the World Heritage Committee express its grave concern with regard to the results of the 2012 survey that shows on the one hand, an alarming reduction of 85% in the elephant population compared to the number indicated at the time of inscription of the site on the World Heritage List and on the other hand, this survey has not been able to confirm the presence of the White Rhinoceros in the northern part of the property, which reinforces the opinion of the IUCN Species Survival Commission that the sub-species is extinct in the DRC.

They consider that this increase in poaching is linked to the persistent pockets of armed groups, notably the LRA rebels as well as a network of *well equipped and heavily armed* professional poachers.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the important efforts of the management authority to extend the surveillance area of the site as well as the efforts to increase the number of

guards for the property, provide them with equipment, train them and establish a rapid intervention team to respond to the poaching crisis. However, they consider that the lack of arms and ammunitions endangers the life of the guards and that it is difficult for the guards to respond to armed groups like the LRA. They recall the commitments undertaken by the Congolese Government in the Kinshasa Declaration of January 2011, with regard to security at the sites and strengthening of the operational capacities of the ICCN, in particular to ensure the availability of mapping equipment for surveillance activities.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that as the data of a new survey is available, the indicators for the Desired State of Conservation of the property for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger should be completed.

For the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, the results of the survey clearly show that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is extremely threatened despite the important efforts of the management authority and its partners to reverse the tendencies of degradation. They therefore recommend that the Committee maintain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.6

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7A.6** adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Expresses its grave concern regarding the alarming reduction of the elephant population by 85% compared to the number present at the time of inscription of the site on the World Heritage List, and the fact that the presence of the White Rhinoceros in the northern part of the property remains unconfirmed;*
4. *Regrets the increase in poaching due to persistent pockets of armed groups, notably the "Lord's Resistance Army" (LRA) as well as the network of well equipped and heavily armed professional poachers and notes that the lack of mapping equipment continues to pose important risks for the guards during patrols;*
5. *Commends the efforts of the management authority and its partners to extend the surveillance area well as efforts to strengthen the guard numbers, provide equipment, train and establish a rapid intervention team to respond to the poaching crisis;*
6. *Recalls the commitments taken by the Congolese Government in the Kinshasa Declaration of January 2011, specifically regarding security of the World Heritage properties and strengthening of the operational capacities of the Congolese Nature Conservation Institute (ICCN), and the availability of arms and ammunitions for surveillance activities;*
7. *Requests the State Party to continue its efforts to implement the corrective measures to rehabilitate the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
8. *Also requests the State Party, based on the results of the survey of large mammal populations and in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, to finalize the Desired State of Conservation of the property for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger and update the required timetable, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;*

9. ***Further requests*** the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2014**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including an update of progress achieved in the implementation of the corrective measures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;
10. ***Decides*** to continue the application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism for the property;
11. ***Also decides*** to retain **Garamba National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

7. Salonga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 280)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
1984

Criteria
(vii) (ix)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
1999 to present

Property subjected to the reinforced monitoring mechanism since 2007 (31 COM 7A.32)

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Impact due to conflict,
- b) increased poaching and illegal encroachment affecting the integrity of the site

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

A project was drafted during the reactive monitoring mission in 2012 (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/280/documents/>) but the indicators basing on the results of the counting of flagship species still needs to be quantified

Corrective measures identified
Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/1270>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures
Will be established when the indicators will have been finalized

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/280/documents/>

International Assistance
Total amount granted: USD 164,500
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/280/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
Total amount granted: USD 320,000 from the United Nations Foundation and the Governments of Italy and Belgium

Previous monitoring missions
2007, 2012: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Armed conflict, lack of security and political instability;
- b) Poaching by the army and armed groups;
- c) Conflicts with local communities concerning Park boundaries;
- d) Impact of villages located within the property.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/280>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc/>

Current conservation issues

On 25 February 2013, the State Party submitted a fairly complete report on the state of conservation of the property. It made mention of the efforts undertaken by the State Party in the implementation of the corrective measures adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012).

The State Party indicated that the main threats affecting the integrity of the property identified by the previous joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission remain present, in particular poaching by armed groups and the local communities, the absence of a protected ecological continuum between the two sectors of the Park and the impact and presence of villages within the boundaries of the Park.

The report provides the following information on the efforts undertaken to implement the corrective measures:

a) Secure the property to eliminate pockets of rebellion still present within the property

The State Party notes that the important mixed FARDC/ICCN operation, the “Bonobo Operation”, launched in October 2011, is still active and has strengthened security in the property. This intervention enabled the reestablishment of ICCN authority and reinforced the anti-poaching combat. The State Party notes that 300 soldiers of the 3rd military region of the Equator are divided into three blocks in Salonga National Park (SNP), based respectively at Boleko in the south-west, Monkoto in the centre and Watsikengo in the north of the Park. Joint FARDC/ICCN patrols have assisted in establishing control of 80% of the property and have seized approximately 170 fire arms, 100 hunting rifles and 2000 rounds of ammunition. 1,200 metal traps have been dismantled and several illicit camps have been destroyed. The report also provides a detailed list of 36 poachers arrested as well as information on the progress of their courtcase.

b) Reignite the consultation structure to eliminate poaching in the Park

The State Party indicates that the consultation structure of the property has not yet been reactivated despite the recommendations of the March 2012 mission. However, the political, military and administrative authorities cooperate closely in continuing the anti-poaching combat and to secure the property. The report notes that the military operations are concentrated between the four provinces and are headed by the 3rd military region of the Equator, that has been instructed to extend its anti-poaching actions to the provinces of Bandundu and the two Kasai. A redeployment project is under study at Headquarters level for a 3rd deployment group to be posted at the Park boundaries to contain poaching activities.

c) Revise and implement the anti-poaching strategy

The State Party informs that, since 2007, an anti-poaching strategy has been active, but does not provide further details. With joint patrols, a patrolling schedule has been set up, and two teams of eight eco-guards are deployed each month in the six sectors of the Park. The monitoring data gathered by the patrols is fed into the “MIST” system, that was provided by UNESCO. The report cites the “MIST” data for 2012 for one of the sectors of the Park, Monkoto Sector. However, the State Party notes that staff numbers remain low to ensure an adequate monitoring of the property. The report indicated 250 guards but does not provide any information on equipment (arms, ammunition) and any future or current technical training for the guards, as recommended by the 2012 mission. The State Party mentions that in October 2012, an important cargo of bush meat was seized in the Monkoto sector and that it was burnt publicly to discourage future perpetrators.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the Committee, on several occasions, has requested a copy of the surveillance strategy; this document was not made available to the reactive monitoring mission during its visit to the property. However, they commend the very important efforts made to improve the surveillance of the property.

d) Implement the a global ecological monitoring of the entire Park

The State Party indicates that the anti-poaching strategy is concentrated on the zones of high density biodiversity that were identified at the time of the inventories in 2005 by the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS). The data gathered by the Milwaukee Zoological Society (MZS) in the Watsikengo Sector have enabled the efforts of the patrols to be concentrated in sensitive areas of the property along the Yenge and Salonga Rivers. However, the data should be updated by new inventories.

e) Manage the conflicts affecting the natural resources

The participatory delineation procedure of the non-natural boundaries of SNP continued in 2012 and was extended into the Bianga Sector. The State Party mentions the establishment in the Monkoto sector of a platform for fishermen to co-manage the adjacent rivers in the Park but does not provide further information on the mission recommendation to reconsider the boundary granted locally for fishing rights towards the river banks and the establishment of prohibited areas. The State Party notes that Local Conservation Committees (LCC) meet regularly to raise-awareness among the local communities regarding an effective participatory conservation and that the local communities benefit from various support activities.

f) Pursue the creation of an ecological continuum between the two sectors of the Park

The State Party indicates the completion of the delineation for the ecological continuum, without further information, but that the listing procedure for the area to be listed as a community reserve has not yet been initiated.

g) Conduct studies concerning the situation and ecological impact of the two communities established inside the Park before taking any relocation decision

The State Party considers that the negative impact linked to the presence of the two communities established within the Park is evident and persistent. ICCN, with support of WCS-Salonga, sent in November 2012 a socio-economic investigating team to the Lyaelimas community. The results of this study are not yet available but they should direct ICCN in its decision-making process regarding the relocation of these populations. ICCN indicates that the dialogue with the Kitawalists is more complicated and has not yet started, as this community is more often involved in poaching activities.

Finally, the State Party mentions that SNP has a General Management Plan (GMP) and a Business Plan that must be approved by the ICCN General Directorate. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note this major progress and request the State Party to submit an official copy of the GMP.

h) Other conservation problems

The 2012 mission had received information indicating the interest of the Congolese Government in oil exploration and exploitation in the central basin of the property, and in its Decision **36 COM 7A.7** the World Heritage Committee requested the State Party to provide detailed information on these exploration projects that risk encroaching on the property. The State Party report provides no information in this respect. However, the World Heritage Centre raised this issue during various meetings with ICCN, in particular during the meeting for the evaluation of the Kinshasa Declaration which was held in Kinshasa on 23 January 2013 (see the general report on World Heritage properties in the DRC – document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.). ICCN indicated that the permits granted were located outside the property, but did not provide any maps or clarifications.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee commends the important efforts of the State Party to secure the property and reduce large-scale poaching, notably of elephants. They note that ICCN now controls 80% of the property but question whether the area is actually covered by surveillance. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN also note the progress achieved by the managers and their partners concerning the delineation and the participatory management of the rivers, but they recall the importance of establishing prohibited areas along the rivers and to reconsider the locally granted fishing boundaries. They reiterate the importance of seeking a suitable solution for the issue of communities installed inside the Park and to formalize the protection status of the ecological corridor between the two sectors of the Park.

They draw the attention of the World Heritage Committee to the fact that it will take time to establish an effective management structure at the site in view of the vast area, logistical problems, available budgets and the insecurity situation that, despite the improvements, remains an important challenge. They emphasize the importance of carrying out a new inventory of the key species to quantify the state of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and to establish a Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, as well as a realistic timetable. They recommend maintaining the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the application of the reinforced monitoring mechanism.

Finally, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee reiterate its request to the State Party to provide more detailed information on the exploration and exploitation projects in the central basin that could encroach on the property.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.7

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7A.7**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Warmly welcomes the important efforts of the State Party to secure the property and reduce large-scale poaching, notably elephants, enabling the management authority to regain control of 80% of the property;*
4. *Takes note of the progress reported by the property managers and their partners concerning the participatory management of the natural resources and their involvement in the marking of the property;*
5. *Considers that it will need time to establish an effective management of the site in view of the vast area, logistical problems, available budgets and the security situation that, despite improvements, remains an important challenge;*
6. *Urges the State Party to continue to implement the corrective measures, as updated by the World Heritage Centre/IUCN joint reactive monitoring mission in 2012 to rehabilitate the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
7. *Requests the State Party to carry out inventories of the flagship species to quantify the state of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, establish a Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and a realistic timetable;*

8. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to provide detailed information on the oil exploration and exploitation projects in the central basin that risk encroaching on the property and recalls its position on the incompatibility of mining and oil exploration and exploitation with World Heritage status;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Committee by 1 February 2014 a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property and progress achieved in the implementation of the corrective measures for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;*
10. *Decides to continue to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism;*
11. *Also decides to maintain Salonga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) on the List of World Heritage in Danger*

8. Okapi Wildlife Reserve (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 718)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late mission)

9. General Decision on the properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add

10. Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N 9)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

11. Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late receipt of supplementary information)

12. Aïr and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger) (N 573)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late receipt of supplementary information)

13. Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1981

Criteria

(x)

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

2007 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Poaching
- b) Livestock grazing
- c) Dam construction project at Sambangalou

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Adopted, see page http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/?id_decision=4087&

Corrective measures identified

Adopted, see page http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/?id_decision=4087&

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Adopted, see page http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/?id_decision=4087&

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/153/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 117,829

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/153/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

2001, 2007 and 2010: Joint World Heritage Centre / IUCN reactive monitoring missions.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Poaching, capture and relocation of wildlife;
- b) Drying up of ponds, and invasive species;
- c) Illegal logging;
- d) Livestock grazing;
- e) Road construction project;
- f) Potential dam construction;
- g) Potential mining exploration and exploitation.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/153>

and <http://whc.unesco.org/fr/soc>

Current conservation issues

The report submitted by the State Party on 4 January 2013 on the state of conservation of the property provides information on the implementation of some of the corrective measures and gives responses to certain problems raised by the Committee at its 36th session (Saint Petersburg, 2012) It is regrettable that the State Party report does not provide details on the progress achieved in this implementation, or on the perspectives envisaged for the coming year concerning each of the approved corrective measures.

a) Strengthen and establish the anti-poaching mechanism

The report indicates that 25 additional agents were recruited in February 2012, but it does not provide any information on the current number of available staff for the management, surveillance and the anti-poaching mechanism for the property, nor on the deployment of this staff in the field. However, it highlights the presence of mobile brigades and the “dense and systematic” grid work in the Park.

The table recording arrest and confiscation provided by the State Party demonstrates that there have been numerous interventions between the months of February to April 2012, and then they greatly diminished, but the report apparently does not indicate whether this reflects an efficient action undertaken (the poachers now avoid the region) or if the anti-poaching activities were less intense after May due to difficult conditions caused by the rainy season.

b) Increase the staff of the property and provide, as soon as possible, training for them focusing on the protection of the property, its integrated management, security regulations, and provide them with equipment essential to their mission

The report does not indicate whether the staff benefit from adapted training courses but underlines that the means for the implementation of the management of the Park have improved thanks to diverse State Party investments (construction of four new control posts, acquisition of material, provision of vehicles).

c) Propose and implement real alternatives to the drilling of boreholes outside the Park in order to reduce the straying of cattle in the overall context of seasonal migration

Consultation meetings with the local communities have enabled the identification of the different types of conflict but the report provides no information as regards the problems linked to pressure exercised by grazing in and around the property, the possible drilling of boreholes, the benefits and risks that might be involved or the alternatives available. Also, there is no mention of the establishment of a Steering Committee for the property as evoked in 2012, nor of its composition or function.

d) Update the Park's ecological monitoring

The State Party report makes no mention of the implementation of a simplified ecological monitoring programme. The ecological monitoring described in the report only refers to visual contact with major fauna and the presence of their tracks, including the lion, Giant Eland, wild dogs and an observation of elephants.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that these observations generally concern a small number of species and that the data only enable recordings for some sectors of the Park containing certain species, without being able to evaluate with precision the general importance of numbers and their variation throughout the property. These somewhat encouraging results, however indicate that the number of large fauna in the Park still remain considerably reduced and critical, as had been observed by an aerial surveillance mission in 2011.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the large fauna had not entirely disappeared and the restoration of more important numbers was possible in the medium-term on the condition that the management of the property is sustainably improved.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN remain, nevertheless, relatively concerned by the erosion of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and reiterate the request of the Committee that a complete inventory of the fauna be urgently organized, covering the whole property and employing methods enabling a reliable comparison with earlier surveys.

e) Improve boundary marking of the property

The report notes that the consultation meetings with the villages around the property resulted in the densification of the marking of the Park near the limit of the agricultural zone as well as participatory zoning in the rural community of Dialacoto. The report, however, makes no mention as to whether these are one-off measures or whether the boundaries of the entire property are now recognized and respected by the neighbouring populations.

f) Establishment of an emergency restoration programme for the ponds in the periphery of the property and its surroundings and make concrete proposals for alternatives to the ponds as water holes in the property

The report makes no mention of the implementation of this corrective measure.

g) Rehabilitation of impassable tracks in the property

The report refers to the ongoing programme of repair work concerning 300 km of tracks to be carried out over 2012 and 2013; to date, a first section of 125 km has been repaired but the report provides no information on the location of the work and the strategic interest, nor on the length of the tracks remaining to be repaired for the satisfactory management of the Park.

h) Control of mining impacts and the Sambangoulou Dam

The report submitted by the State Party in 2012 informed of the closure of the basalt quarry located within the property and the commitment of the State Party in undertaking actions for the rehabilitation of the exploitation zone; but the current 2013 report makes no mention of progress achieved in the rehabilitation of the site.

Concerning the Sambangoulou Dam project, the State Party indicated that the work had “not yet” commenced but it judged unnecessary to complete the environmental impact studies carried out in 2007 and 2010 because it considered that the earlier reports provided sufficient information on the potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and an environmental, management and social plan has been prepared and was available. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the studies in question were never transmitted.

Furthermore, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the updating procedure for the Management Plan initiated in 2011 with assistance from the IUCN Protected Areas Programme has been postponed.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note with satisfaction that the State Party has made progress in the implementation of the corrective measures, however they note their concern with the imminent completion of the budgetized 2-year Action Plan (2011-2013) and consider it necessary to prepare a budgetized Action Plan for 5 years that would benefit from achievements of the first two years of the previous plan.

They note that the report provides little information on implementation of the corrective measures and therefore consider that it is difficult to evaluate their progress.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN wish to highlight that if the control and anti-poaching activities, which were reinforced in 2012, appear to be successful, the very low level of large mammals remains very worrying. They consider that if the animal populations do not stabilise and shows no signs of increasing in the near future, there will be no effective short-term restoration of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They therefore recommend that the Committee request the State Party to give priority to the implementation of the corrective measures and the Emergency Action Plan prepared with assistance from IUCN, in

order to stabilise these tendencies. It would also be desirable that an inventory to evaluate the state and dynamics of the populations of key species and their habitats, covering the entire property, be taken into account in the emergency plan.

They note that the impact studies for the Sambangalou Dam treated potential impacts of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the site and that an environmental, management and social plan has been prepared. They recommend that the Committee request that the studies evaluating potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property be transmitted, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

They note, finally, that no information has been provided on progress accomplished in the preparation of the Desired State of Conservation, with a view to the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. They therefore recommend that the Committee maintain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.13

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7A.12** adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Notes with satisfaction the efforts undertaken by the State Party to reinforce the anti-poaching combat and the delineation of the property, in consultation with the neighbouring communities, and it encourages the State Party to strengthen the operational means for the mobile brigades throughout the year by establishing a special anti-poaching budget;*
4. *However, expresses once again its grave concern with regard to the low density of large animals within the property and urgently requests the State Party to strengthen the implementation of the corrective measures and the Emergency Action Plan prepared with assistance from IUCN, aimed at preserving the still existing elements of Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
5. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit a specific study on the impacts of the Sambangalou Dam project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, prior to any decision-making on its construction, in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;*
6. *Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by **1 February 2014**, an updated explicit and informative report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress achieved in the implementation of the seven corrective measures and the other issues mentioned above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;*
7. ***Decides to retain the Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

ASIA-PACIFIC

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

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (pending receipt of the draft Desired state of conservation for the property)

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

15. Everglades National Park (United States of America) (N 76)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1979

Criteria

(viii) (ix) (x)

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

1993-2007; 2010 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

The property was re-inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, on the request of the State Party, due to concerns that the property's aquatic ecosystem continues to deteriorate, in particular as a result of:

- a) Alterations of the hydrological regime (quantity, timing, and distribution of Shark Slough inflows);
- b) Adjacent urban and agricultural growth (flood protection and water supply requirements that affect the property's resources by lowering water levels);
- c) Increased nutrient pollution from upstream agricultural activities;
- d) Protection and management of Florida Bay resulting in significant reduction of both marine and estuarine biodiversity.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4348>

Corrective measures identified

Developed 2006 (IUCN technical workshop), see page: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006/whc06-30com-07Ae.pdf>

Adopted (refinements have been suggested), see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4348>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4348>

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/76/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

April 2006: IUCN participation in a technical workshop to identify benchmarks and corrective measures; January 2011: joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Quantity and quality of water entering the property;
- b) Urban encroachment;
- c) Agricultural fertiliser pollution;
- d) Mercury contamination of fish and wildlife;
- e) Lowered water levels due to flood control measures;
- f) Damage from hurricanes;
- g) Exotic invasive plant and animal species.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/76>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

A comprehensive report on the state of conservation of the property was received from the State Party on 11 February 2013, detailing progress on corrective measures adopted in 2006 and 2010, as well as trends for the indicators of integrity identified during the 2011 reactive monitoring mission, and formalized as the Desired State of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

a) *Status of implementation of the corrective measures*

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the technical nature of most of the corrective measures and have prepared a detailed summary of the progress in the implementation of each of these measures, which is available online at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/37COM/documents>. The main points are summarized briefly here.

The State Party reports significant progress in the land acquisitions, which is now 99% complete and expected to be completed by 2014. Many of the corrective measures foresee construction of infrastructure to increase the water flow into the property through 3 major projects: the Tamiami Trail, the Everglades Restoration Strategies, and the Central Everglades Planning Project. While some delays and challenges are noted, work is progressing. However, it needs to be noted that the ambitious programme of work is enormous and most infrastructure will only be completed in 5 years time, while for some it is expected that completion will take more than 10 years. In terms of the improvement of the water quality, the State of Florida and the US Environmental Protection Agency agreed on a Water Quality-Based Effluent Limit that, if achieved, will ensure that park waters meet the 10 ppb target. In terms of stakeholder involvement a Park Advisory Committee is to be created in order to maintain important links between park managers, representatives of other resource agencies, and the local public. The Advisory Committee should also assist in streamlining planning and decision processes not only for projects inside the park, but also for the ecosystem restoration projects that collectively make up the corrective measures. The finalization of the General Management Plan has been delayed and is now expected in 2014.

a) *Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger*

The Desired State of Conservation includes 13 indicators which are grouped around the characteristics that make up the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. A detailed overview of the trends for each indicator is provided in the State Party report. Six of the indicators showed a slight positive improvement of condition, particularly those related to the volume, levels and distribution of water flow which are essential to the integrity of the property; 3 indicators show unchanged conditions and 4 indicators are deteriorating. The latter relate to invasive species, algal blooms in Florida Bay and freshwater fauna.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the State Party is moving forward with the implementation of the corrective measures. They also note the slight improvement of condition for several of the indicators for integrity of the property. They conclude that it is crucial for the State Party to focus effort, together with the necessary partners responsible for part of the impacts on the park, to substantially complete the three major projects cited above (the Tamiami Trail Next Steps, the Everglades Restoration Strategies, and the Central Everglades Planning Project) within the next 10 years. Such focus is central if a slowing of

ecosystem degradation and tangible improvements to the property indicators of integrity are to be expected. They further note that the General Management Plan is still not completed, continues to be postponed and is now scheduled for 2014 (instead of the original 2011 target for finalization).

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN acknowledge the work done by the State Party to develop a comprehensive trend analysis for the indicators of the Desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to connect them to the implementation of the 14 corrective measures so that progress can be measured comprehensively. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that significant work remains to be done to meet the Desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Therefore, they recommend that the World Heritage Committee retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

In view of the fact that the implementation of the corrective measures, while well underway, still will take at least 10 years to complete, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN propose to request the State Party to submit a progress report only in 2 years time.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.15

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7A.14**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Welcomes the significant effort of the State Party to provide clear indication of the trends in conditions for the indicators developed for the Desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and to connect them to the 14 corrective measures allowing a comprehensive report on progress;*
4. *Notes with appreciation that the State Party is making progress on the implementation of the corrective measures, and requests the State Party to maintain this level of effort in particular toward completion of the three major projects including the Tamiami Trail Next Steps, the Everglades Restoration Strategies, and the Central Everglades Planning Project;*
5. *Notes the continuous postponements in the finalization of the General Management Plan and urges the State Party to give priority to its finalization particularly in view of the importance to ensure an entire catchment scale approach to the planning and management of the property, and the cooperation among all partners toward protection of the Outstanding Universal Value as a consistent high priority;*
6. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, including progress achieved in implementing the corrective measures and in meeting the indicators developed for the Desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015;*
7. ***Decides to retain Everglades National Park (United States of America) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

16. Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System (Belize) (N 764)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late mission report)

17. Los Katios National Park (Colombia) (N 711)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1994

Criteria

(ix) (x)

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

2009 - Present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Illegal logging;
- b) Unauthorized settlements;
- c) Fishing and hunting;
- d) Threats from major infrastructure projects.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Adopted, see <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4628>

Corrective measures identified

Updated technical measures adopted; see <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4628>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Not yet established

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/711/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 30,000

For details, see <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/711/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2011: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission to Bogota in lieu of visit to the property

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Armed conflict;
- b) Illegal extraction of natural resources;
- c) Threats from major infrastructure projects;
- d) Lack of control of management agency.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/711>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 1 February 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report to the World Heritage Centre, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012). In its Decision **36 COM 7A.16**, the World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to implement the updated technical corrective measures and endorsed a set of indicators related to the Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The latter distinguishes current threats (settlements and illegal and uncontrolled resource extraction) from potential threats (planned mega projects and security). Compliance with the indicators is the decisive measure for eventual removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The State Party focuses on reporting on activities and progress made in response to the above Committee decision, and IUCN also has worked directly with the State Party, on request, to provide advice.

a) Settlements within the property

An indigenous community established itself in an area within the property, which they consider their ancestral land. Agreements are required to balance legitimate rights with conservation objectives in the property. The State Party reports several meetings between the indigenous Phu Juin Wounaan Buur community and conservation authorities in 2012. The first exchanges resulted in a voluntary agreement between the community and park management in April 2012 with a focus on joint spatial planning, zonation and research on the community's ancestral history. A follow-up workshop in October 2012 refined the first agreement, highlighting mutual respect and consideration of divergent cultural views and concepts. The extended agreement sets out guidance for shared governance and management, a coordination mechanism (committee and rules), and monitoring of the implementation of the agreement. Important progress is noted, and a final agreement should be reached.

b) Illegal logging, hunting and fishing

The limited governmental presence in the property over an extended period of time due to security reasons, among other factors, has favoured illegal resource extraction, in particular of timber, fish and wildlife. Following up on the Action Plan 'Plan Choque', the State Party describes a process of regaining control, including through investments in communication devices and a new control post. Arrangements for the restoration of river banks have been established with several communities along the Cacarica and Atrato Rivers. The State Party further highlights an agreement on fisheries management in the Tumaradó Swamp signed between the conservation authorities and the Tumaradó Community Council. A comparable agreement is underway with the Puente America community. External support contributes to the promotion of sustainable production systems through material support, capacity development and monitoring. These activities are designed to improve local livelihoods, thereby relieving pressure from the property.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN acknowledge both the considerable progress and the need for additional efforts after years of severely limited operations. They consider that the combination of control and law enforcement and participatory cooperation with local communities is adequate and should be further pursued.

c) *Planned mega projects with possible impacts on the property*

The World Heritage Committee, in Decision **36 COM 7A.16**, noted that mega projects did not pose an immediate threat to the property. In the absence of any notification of such projects, as per Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN assume that status has not changed. The Committee's request to carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the electrical utilities corridor planned near the property's boundaries has not been addressed. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note the ongoing need to carry out such an assessment, and this should include explicit consideration of the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, unless a decision has been taken to abandon the project.

d) *Security and conflicts*

Despite occasional reports on armed groups believed to cross the property, the multiple activities by conservation authorities within and near the property provide clear evidence of an improving overall security situation. The State Party reports efforts to reduce the risks posed by antipersonnel mines. While further improvements are needed to fully restore effective management, the current security level allows the conservation authorities to carry out their mandate and to conduct routine management and control operations. In the view of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN the improving situation may permit a monitoring mission to the property in the not too distant future, pending United Nations security clearance. The State Party has indicated a willingness to host such a mission.

Conclusion

The State Party has reported a significant investment in governance, management and law enforcement, thereby embarking on a systematic process of regaining control. External support has contributed to this positive development. Management measures are moving from emergency measures to more structured and systematic approaches. The government has re-established its presence, improved the understanding of the situation and has made significant efforts to engage with local communities, including communities of indigenous and African origin. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that these efforts should be continued and regular communication with these communities should be ensured. The presence of Wounaan within the property can now be considered an integral part of the governance and management of the property. The explicit integration of local interest and views, including diverse cultural perceptions is promising but likely to take time in a post-conflict setting. The final resource management agreements will need to demonstrate that the property's OUV will not be undermined before it can be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. These resource agreements may prove a critical tool for the future integrity of the property in parallel to control and law enforcement. The analysis of lessons learned may yield valuable results for sustainable use in World Heritage properties. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN therefore recommend that the Committee encourage the State Party to document and share the experience. The positive tendencies deserve further consolidation, including through additional external support.

Major infrastructure projects do not appear to be a major concern at this stage. However, any changes will need to be communicated to the Committee. There is a need to report on the status of the EIA for the electrical utilities corridor planned near the property's boundaries and, if the project is still under consideration, to carry out the assessment and inform the World Heritage Centre in line with paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN are of the view that the State Party has made notable progress under adverse circumstances. However, the corrective measures are yet to be fully implemented and the indicators of the Desired State of Conservation are yet to be fully achieved. The successful consolidation of ongoing trends would enable the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, possibly within 2-3 years if current progress is sustained.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.17

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,
2. Recalling Decision **36COM 7A.16**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Acknowledges the notable progress made by the State Party in response to the updated corrective measures and towards the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger;
4. Encourages the State Party to consolidate the current efforts in order to be able to meet the indicators established for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and in particular, to ensure that any agreement signed with the communities established within the Park take full and explicit consideration of the need to ensure the long term conservation of the property's Outstanding Universal Value;
5. Regrets that the State Party did not provide further information on the status of the electrical utilities corridor planned near the property's boundaries, and requests the State Party to report on the status of the Environmental Impact Assessment for this project to the World Heritage Centre, in line with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, or otherwise to confirm that the project has been abandoned;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the remaining corrective measures and recommendations, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;
7. **Decides to retain Los Katíos National Park (Colombia) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

18. 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; 2011 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a. Illegal logging;
- b. Illegal occupation;
- c. Reduced capacity of the State Party;
- d. General deterioration of law and order and the security situation in the region.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Not yet drafted

Corrective measures identified

Adopted, See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4439>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

To be established

Previous Committee Decisions

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

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 198,000

For details, see <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/196/assistance/>

Emergency International Assistance, December 2012, in progress.

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

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

Previous monitoring missions

2000: IUCN monitoring mission; 2003 and 2006: World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring missions; 2011: Joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Illegal settlements;
- b) Illegal livestock grazing and agricultural encroachment;
- c) Illegal logging;
- d) Illegal commercial fishing;
- e) Poaching;
- f) Alien invasive species;
- g) Management deficiencies;
- h) Potential impacts from hydroelectric development projects Patuca I, II and III;
- i) Lack of law enforcement;
- j) Lack of clarity regarding land tenure and access to natural resources.

Illustrative material

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

and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the property's state of conservation on 18 January 2013. Responses to the corrective measures identified at the time of inscription of the property onto the List of World Heritage in Danger are as follows:

- a) *Establish permanent and systematic monitoring to identify encroachment and land use changes of the entire protected area, and if possible the broader region, and relocate illegal occupants who have recently settled on the property, in particular in the core zone of the Rio Plátano Biosphere Reserve*

The State Party reports on a number of initiatives contributing to this measure, based on satellite imagery, aerial surveys and a series of checkpoints and patrols operated by the armed forces (200 soldiers in 13 detachments). It recognized the need to coordinate these efforts, and is currently setting up a monitoring platform to systematize and integrate different monitoring approaches. Results from recent monitoring indicate a loss of 39,763 hectares of forest cover between 2007 and 2011. However, because the study area encompasses the Biosphere Reserve boundaries as per the 1997 expansion decree, which is larger than the World Heritage property (850,000 ha vs. 350,000 ha), it is difficult to gauge to what extent the property itself is affected. The State Party notes that the core zone of the Biosphere Reserve, which is clearly within the property boundaries, has suffered relatively little deforestation (29 hectares per year), though new illegal settlers were once again observed, despite recent State Party success in removing previous illegal settlers last year. The State Party indicates that it is currently taking action to remove them.

- b) *Continue efforts to negotiate and clarify access to land and natural resources while enforcing existing land tenure and access arrangements and explore opportunities for more meaningful co-management with a particular focus on the indigenous communities of the cultural zone*

The State Party reports that 107,683 hectares of land have been organized through community forest management contracts, giving 12 neighbouring communities (indigenous and other) access to resources for economic, environmental and social benefits. It also reports that forest management plans have been approved for 9 cooperatives affecting lands within the Biosphere Reserve, along with the granting of 5 business licenses for commercial extraction of precious woods. Maps provided illustrate that a significant part of these permits and plans are granted for activities located clearly within the World Heritage property. Therefore, there is the potential of a conflict between resource extraction permits and the conservation of the property's OUV.

- c) *In cooperation with the indigenous communities concerned, complete land tenure and resource access arrangements adapted to their historical and cultural contexts*

With continuing support from German government aid, a land titling procedure specific to the needs and cultural contexts of indigenous communities was developed and officially recognized by law in August 2012. According to information from the State Party, the process is reported to have been fully discussed with affected communities, with free prior and informed consent having been obtained. The State Party expects to grant titles to at least 3 communities in 2013.

- d) *In coordination with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, review in a timely manner, any projects for the construction of hydroelectric dams on the Patuca River until it has been clearly demonstrated to the World Heritage Committee that they will not negatively impact the property's OUV;*

Though the Committee indicated in Decision **36 COM 7A.17** that it considered the Patuca III dam did not pose a threat to the property's OUV, the State Party reports that the 40 natural resource conservation mitigation measures recommended by the environmental impact assessment had been fully met. Both the World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the dam's distance from the property and the presence of several tributaries of the Patuca River downstream of the dam, could potentially mitigate negative impacts. Nevertheless, IUCN recalls that indirect or long-term impacts, such as displacement of local communities, in particular as a result of potential loss of livelihood of downstream communities due to changes in water flow, further complicating the land tenure issue, and impacts on aquatic migratory species downstream from the dam should also be noted. Furthermore, recalling the Committee's request that the State Party redefine the property's boundaries so that its Outstanding Universal Value can be better conserved (Decision **35 COM 7B.31**, **36 COM 7A.17**), IUCN notes that the dam may impact areas that could be considered for inclusion in the property and also recalls that other protected areas in the region may be impacted.

- e) *Provide the necessary human resources and logistical capacity to the agencies responsible for the protection and management of the property to enable them to regularly monitor and deal with illegal activities affecting the property;*

The State Party reports on the strengthening of the legal and oversight framework for the conservation of the property, along with the formulation of strategies regarding government involvement. It states that it is actively seeking international support for additional help in carrying out activities necessary for the management of the property. No specific information is provided on any actual institutional strengthening in terms of human or material resources.

- e) *Using the on-going management planning process, seek to coordinate the many actors, various institutions and external supporters involved in Río Plátano in order to significantly improve coherence, effectiveness and efficiency of future management in addressing the issues affecting the property;*

The State Party does not specifically address this measure in its report. The inter-ministerial ad-hoc committee for the property is reported to have been strengthened.

Beyond the corrective measures identified by the World Heritage Committee, additional issues were requested to be addressed:

i) Property boundary design

The updated International Assistance request was submitted to the World Heritage Centre in late 2012 and discussions on its content and budget are on-going. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the revised request is exclusively to support illegal logging control work. However, given that there are several active projects endeavoring to address this issue there is little to demonstrate post-project longer term outcomes for a small project on illegal logging that is not linked in with the other ongoing projects. They are of the view that the priority would be to establish clarity on the property's boundaries, with a focus on re-nomination, as recommended by the World Heritage Committee in Decisions **35 COM 7B.31** and **36 COM 7A.17**, and as referred in the 2011 UNESCO/IUCN reactive monitoring mission. IUCN notes that it would be able to support the preparation of a revised request. Currently, the property boundaries as officially recognized under the *World Heritage Convention* by a clarification in Decision **36 COM 8D**, no longer coincide with the actual boundaries as recognized under Honduran legislation. This issue should be resolved to guarantee that the OUV of the property will be protected over the longer term.

ii) Increase in illegal drug trans-shipment activities in and near the property

No reference is made to any targeted effort on this issue. The State Party reports the presence of 200 members of the military in the region, occupying check points and monitoring for illegal activities.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that gradual progress is being made in regards to several of the corrective measures, particularly in terms of systematic monitoring, land titling and the formalization of resource use agreements (measures a, b and c). The State Party is implementing mitigation measures for the Patuca III dam, however IUCN recalls that indirect or long-term impacts, such as displacement of local communities, further complicating the land tenure issue, and impacts on aquatic migratory species downstream from the dam as a result of changes in water flow, should also be noted. IUCN also recalls that the dam may impact areas that could be considered for inclusion in the property, as well as other protected areas in the region. The property appears to remain seriously under-serviced on the part of relevant government institutions. The State Party's indications that it is seeking international support to help it deal with this issue is encouraging, but no explicit progress is reported. It is not clear if the Committee's request to ensure greater coordination amongst the various agencies and supporters of the property's conservation is being adequately met by the inter-ministerial ad-hoc committee on the Biosphere Reserve.

Little substantive information has been provided in regards to the efforts undertaken to end the use of the property as a drug trans-shipment area. This activity had been noted in the 2011 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission report as a serious long term threat to the property, undermining the rule of law and challenging the security of government representatives in the area.

Of overarching importance in addressing the above-noted issues is the need to reassess the property boundaries in light of significant changes to the original Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve boundaries and zonation scheme. The State Party approved the modification of

limits by national legislation but no consultation was undertaken with the World Heritage Committee. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee urge the State Party to submit a revised International Assistance request on this issue. Until this issue is addressed to the satisfaction of the World Heritage Committee, the property's integrity cannot be guaranteed nor can the corrective measures be put in place. In light of the above, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommend that the Committee retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.18

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A;*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7A.17**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012);*
3. *Welcomes progress made towards the land titling for communities surrounding the property and in the provision of instruments designed to provide managed access to natural resources, and encourages the State Party to put in place further measures to provide greater tenure and livelihood security for indigenous communities and to ensure respect for their rights;*
4. *Also welcomes the establishment of a systematic monitoring platform, ensuring a systematic and integrated monitoring effort on land use and land use changes in and around the property, and the efforts undertaken to control illegal activities;*
5. *Notes with concern that new illegal settlements appeared on the property and urges the State Party to continue to deal swiftly and effectively with such incursions in full observance of the rule of law;*
6. *Requests the State Party to increase its efforts to implement the corrective measures identified in Decision **35 COM 7B.31**, in particular the measures listed in b, c, e and f therein;*
7. *Strongly urges the State Party to advance on the proposal for the property's boundary modification, without which the corrective measures cannot be adequately implemented and the property's Outstanding Universal Value remains at risk;*
8. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to finalize, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, 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 38th session in 2014;*
9. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, a detailed report on the state of conservation of the property, with a particular focus on the advances related to the corrective measures and on the clarification of the property's boundaries, particularly measures listed in b, c, e and f heading of this report;*
10. ***Decides to retain Rio Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

19. Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119rev)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late mission)

20. Tomb of the Askia (Mali) (C 1139)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late mission)

21. Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) (C 1022)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)

22. Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 144)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1981

Criteria

(iii)

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

2004 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

Deterioration and decay leading to the collapse of the historical and archaeological structures for which the property was inscribed

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/1586>

Corrective measures identified

Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/1586>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/1586>

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/144/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 41,370

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/144/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

Total amount granted: USD 201,390 from the Norwegian Funds-in-Trust for UNESCO rehabilitation project

Previous monitoring missions

February 2004: ICOMOS mission; June 2008 and March 2009: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of approved boundaries for the property and buffer zones linked to the land-use plans and appropriate protection;
- b) Deterioration of the architectural heritage fabric;
- c) Sea wave erosion;
- d) Theft of stone from ruins for use as building material;
- e) Lack of functioning local consultative committee;
- f) Lack of implementation of the conservation and management plans.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/144>

and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 7 February 2013, a report on the state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party. The report includes information on the current conditions as well as a detailed chart on the progress made towards the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Additional information submitted includes the project for Integrated Preservation at Kilwa Kisiwani (Part of the Large Grants Program 2011 for World Monuments Fund) and an Interim report on the Study of the Coastal Environment in the Kilwa Kisiwani area.

e) Management system

The report mentions that the updating of the management plan will be finalised by June 2013, as part of the Integrated Preservation Project. In order to secure resources, discussions for collaborative endeavours are being carried out with the World Monuments Fund, CRAterre, Communauté d'agglomération du Pays Rochefortais (CAPR) and the Aga Khan Foundation. These would address both conservation concerns but also issues pertaining to heritage development and capacity building within the local community to ensure a sustained approach to conservation and development.

f) Clarification of boundaries and delineation of buffer zone of the property

Limited progress has been achieved on this issue to date. However, the State Party reports that the process of surveying the boundaries of the property will be completed by April 2013, through a contract between the World Monuments Fund and Ardhi University (ARU) in Dar es Salaam. As for the potential extension of the property, this will be examined once the

conditions for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger are met and when conditions of the Kilwa Kivinje and Sanje ya Kati are improved through the documentation and restoration programme.

g) Land Use Plan

The State Party reports that the process began by undertaking a social economic survey and holding two stakeholder meetings. The plan will be completed by April 2013, contingent upon the approval by the Ministry of Natural Resources of the contract between the World Monuments Fund and ARU.

h) Progress made in the implementation of the corrective measures

Rehabilitation of heritage monuments

The State Party reports that significant progress has been made in the restoration of heritage monuments and expects that by June 2013 the benchmark of 70% of buildings rehabilitated will be met. It is considered that with the sustained interventions, most monuments are in good state of conservation, a condition that will be preserved through a maintenance plan. Since capacity building has been addressed through the implementation of diverse projects, there is now a conservation team with the adequate skills to continue these actions.

Establishment of boundaries and extension of the property and Land Use Plan

As aforementioned, it is expected that these corrective measures will be fully addressed by May 2013.

Fully established on-site administrative structures

The State Party reports that the property has a proper administrative structure with four sections under the site manager. To date, it is functional and has simplified management and distribution of responsibilities.

Halt sea-wave action

Numerous actions have been implemented to control the active erosion near the monuments; therefore the area that was treated is stable. Within the framework of the World Monuments Fund project, a study on the coastal environments in Kilwa Kisiwani was carried out in April 2012 to identify risks and identify measures for their control and mitigation. The implementation of proposed actions will require the collaboration of local and international development partners. In addition, a maintenance plan is needed for the current sea walls. The State Party recognises that this will need long-term attention, including measures along the Malinda and Garza sea front and the Makutani monument complexes.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note with satisfaction the significant progress that has been made by the State Party in addressing the conditions that warranted the inclusion of the property in the List of World Heritage in Danger. They however wish to underscore the importance of clarifying the boundaries, finalising the management plan and securing the necessary resources for the sustained implementation of the proposed actions as well as the functionality of the management system. Given that the State Party plans to address these remaining measures within the next six months, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that it would be timely for a reactive monitoring mission to visit the property in order to ascertain whether the conditions for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger have been met.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.22

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7A.19** adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Notes with appreciation the progress made by the State Party in the implementation of the corrective measures and encourages it to continue its efforts, particularly in the approval and the sustained implementation of the management plan and the clarification of the boundaries of the property;
4. Requests the State Party to provide three printed and electronic copies of the draft revised management plan for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies;
5. Also requests the State Party to invite a World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to review the current state of conservation and evaluate whether the conditions for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger have been met;
6. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.
7. **Decides to retain the Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara (United Republic of Tanzania) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

ARAB STATES

23. Abu Mena (Egypt) (C 90)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late mission report)

24. Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat) (Iraq) (C 1130)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2003

Criteria

(iii) (iv)

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

2003 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Nearby construction of a dam entailing partial flooding and seepage;
- b) Armed conflict.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Not yet drafted

Corrective measures identified

Not yet identified

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Not yet established

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1130/documents>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 50,000 (5,000 disbursed)

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1130/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

Total amount granted: USD 6,000 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust

Previous monitoring missions

November 2002: UNESCO mission for the Makhool Dam project; June 2011: World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Partial flooding and seepage due to a dam building project;

- b) Fragile mud brick structures;
- c) Absence of a comprehensive conservation and management plan.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1130>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 4 February 2013 in which it confirmed the cancellation of the Makhool Dam project, the general critical state of conservation of the property and the difficulties in terms of management, due to the absence of a comprehensive strategy to ensure the protection and conservation of the property, the lack of financial means as well as of enough skilled staff. There is no reference in the report to the works which were expected to begin by June 2011 for the construction of a retaining wall. This project was expected to be submitted to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for review.

A general strategy for conservation interventions was not yet in place in June 2011 although it was considered as a priority due to the risk of flooding and the erosive action of the Tigris River at some sectors. The negative impact of the on-going erosion and lack of drainage have not been addressed yet. The State Party mentioned the construction of a one-meter high shelter (iron structure) over the Royal Cemetery but did not provide enough details about this intervention. No information on the regulatory measures or the proposed intervention projects has been provided either. In 2012, the State Party submitted a draft retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, but still incomplete, which needs to be revised. The State Party also submitted a proposal for boundary clarifications, which does not correspond to the required format and also needs to be reviewed.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are pleased to learn the decision of the Iraqi authorities to cancel the Makhool Dam project which was threatening the property. They acknowledge the efforts made by the State Party and the difficulties and challenges which it faces on the ground. They recommend that the Committee underline the need for the State Party to develop and adopt comprehensive management and conservation plans, as the key condition toward the efficient implementation of the identified measures which aim at addressing the issues highlighted by the 2011 reactive monitoring mission (report available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/36COM/documents/>).

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies suggest that the State Party consider requesting the assistance of the UNESCO Office for Iraq and also envisage submitting an International Assistance Request in order to meet these objectives while submitting the details of all on-going or planned interventions at the site to the World Heritage Centre as per Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.24

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,
2. Recalling Decision 36 COM 7A.21, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),

3. Welcomes the announcement by the State Party of the cancellation of the Makhool Dam project;
4. Requests the State Party to submit, in accordance to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, the details of all on-going or planned interventions at the site, including the construction of the protective shelter at the Royal Cemetery;
5. Reiterates its invitation to the State Party to submit a request for International Assistance to the World Heritage Fund to support the preparation of the requested conservation and management plans;
6. Reiterates its request to the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, proposals for corrective measures and for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, together with a proposed timeframe, and to finalize the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;
8. Decides to retain Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat) (Iraq) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

25. Samarra Archaeological City (Iraq) (C 276 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2007

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv)

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

2007 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

State of conflict in the country that does not allow the responsible authorities to assure the protection and management of the property.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Not yet drafted

Corrective measures identified

Not yet identified

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Not yet established

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/276/documents>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 100,000 from the Nordic World Heritage Fund for training and documentation aiming at the preparation of the Nomination File.

Previous monitoring missions

June 2011: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Weathering and lack of maintenance affecting the fragile structures;
- b) State of conflict in the country that does not allow the responsible authorities to assure the protection and management of the property.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/276>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 3 February 2013 in which it provided brief information on ongoing actions at the site, aiming at addressing some of the issues highlighted by the 2011 reactive monitoring mission which assessed the state of conservation of five of the main components of the property (the Great Mosque and its Spiral Minaret, Abu Dulaf Mosque, the Caliphal Palace - Qasr al-Khalifa, Al-Ma'shuq Palace and Tell es-Sawwan) and defined priority measures to be implemented. (Report available online at the following web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/36COM/documents/>). No information has been provided on whether these priority measures have been implemented since then.

Several factors affecting the property were identified, including the lack of a permanent management and conservation unit, the limited capacities for implementation of conservation measures, the lack of comprehensive planning tools, including a management and a conservation plan and issues related to permanent control and security.

The ongoing actions described by the State Party in its report consist of restoration works, notably at the Malwiya Minaret, the Great Mosque and a pathway surrounding the latter. No further details were provided regarding these interventions (maps showing the exact location, scope, timeframe, budget, human resources mobilized, etc.). The State Party also acknowledged the lack of staff, capacities and means to properly manage the site thus reiterating its call for international support for the planning of projects, restoration works and research.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that although efforts have been made by the State Party in regard to the conservation and protection of the property, the information provided on the actions undertaken is still too limited. Priority has to be given to the problem of lack of human and financial resources and of a clear work plan in the identification of the corrective measures and drafting the Desired state of conservation for the property. They recommend that the responsible authorities request the support of the UNESCO Office for Iraq to address these issues and look for potential international funding, including a Request for International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.25

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-17/37.COM/7A,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7A.22**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Urges the State Party to pursue its efforts in implementing the recommendations of the 2011 reactive monitoring mission, and to prioritize the implementation of the following actions:
 - a) Develop baseline documentation, including missing architectural plans and topographic surveys, carry out a detailed conservation condition survey,
 - b) Undertake identified preventive conservation actions to ensure the stability of the built fabric,
 - c) Identify regulatory measures to ensure the protection of the property and establish protocols for the approval of public works in the vicinity of the site, including the development of heritage and environmental impact assessments,
 - d) Initiate the planning process for the development of the Management Plan for the property, including a comprehensive conservation plan,
 - e) Establish a site management unit with adequate staff to implement priority conservation measures as well as maintenance and monitoring actions;
4. Encourages the State Party to submit an International Assistance Request to facilitate the implementation of the above;
5. Reiterates its request to the State Party to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, proposals for corrective measures and for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, together with a proposed timeframe for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;
6. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;
7. **Decides to retain Samarra Archaeological City (Iraq) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

26. Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan) (C 148 rev)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (subject to the Reinforced Monitoring mechanism)

27. Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem (Palestine) (C 1433)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2012

Criteria

(iv) (vi)

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

2012 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Degradation of the architectural complex of the Church of the Nativity;
- b) Development pressure;
- c) Tourism pressure.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Not yet drafted

Corrective measures identified

Not yet identified

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Not yet established

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1433/documents>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 723,000 from Italy (Emergency Action Plan 1997-1998; Conservation and Management Plan 2006-2010).

Previous monitoring missions

N/A

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

N/A

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1433>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted the state of conservation report for the property on 21 February 2013. It consists of a short note about maintenance and tourism services, about the restoration of the roof of the Church of the Nativity and about the preparation of a conservation and management plan for the historic town of Bethlehem, declared as the "buffer zone of the property". The project is said to be funded by the European Commission and implemented by the Centre for Cultural Heritage Preservation (CCHP), the Bethlehem Municipality and the Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities. The reason why a new plan is being

prepared, while the existing “Bethlehem Area Conservation and Management Plan” prepared with the support of UNESCO and with funding from the Italian Government is available and is to be published in the near future, is not spelled out in the report. There is no mention either of a specific conservation and management system for the property itself.

As regards the restoration of the Church of the Nativity, the tender for the roof has been advertised in the newspapers and is due on 13 March 2013 with works projected to start in June 2013. The State Party announces that it will ask ICCROM for technical assistance and advice on the restoration works and will provide progress reports to the World Heritage Centre. A series of pictures, showing some water damage, is attached to the report.

The State Party announces that a “Charter on the Conservation of Cultural Heritage in Palestine” has been proclaimed on 6 February 2013, setting guiding principles for conservation.

The State Party has annexed to the report a document entitled “Master Plan for Developing Tourism in Bethlehem”, undated. This document is in the form of a project document, drafted further to the Bethlehem Tourism Action Plan Initiative launched on 5 March 2011.

The State Party has reviewed the statement of Outstanding Universal Value revised by ICOMOS on the basis of the provisional statement adopted by the World Heritage Committee in Decision **36 COM 8B.5**. This statement will be examined by the World Heritage Committee under Item 8 of the Agenda (Document *WHC-13/37.COM/8E*).

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the announcement of the preparation of a new Conservation and Management Plan for the Historic Town of Bethlehem and would recommend the World Heritage Committee to urge the State Party to develop a specific plan for the property itself, based on its Outstanding Universal Value, and to submit it for review by the Advisory Bodies prior to its adoption.

They also take note of the decision of the State Party to separate into three phases the restoration programme for the Church of the Nativity and to tender only the restoration works for the roof at the time being. In this respect, they wish to highlight, as outlined in the ICOMOS evaluation, the necessity to design an overarching conservation strategy for the repair and restoration of the monument before initiating the effective work, and to submit this to the Advisory Bodies for review.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, taking into account the shortcomings revealed by the ICOMOS evaluation of the property before its inscription on the World Heritage List, recommend to the World Heritage Committee to request the State Party to identify urgently the corrective measures and Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger that would serve as a basis for planning of all future action at the property.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.27

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 8B.5**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop proposals for corrective measures and for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in*

Danger, together with a timeframe for their implementation, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;

4. *Recalls the need for an overarching conservation strategy for the Church of the Nativity to be developed as early as possible to guide the restoration project;*
5. *Also requests the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre, for examination by the Advisory Bodies according to Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines, the conservation strategy and details of the restoration project for the Church of the Nativity, in particular for the roof for which tendering has commenced;*
6. *Urges the State Party to develop a specific conservation and management plan for the property as a whole that includes approaches to tourism and development regulations;*
7. *Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;*
8. ***Decides to retain the Birthplace of Jesus, Church of the Nativity and the pilgrimage route, Bethlehem (Palestine) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

28. Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) (C 611)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1993

Criteria

(ii) (iv) (vi)

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

2000 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Serious deterioration of the built heritage (a high percentage of the residential houses being replaced by concrete and multi-storey buildings);
- b) The remaining houses in the city are rapidly deteriorating, due to the prevailing low income of the inhabitants;
- c) Since the souq activities have been transferred outside the city, the ancient souq is almost empty and free from any type of activity and the shops are falling apart;
- d) The traditional economic role of the city has vanished;
- e) The city in general, is lacking any conservation and rehabilitation strategies.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Adopted 2011; See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4357>

Corrective measures identified

Adopted 2007; See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/1282>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Adopted 2011; See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4357>

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/611/documents>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 185,918

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/611/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

Total amount granted: USD 14,000 from the Italian Funds-in-Trust and the France-UNESCO Co-operation Agreement.

Previous monitoring missions

2002 and 2003: international expertise; December 2004: World Heritage Centre mission; January 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; January 2009: World Heritage Centre mission; January 2011: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Serious degradation of the city's heritage (many houses and the ancient souq are in an alarming deterioration state);
- b) Large percentage of the city's houses replaced by inappropriate concrete buildings;
- c) Large sections of the city's open spaces have been privatized, either illegally or informally and more than 30% of these built-up;
- d) Lack of conservation measures and supportive developments.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/611>

and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 2 February 2013. The report provides succinct information on the actions implemented to date and includes the Conservation Management Plan for Zabid/Tihama, prepared under the German International Assistance project in March 2012.

a) Regulatory measures

The State Party reports that adoption of conservation and protection regulatory measures has continued. A draft Law of protection of historic sites, monuments, cities and their urban and cultural heritage has been submitted to the Parliament and is expected to be issued officially in 2013. In addition, high level meetings have been held to reactivate the conservation processes for Zabid and Sana'a. It notes that a Cabinet meeting was held in February 2013 to discuss conservation issues at Zabid leading to the issuing of several decrees. There is no additional information on the specific content of the issued decrees or on the mechanisms for their implementation. The Higher Ministerial Coordination Committee for Zabid has also continued meetings and identified the challenges being faced for the implementation and follow-up of corrective measures. Budgets have been allocated to support the operational costs of staff contracted to address issues pertaining to illegal construction and daily monitoring within the property.

b) Conservation of the historic town

Two documents were submitted by the State Party: An Urban Conservation and Development Plan, prepared in 2011, distributed in Arabic and English, and a Conservation Management Plan completed in March 2012. The information and revisions provided by the local community were integrated into the final document. No indication has been given on the current status of its implementation. As regards the submission of maps indicating the boundaries of the property and proposed buffer zone, the State Party indicates that it has submitted the data to the National Commission for UNESCO in December 2012. However,

this data was not received at the World Heritage Centre, nor is it annexed as announced to the Conservation Plan.

As for stopping new construction of poor quality and ensuring that no further degradation of protected heritage buildings occur, the State Party reports that limited progress has been achieved given the existing political situation. On 8 January 2013, the Cabinet adopted decree no. 9 regarding the protection of the Historic Town of Zabid, which will force action to ensure the removal of illegal construction. In regard to approval of contractors for carrying out emergency conservation works, the State Party reports that the General Organisation for the Protection of Historic Cities in Yemen (GOPHCY) has continued with the listing of qualified contractors and specialists and capacity building on conservation methods is foreseen prior to their approval for implementing works.

Draft guidelines for new construction and for restoration have been prepared by GOPHCY but they will need to be updated and approved. No timeframe for this action has been indicated.

The State Party also reports that the Zabid Urban development community forum was established with the support of GOPHCY and of the German International Cooperation (GIZ). The objectives of the forum shall contribute effectively to the conservation and protection of the property but it needs the support from involved authorities and organisations to ensure the sustained implementation of its recommendations.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that efforts have been made by the State Party in implementing the corrective measures for the property notwithstanding the prevailing political conditions. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee welcome the efforts made to ensure broad participation in conservation endeavours. They are of the view that support should be granted for the continuation of these processes. They note however that significant action and resources are still needed to ensure that all measures are comprehensively implemented within the adopted timeframe. In particular, they note the importance of approving and enforcing the Law of Protection of historic sites, monuments, cities and their urban and cultural heritage, which is a crucial measure to ensure sustained actions for the conservation and management of the property. They also underscore that adopting and enforcing other regulatory measures, and having the adequate number of staff, will be essential to adequately control building activities and implement the corrective measures for the property.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.28

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7A.24**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Acknowledges the efforts made by the State Party in the implementation of the corrective measures and urges it to secure adequate resources and support to ensure their sustained and comprehensive implementation;*
4. *Welcomes the development of the Conservation Plan and also urges the State Party to allocate the necessary resources for its implementation;*

5. Requests the State Party to finalize the approval process for regulatory measures for the property, in particular the adoption of the Law of Protection of historic sites, monuments, cities and their urban and cultural heritage, as well as new construction codes, and to ensure their appropriate enforcement;
6. Also requests the State Party to submit a boundary clarification indicating precisely the boundaries of the property at the time of inscription no later than **1 December 2013** and a boundary modification request for a buffer zone, according to Annex 11 of the Operational Guidelines, no later than **1 February 2014**;
7. Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;
8. Decides to retain the **Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) on the List of World Heritage in Danger**.

ASIA AND PACIFIC

29. Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) (C 211 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2002

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv)

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

2002 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Lack of legal protection;
- b) Lack of an effective monuments protection agency;
- c) Lack of adequate protection and conservation personnel;
- d) Lack of a comprehensive management plan.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Adopted, See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/211/documents>

Corrective measures identified

Adopted, See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/211/documents>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Adopted, See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/211/documents>

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/211/documents>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 17,200 (in 1995) for Consolidation of the Minaret of Jam

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/211/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 844,901 (2003-2012) from the Italian Funds-in-Trust; USD 124,300 (2003-2012) from the Swiss Funds-in-Trust.

Previous monitoring missions

Several annual UNESCO expert missions took place between 2002 and 2006 in order to implement the operational projects for the property. After a period of three years of inactivity from 2007 to 2009 due to the security situation, UNESCO dispatched a mission in cooperation with an Afghan local NGO in 2010 to resume the on-site operations.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Political instability;
- b) Inclination of the Minaret;
- c) Lack of management plan;
- d) Illicit excavations and looting.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/211>

and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 11 February 2013, the State Party submitted a state of conservation report providing information on progress made to achieve the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

c) *Site Security*

The State Party reports that the Ministry of Information and Culture (MoIC), jointly with the Ministry of the Interior, have placed a team of police officers at the site, in particular to control site looting.

d) *Long-term consolidation and conservation of the Minaret of Jam and archaeological remains*

The State Party also reports that part of the protective walls, built within the River Defence Project 2006-2008, to protect the Minaret from seasonal floods of the Jam and Hari Rud rivers, was damaged and washed out by the devastating floods occurred in fall 2012.

In order to assist in prompt manner the MoIC, United States Military, through an agreement signed on 16 October 2012, provided funding for this emergency work, based on the damage assessment carried out in-situ by the United States AID team, as well as by Lithuanian Provincial Reconstruction Team. The emergency work, therefore, could be undertaken accordingly in 2012 without further delay. The report further notes that additional funds are necessary in order to carry out a long-term solution for consolidation efforts to address the risk posed by the two rivers.

e) *Identification of clearly marked property boundaries and buffer zones*

Out of 5 corrective measures adopted by the World Heritage Committee, significant progress has been made in the establishment of a precise topography of the property, which provides a clear boundary of the property as well as its buffer zones. The World Heritage Centre, within the UNESCO/Italy Funds-in-Trust, was able to produce a detailed topography of the property by using newly available GeoEye Satellite Stereo Image Technology, having capacity for mapping of a high degree of accuracy (about 1 metre above the ground) and very high spatial sampling without undertaking a field survey. By using this latest satellite stereo technology of the remote-sensing, and an extensive survey on existing material on archaeological research on Jam, a detailed topography was finally produced in 2012, with clear definition of the property, not only the Minaret, but also archaeological remains such as Jewish cemetery with Hebrew inscription, Ghurid castles/fortification walls and towers, its buffer zones, as well as the areas affected by illicit looting. In addition, hydrological research was carried out by using the additional data obtained through GeoEye Satellite Stereo Image. The study greatly contributed to establish a long-term strategy for conservation of Minaret, in particular with relation to the protection of the Minaret from river floods, by providing a clear further step in hydrological studies and measures to be undertaken in-situ.

f) *Other issues and developments*

The World Heritage Centre organized, in close co-operation with the Permanent Delegation of Afghanistan to UNESCO, UNESCO Kabul, and Museo d' Arte Orientale in Turin, the *Third Expert Working Group Meeting for the Old City of Herat and the Jam World Heritage property* at the Museo d' Arte Orientale, Turin, Italy(4-6 September 2012). The Working Group Meeting, held within the UNESCO/Italy Funds-in-Trust co-operation, put forward prioritized activities for the conservation of the property, and adopted a set of recommendations for achieving the Desired state of conservation.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recognize the State Party's efforts to achieve the Desired state of conservation adopted by the World Heritage Committee, in particular for site security, as well as for the conservation of Minaret including its protection against floods and river erosion. They further recognise financial and technical support provided by the international community, notably from the governments of Italy, Switzerland, and the United States of America, either through UNESCO or bilaterally.

They consider that the completion of the topographic and archaeological survey of Jam was an essential step to properly plan for, and implement, an effective conservation strategy for the property. This strategy should include the important ancient settlement, the precise extent and remains of which had yet to be defined.

On the other hand, they note that there is still room to further enhance national capacity in particular within the MoIC of Afghanistan. In this sense, various on-going UNESCO Funds-in-Trust are expected to produce synergies between their respective projects, in particular to reinforce national capacity in the field of conservation and management of important historical and archaeological sites in Afghanistan. Further progress must still be made with the development of a comprehensive management system including a long-term conservation policy developed and implemented for the property.

They further note that the previously proposed time frame for implementing the corrective measures cannot be achieved and *needs to be updated*, so as to achieve the Desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 37COM 7A.29

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM7A.25**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to continue its efforts in the implementation of all the corrective measures adopted at its 31st session (Christchurch, 2007), and requests the State Party to update the time frame for their implementation in order to achieve the Desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
4. *Also requests the State Party to endorse the detailed topographic map of the property produced in 2012 with GeoEye Satellite Stereo Image Technology, and to submit the minor boundary modification request to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies;*
5. *Calls upon the international community to continue its technical and financial support in co-operation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in the efforts to carry out the prioritised programme identified by the Third Expert Working Group Meeting in Turin (September 2012), in particular the river defense programme dealing with Jam and Hari Rud rivers;*
6. *Encourages the State Party to continue its efforts to develop and implement a comprehensive management system including a long-term conservation policy for the property;*

7. Further requests the State Party to continue its work on the implementation of the adopted corrective measures and to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a revised timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures;
8. Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2014, a detailed report on the progress achieved in the state of conservation of the property, along with a revised timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session 2014;
9. **Decides to retain the Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

30. Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Afghanistan) (C 208 rev)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2003

Criteria

(i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (vi)

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

2003 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Site security not ensured;
- b) Long-term stability of the Giant Buddha niches not ensured;
- c) State of conservation of archaeological remains and mural paintings not adequate;
- d) Management Plan and Cultural Master Plan (the protective zoning plan) not implemented.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Adopted, See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/208/documents>

Corrective measures identified

Adopted, See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/208/documents>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Adopted, See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/208/documents>

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/208/documents>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 150,000 (in 2002 and 2003) for Preparatory assistance.

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/208/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 6,345,807 (2003-2014) from the Japanese Funds-in-Trust; USD 600,000 (2013) from the Italian Funds-in-Trust.

Previous monitoring missions

No reactive monitoring mission was carried out; November 2010: World Heritage Centre/ICCROM advisory mission; April 2011: UNESCO Kabul/ICOMOS advisory mission; UNESCO expert missions in the context of the implementation of specific projects.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Risk of imminent collapse of the Giant Buddha niches;
- b) Irreversible deterioration of the mural paintings;
- c) Looting, illicit traffic and illegal excavations of cultural heritage assets;
- d) Continued use of certain heritage areas for military posts;
- e) Anti-personnel mines and unexploded ordinances (i.e. munitions);
- f) Development pressure.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/208>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

A state of conservation report was submitted by the State Party on 11 February 2013. The report responds to the decision made by World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012). It includes information on the corrective measures taken by the State Party (Management Plan, Cultural Master Plan, site guards, education and public awareness, stabilization of the Buddha niches and conservation of the fragments); on the difficulties in their implementation and other conservation issues. In addition to this State Party report, the state of conservation of the site was also discussed by international experts and Afghan authorities at the Eleventh Bamiyan Expert Working Group Meeting (here after *11th BEWGM*) held in Aachen, Germany from 10 to 12 December 2012. At the meeting, the State Party also reiterated its commitment to achieving the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and the preservation of all the related monuments of the Bamiyan Cultural Landscape.

With regard to the implementation of the corrective measures, the following progress has been noted:

a) *Ensuring site security*

The State Party report highlights its commitment to ensuring site security. The report notes that in addition to the site guards, the Ministry of the Interior has deployed a team of police officers from a specialized unit for the protection of cultural properties to monitor and safeguard the property.

b) *Ensuring the long-term stability of the Giant Buddha niches*

The long-term stability of the Giant Buddha niches has remained a central priority. In 2012, the ICOMOS Germany team organized three international expert missions to Bamiyan to implement the conservation and consolidation measures in caves II-VI of the large Western Buddha niche. The entire rear wall of the Eastern Buddha niche was documented into a 3D Scan and some 3D scan documentation was undertaken for the Western Buddha. The experts also worked to set up the model restoration of original fragments in caves II-VI of the Western Buddha in close collaboration with local Afghan craftsmen and under the supervision of the restorer(s). From 18 to 24 June 2012, an Italian Team carried out an international expert mission to Bamiyan to develop detailed field planning and implement preparatory measures for checking and evaluating the threat of rock fall and the formation of dangerous cracks in the upper access of the Western Buddha niche. The mission also evaluated the main cliffs' monitoring system, including the Hazard mapping of the main cliffs. The State Party report highlights the completion of the stabilization of the Eastern Buddha niche in 2011 as a major achievement of the Ministry of Information and Culture, UNESCO and ICOMOS Germany. The State Party indicates that the large Western Buddha niche is in

critical condition and in need of urgent consolidation to avoid further deterioration. It requests continued support from UNESCO and the international community on this work. During the 11th BEWGM, the State Party also expressed its wish for partial reassembly of the Eastern Buddha.

c) *Achieving the Desired state of conservation of archaeological remains and mural paintings;*

While conservation activity on the archaeological remains and mural paintings was not possible for the Japanese Team in 2012 due to security reasons, considerable preparation work was done for future activities. Within the above-mentioned mission of the Italian team, the Guidance and planning for the prevention of erosion at Shahr-i-Zuhak was developed and drafted. This was presented at the 11th BEWGM. Within 2012, the National Research Institute for Cultural Properties (NRICP) Tokyo successfully edited its previous missions findings and related maps and published the Scientific Documentation of Bamiyan Sites, notably: *Vol 1: Cultural Landscape of the Central Part of the Bamiyan Valley in the 1970s* and *Vol 2: Topographic Survey of the Central Part of the Bamiyan Valley*. The State Party report also noted the efforts made towards capacity-building for Afghan experts in 2012 *in situ* in Afghanistan and training abroad in Japan and in Kyrgyzstan. It reports that besides the Bamiyan cliff Buddha niches, other components of the property, such as Shar-i Gholghola, Shahr-i-Zuhak and Kakrak, are in danger of collapse or serious and rapid deterioration and need continued assistance from UNESCO and the international community.

d) *Implementation of the Management Plan and Cultural Master Plan (the protective zoning plan)*

The State Party report notes continuing progress on the preparation of the Management Plan for the property through discussions between local stakeholders, government agencies and international experts. The report particularly notes the June 2012 International Coordination Meeting in Bamiyan as a key opportunity for Afghan officials from concerned ministries and institutions (Bamiyan Governor Office, Ministry of Information and Culture, Ministry of Urban Development, Ministry of Aviation and Transport, Ministry of Public Works) to share their plans to protect the World Heritage property. The 2012 *Second Annual Progress Report of the Bamiyan Valley World Heritage Property Management Plan Preparation*, produced by the Aachen Conservation and Documentation Centre (ACDC), Germany, in conjunction with the Afghan authorities, has been produced. In addition, the Aachen University team drafted the detailed damage assessment on selected structures, showing typical damage types at Shahr-i-Zuhak and carried out documentation and interpretation work for other sites within the property. It is hoped that this Bamiyan scientific documentation system will be used as an example for Afghanistan's National Heritage Documentation data. Regarding the Cultural Master Plan, the State Party report confirms that the plan has been adopted at the local and national levels through the Bamiyan provincial Government, Ministry of Urban Development and Ministry of Information and Culture (MoIC). The report states that the Cultural Master Plan currently functions as a guide to urban development in the Bamiyan Valley and to mitigate any potential negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. However, the report suggests that the plan be simplified to ensure its implementation by the local authorities on the ground.

e) *Other issues and development pressure*

A draft design for a potential Bamiyan Museum for Peace, along with the architectural model was presented at the 11th BEWGM. The State Party confirmed its interest in this Museum project and has requested continued cooperation from UNESCO and the international partners to achieve its completion.

At the 11th BEWGM, another presentation was made by the Afghanistan Operations Centre (AGOC) of UNOPS (United Nations Office for Project Services) on the Foladi road construction. The State Party report mentions that MoIC has been advising UNOPS on the need to provide inputs for a Heritage Impact Assessment to help in the planning of the road

construction, especially in the areas where the road comes near to or inside the boundaries of the property. The State Party report also mentions that the property faces increasing urban pressure from the re-settlement of people within the Bamiyan Valley. Some land within the boundaries is in private ownership and the cultural landscape is under increasing pressure from development and urban growth.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress that has been made by the State Party on the implementation of corrective measures as well as in the area of capacity building. They further note the strong commitment of UNESCO and the international community to the preservation of the property, through expert missions, technical assistance, local capacity building and publications. They encourage the continuation of the effort, not only for the Bamiyan cliff Buddha niches, but also for other component parts of the property, such as Shar-i Gholghola, Shahr-i-Zuhak and Kakrak.

In this context, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that in order to finalize the Management Plan, the Cultural Master Plan and the *2012 Second Annual Progress Report for the Preparation of a Management Plan* as well as the *Scientific Documentation of Bamiyan* should be shared amongst all stakeholders, and should function as references for the overall development strategy of the valley. They also reiterate the importance of enforcing building codes and controls on development within the property and its buffer zones and other areas protected under the 2004 Afghan Law on the Protection of Historical and Cultural Properties.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note with concern the urgency of the critical condition of the large Western Buddha niche which is in need of urgent consolidation to avoid further deterioration as well as the interest expressed in the partial reassembly of the Eastern Buddha niche. They suggest that any measures for the treatment of the Buddha niches take into account an overall approach to conservation and presentation of the property, an appropriate conservation philosophy based on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and in particular, the technical and financial possibilities for the implementation of the project proposals.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note with concern the development pressures on the property, in particular the proposed Foladi Valley Road, and recommend that any decision on the proposed development projects be based on a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), in conformity with the ICOMOS Guidelines on Heritage Impact Assessments for World Heritage Cultural Properties, and be considered in the framework of the on-going development of the Management Plan. They consider that the timeline for the implementation of the corrective measures has to be revised so as to achieve the Desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.30

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7A.26**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Commends the progress made by the State Party on the implementation of the corrective measures and on capacity building;

4. Takes note of the concerns expressed by the State Party on the critical condition of the large Western Buddha niche;
5. Urges the State Party to :
 - a) finalise the Management Plan with an overall strategy of managing the property as a Cultural Landscape,
 - b) ensure that the Cultural Master Plan is shared with other stakeholders intervening in the valley, and
 - c) enforce building codes and regulations on development in the buffer zones of the property and other areas protected under the 2004 Afghan Law on the Protection of Historical and Cultural Properties;
6. Also encourages the State Party to elaborate and implement a capacity building strategy with a view to reinforcing national capacity in the field of conservation and management of important historical and archaeological sites within the property with the support of international donors;
7. Reiterates its request to the State Party, when considering options for the treatment of the Buddha niches, to ensure that proposals are based on feasibility studies which include:
 - a) an overall approach to conservation and presentation of the property,
 - b) an appropriate conservation philosophy based on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property,
 - c) technical and financial possibilities for the implementation of the project proposals;
8. Also reiterates its request to the State Party to submit detailed information on any planned development within or nearby the property, in particular the proposed Foladi Valley Road, to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies, including a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), in accordance with Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines;
9. Requests the State Party to continue its work on the implementation of the adopted corrective measures and to develop, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a revised timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;
10. Calls upon the international community to continue providing technical and financial support for the protection and management of the entire property, including component parts such as Shar-i Gholghola, Shahr-i-Zuhak and Kakrak, in order to achieve the Desired state of conservation;
11. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;
12. **Decides to retain the Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Afghanistan) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

31. Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 1208 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv) (v)

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

2004 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Severe damage to the property caused by the earthquake in December 2003;
- b) Development pressures related to the post-disaster reconstruction process.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Adopted see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/1288>

Corrective measures identified

Adopted see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/1288>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

In progress

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1208/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 50,000 in 2004 for Emergency assistance.

For details, see <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1208/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

Total amount granted: USD 568,000 (2004-2007) from the UNESCO Japan Funds-in-Trust; USD 136, 985 (2005-2010) from the UNESCO Italy Funds-in-Trust; USD 20,000 (2004) from the World Bank Italian Trust Funds'; USD 50,000 (2004) Emergency Assistance under the World Heritage Fund.

Previous monitoring missions

Since January 2004: several UNESCO missions; October 2011: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a comprehensive management plan; (issue resolved)
- b) The boundaries of the property inscribed on an emergency basis were not aligned with the written text of the original Nomination File; (issue resolved)
- c) Development pressure related to the post-disaster reconstruction process.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1208>

and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted its state of conservation report on 1 February 2013. The extensive report includes information on the implementation of the corrective measures and the achievement of the Desired state of conservation to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property and addressing the recommendations of the October 2011 reactive monitoring mission.

a) Conservation of the Arg-e-Bam and other cultural heritage assets within the property

In general, conservation interventions continue to concentrate on the protection of remains, the stabilization of areas to prevent further decay and address vulnerabilities. In addition, some interventions have also been implemented so that spaces were rehabilitated for reutilization for different purposes. It is reported that some sections already restored at the Citadel were also assigned new functions. These uses include, among others, storage areas, exhibition areas, archaeology and restoration offices and areas for the production and exhibition of handicrafts. Research has also been carried out to improve and strengthen the mud brick used for these interventions. Actions implemented included emergency conservation, as well as continuing interventions that were already underway. The report includes photographic records of all areas of intervention together with the objectives pursued.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider the stabilisation and protection of the Arg-e-Bam and other significant cultural heritage assets within the property together with removal and documentation of debris has considerably progressed and therefore these measures have been met. However, they wish to note that consistency in the restoration approach still needs to be ensured.

b) Completion of necessary scientific studies for the recognition, registration, and legal protection of properties with historical, cultural, and natural significance within the cultural landscape zone, as well as marking the protective boundaries around each property within this zone

The State Party reports that surveying has continued and technical maps produced that will form the basis for research and conservation. Maps have been produced both for the Arg-e-Bam and for other heritage places located at the landscape areas. The State Party also reports on archaeological investigation and conservation surveys that have been carried out to update condition assessments. Archaeological surveys have also continued not only at the citadel but also at the Bam cultural landscape which are essential elements for the development of the complete archaeological map and will also serve to identify boundaries for the overall landscape. In addition, topographic maps of the Cultural Landscape were produced, which were complemented with aerial photography of the region.

3D modelling and virtual reconstruction of some of the major complexes of the Citadel have been produced although how these will be used is not explained in the report.

No additional information is provided on whether these maps of the cultural landscape will be used to define legal measures for the protection of the demarcated areas. The produced maps were not included in the report.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the completion of these studies will further strengthen the conservation and protection policies and should be completed as soon as possible. This requirement can be considered as partially completed and therefore should be subject of further state of conservation reporting.

c) Implementation of the management plan

Management actions for the property have followed the provisions made in the Management Plan. Meetings have engaged diverse stakeholders to facilitate the implementation of the action plan. Funding from the State and other sources has been secured for the continuation of research, conservation and capacity building actions. International cooperation has also

contributed to the furtherance of conservation interventions and is expected to continue in the future.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the necessary steps have been taken to ensure effective management of the property and therefore this requirement has been met.

They also note that stronger regulatory measures need to be enforced in order to control construction in the buffer zone.

d) Precise understanding and definition of the outer boundaries of the heritage areas surrounding the property

The boundaries of the property are clearly defined. As aforementioned, the topographic maps for the cultural landscape, complemented with the aerial photography of the region, have been produced.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider this requirement has been met.

e) Adequate security of the heritage areas within the World Heritage property in addition to the Arg-e Bam

The measures taken to safeguard the property include the formation of a Security Unit for Arg-e Bam with 11 permanent guards equipped with vehicles. This Unit has been operational since 2007. Security measures in place continue to be implemented and no additional information is provided on whether personnel has been increased or if additional security measures have been implemented for the remaining 13 component parts of the property.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider this requirement has been met.

f) Other conservation issues, visitor management, regulatory measures to restrict encroachment and development pressure

The State Party also reports on archaeo-geophysical studies carried out, as well as research for the dating of architectural remains. Capacity building programmes for local people, stakeholders and students were continued for conservation, as well as awareness raising activities concerning legal issues and the significance of the landscape. As for promotion, a tourism station and exhibitions were prepared and the tourist route was developed and upgraded. No further information is provided on whether the public use strategy has been developed.

As for the control of pressures derived from development, the utilitarian shift of lands within the limits of the citadel and the surroundings has been brought under control and mechanisms are still in place to inspect requests before permits are issued. However, the issue of illegal construction still needs to be fully addressed and will require the support of different government agencies.

The October 2011 reactive monitoring mission noted the encroachment and existence of a gas station in the buffer zone of the property and was informed that the Bam Governor was waiting for the court decision to remove the service station. No information was provided in the State Party report. The State Party also reports on initial steps taken to establish an international research centre for earthen heritage at Bam Citadel as requested by the Committee in Decision **36 COM 7A.27**.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are of the view that the State Party has addressed the work needed to complete the remaining corrective measures identified by the October 2011 reactive monitoring mission and has now met the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee commend the State Party for the sustained efforts made in implementing the corrective measures for the property. Therefore, they recommend that

the World Heritage Committee consider the removal of this property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. They note however that the property remains vulnerable, in particular the challenges in controlling illegal construction, effective protection of the buffer zone, achieving consistency in restoration, and ensuring continuous site security.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.31

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,
2. Recalling Decision **36 COM 7A.27**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),
3. Commends the considerable efforts made by the State Party, with the support of the international community, to address the threats that led to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and to implement the corrective measures;
4. Considers that the State Party has addressed the work needed to complete the remaining corrective measures identified by the October 2011 reactive monitoring mission and has now met the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger;
5. Notes that the property remains vulnerable and recommends that the State Party pay attention to the following:
 - a) *Revise the existing Management Plan to include visitor management component and action plans with timeframes and adequate resources for implementation,*
 - b) *Control illegal construction and ensure effective protection of the buffer zone through the development and adoption of regulatory measures,*
 - c) *Achieve consistency in restoration through the development guidelines and criteria for interventions to ensure a balanced approach to conservation that sustains the conditions of authenticity and integrity of the property,*
 - d) *Ensure continuing site security with the involvement of the local authorities and communities;*
6. Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2015** an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 39th session in 2015;
7. **Decides to remove Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Islamic Republic of Iran) from the List of World Heritage in Danger.**

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

32. 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

2010 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

Irreversible interventions as part of major reconstruction of the structure of Bagrati Cathedral

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4196>

Corrective measures identified

Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4196>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4196>

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/710/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2003, June 2008, March 2010, April 2012: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) General need for interior and exterior conservation work on the monuments;
- b) Major reconstruction of the structure of Bagrati Cathedral;
- c) Insufficient coordination between the Georgian Church and the national authorities (issue resolved);
- d) Lack of co-ordinated management system (issue resolved).

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/710>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

At its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012), the World Heritage Committee decided to exceptionally adjourn until its next 37th ordinary session the debate on the state of conservation of Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery. The state of conservation report for the property, presented to the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee (see item 30 of Document WHC-12/36.COM/7A.Add) is therefore proposed as Annex 1 to the present report which includes only updated information and new elements which have not been addressed in the above-mentioned report. Both reports should be considered in conjunction with each other.

On 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted an updated state of conservation report addressing progress made with conservation work at Gelati Monastery. The report also confirmed that the full re-building of the Bagrati Cathedral was completed in September 2012.

a) *Request for a major boundary modification of the property*

On 24 January 2013, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre a request for a major boundary modification of the property, which the State Party had prepared to address the consequences of the re-building of Bagrati Cathedral, further to the conclusions and draft Decision included in Annex I.

A completeness-check of the nomination file was undertaken by the World Heritage Centre. The submission was considered incomplete, in conformity with Paragraph 140 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The State Party was duly informed on 1 March 2013.

b) *Conservation Programme at Gelati Monastery*

The State Party reported that in 2012 urgent rehabilitation work was carried out on the roof of St. Marine's chapel of the Church of the Virgin in order to stabilize the structure and to protect the interior from atmospheric condensation. Completion of this work will allow for further conservation work on the wall paintings of the chapel. The State Party pointed out that the conservation of mural paintings and frescos in the churches' interiors remains a priority issue. Since 2012 a long-term conservation programme, containing an extensive training component, is being planned in co-operation with the Courtauld Institute of Arts, UK, and the Tbilisi State Academy of Fine Arts. In 2012, an agreement was reached with the World Bank to ensure financing of the wall painting conservation and research works at Gelati.

c) *Protection of the setting of Gelati Monastery*

The State Party reports that during 2011-2012, as part of work to develop a major boundary modification for the property, a needs assessment for the buffer zone has been undertaken. Based on this analysis, an extended buffer zone was proposed for Gelati Monastery to reflect its close relation with the kings' residence in ancient Kutaisi. The proposal was part of the major boundary modification file referred to above. The State Party further points out that legal protection would be put in place once the extended buffer zone is approved.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note that this report should be considered in conjunction with the state of conservation report prepared for the 36th session (Annex I).

They note with concern that re-building of Bagrati Cathedral has been completed and reiterate the conclusions presented in Annex I, that the new work has overwhelmed the original masonry to such an extent that the authenticity of the Cathedral has been irreversibly destroyed and that Bagrati Cathedral can no longer be said to contribute to the criterion for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note that the request for a major boundary modification for the property submitted by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre in January 2013 was considered incomplete. While they acknowledge the effort of the State Party to start addressing the consequences of re-building Bagrati cathedral, they consider nonetheless that the State Party would have benefitted from seeking the advice of the World Heritage Centre by submitting a draft proposal by the deadline of 30 September 2012, as per Paragraph 168 of the *Operational Guidelines*. They recommend that the Committee request the State Party to submit a major boundary modification which would allow Gelati to justify the inscription criteria on its own, at the latest by 1 February 2014, in close consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the progress made with establishing a long term programme for the conservation of wall paintings at Gelati Monastery, with a strong capacity-building component. Altogether, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the State Party has made significant progress in implementing the corrective measures regarding the Gelati Monastery. They consider that the development of a Management Plan could help address negative factors impacting on Gelati Monastery.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.32

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **34 COM 7B.88**, **35 COM 7A.29**, **36 COM 7A.30**, adopted at its 34th (Brasilia, 2010), 35th (UNESCO, 2011) and 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) sessions respectively,*
3. *Welcomes the progress in the implementation of the conservation programme plan for Gelati Monastery and encourages the State Party to continue to implement all relevant conservation measures regarding Gelati Monastery, including elaboration of a management plan;*
4. *Expresses its deep regret that despite previous decisions the re-building of Bagrati Cathedral has been completed and considers that the Bagrati Cathedral has been altered to such an extent that its authenticity has been irreversibly compromised and that it no longer contributes to the justification for the criterion for which the property was inscribed;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit, by **1 February 2014**, a request for a major boundary modification for the property to allow Gelati Monastery to justify the criterion on its own;*
6. *Also encourages the State Party to seek the advice of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in developing the boundary modification and submit the draft to the World Heritage Centre for comments by the Advisory Bodies, by **30 September 2013**;*
7. ***Decides to retain Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) on the World Heritage List in Danger.***

30. 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

2010

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

Irreversible interventions as part of major reconstruction of the structure of Bagrati Cathedral

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Adopted in Decision - **34COM 7B.88**

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4196>

Corrective measures identified

Adopted in Decision - **34COM 7B.88**

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4196>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Adopted in Decision - **34COM 7B.88**

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4196>

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/710/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2003, June 2008 and March 2010: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions

Factors affecting the property 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

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/710>

Current conservation issues

At its 34th session the Committee requested the State Party to halt work on a monumental, stone-clad, reinforced concrete reconstruction of Bagrati Cathedral that had been started without its approval and decided to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List in Danger. At the 35th session, the Committee noted that work on reconstructing the Cathedral according to the monumental scheme had been halted.

The Committee also took note that according to the international conservation architect appointed as a consultant for the Bagrati Cathedral that the incomplete structural condition of the Bagrati Cathedral was not sustainable, that it might not be feasible to reverse what has been recently built as the interventions are almost irreversible, and that a lightweight roof could be mounted on the existing concrete columns.

The Committee requested the State Party to produce a Rehabilitation Strategy that could allow the building to be brought back into use, while reversing the maximum amount of recent work and incorporating fragments of the original building where they form part of the walls.

The Rehabilitation Strategy was to be presented to the Committee for approval before a detailed rehabilitation project was submitted, and before any further work on the Cathedral was undertaken.

As also requested by the Committee at its 35th session, a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited the property from 22 to 28 April 2012 to discuss the Rehabilitation Strategy and to consider the overall state of conservation of the property.

At the time of drafting this report, only a preliminary mission report has been received. However, the report shows that a monumental re-building of the Cathedral using modern materials was well underway at the time of the mission.

The State Party submitted a State of Conservation Report on 31 January 2012. The report did not mention the fact that re-building work was well under way. The report addressed progress made with the drafting of the Rehabilitation Strategy for Bagrati Cathedral, with conservation work at Gelati monastery, and with drafting a retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Further documents relating to the re-building of the Cathedral were submitted on 15 May 2012, after the mission had taken place. They included a revised Rehabilitation Strategy, details of the engineering work carried out, and a partial report on archaeological investigations, but no detailed plans of the re-building project.

a) *Rehabilitation Strategy for Bagrati Cathedral*

The State Party submitted a first draft of a Rehabilitation Strategy in January 2012. This was drafted following a round table discussion organised at the request of the State Party at the World Heritage Centre on 9 November 2011 and attended by representatives of the State Party, the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM.

This meeting agreed that the purpose of the Rehabilitation Strategy was to set out a rationale for a project to allow the Cathedral to be brought back into use.

It was agreed that as the conservation history of Bagrati Cathedral is complex, and as recent interventions have to an extent limited certain options, the Rehabilitation Strategy needed to set out the necessary evidence to justify any rebuilding approach that was being suggested.

The meeting discussed a possible alternative approach to the monumental concrete option which could be based on a combination of reinforcement of the original parts of the fabric that had already been implemented (and agreed as being non-reversible), rebuilding using the four hundred or so stone blocks on site, where detailed evidence exists in the central and eastern part, and the insertion of modern construction in the west where evidence is lacking. The roof would be supported by lightweight steelwork and the whole construction would respect detailed archaeological research and allow for conservation of the original fabric. This approach would have the advantage of reversibility of the new construction.

The first draft of the Rehabilitation Strategy submitted by the State Party in January 2012 set out an approach based on recreating the eastern and central part of the Cathedral for which evidence exists, and completing the building with new structures at the western end where there is no evidence or little original material remains.

The draft Strategy was reviewed by ICOMOS who considered that in some places there was a need for further information and analysis in order to provide a clearer understanding as to the extent of the interventions to the fabric so far, the technical and conservation issues that these create. In general terms, ICOMOS considered that Strategy needed to be clearer on what could be reversed and what could not be reversed and how much of the existing recent work was needed from a structural point of view, what would be modified, and how new strengthening would be addressed. ICOMOS also considered that there was a certain amount of overlap between the strategy and the resulting project which needed to be resolved in the document. ICOMOS stressed that no approval had been given for the re-building project – as inferred in the draft strategy.

It was agreed that the reactive monitoring mission should discuss these comments with the State Party, so that a revised Rehabilitation Strategy could be submitted to the Committee at its forthcoming session.

This aim has however been overtaken by the resumption of work on the Cathedral which appears to have started after the last session of the Committee.

A second draft of the Rehabilitation Strategy was submitted by the State Party on 15 May 2012. However, as by this time reconstruction work was well under way, the purpose of the strategy as a document that could inform a reconstruction project is no longer relevant. The document has become a justification for work already carried out. In it the State Party concludes that the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value is negligible.

b) Stabilisation works of the Bagrati Cathedral

Although the State Party report states that some urgent stabilization works were undertaken to the west wall necessary for further supporting structures that might be needed for the rehabilitation strategy, as explained in a letter to the World Heritage Centre of 27 September 2011 to which the World Heritage Centre responded in the affirmative on 5 October 2011, the mission observed a very different situation.

Work on re-building the Cathedral was seen to be progressing non-stop to achieve a full reconstruction of the building, using stone-clad reinforced cement in the central and eastern parts, together with modern interventions in the western part, mostly along the lines of the original monumental project combined with the plans drawn up by international conservation architect. A cast concrete cupola had already been partially raised up. The State Party confirmed to the mission that the inauguration of the Cathedral is being planned for September 2012.

The idea of restoring those parts of the building where evidence exists, on the basis of careful documentation and research, and conservation of the original fabric, has been abandoned.

c) Structural additions:

The mission was provided with information on the major structural interventions undertaken so far, and these have been confirmed in further information received from the State Party. These are:

- Completion of consolidation work on interior and exterior foundations of the load bearing walls;
- Creation of four central concrete pillars on the bases of the original ones;
- Installation of underground reinforced concrete beams, connecting the four pillars with the underground foundation of the exterior walls, which according to Georgian engineers, are placed under the archaeological level;
- Covering of the interior surface of the church walls with stone cladding, on a reinforced base – a totally irreversible process.

Although these works were stated to be necessary for the stability of the church in an earthquake zone, in reality these drastic interventions actually allowed the realisation of the first phase of the reconstruction project, in providing the necessary stability to allow for the proposed concrete cupola and the new roof.

d) *Re-construction:*

The mission observed the following work being undertaken:

- *Western part:*

In this end of the church, where inadequate original material and evidence exists for a full reconstruction, reinforced concrete beams have been installed in order to support the new stone and metal roof.

- *North-west corner:*

A metal construction has been prepared (with iron inserts into the original fabric), to support the new staircase and a lift that will lead to a first floor museum.

- *Central part:*

A reinforced concrete dome has been installed, theoretically supported by the four central concrete pillars together with concrete arches to supplement the concrete pillars, although the latter are still under construction. All the new (interior and exterior) surfaces are stone-clad. The only non-clad surface is in the area of the proposed museum. The gaps in the interior of the fabric are grouted with cement.

- *Northern and southern wings:*

Raised over the historical porticos with their famous stone reliefs, are reinforced concrete constructions, with iron supports for the metal roof covering.

- *Eastern end:*

This is being completed by continuing the reconstruction work of the 1950's. It is being roofed over in a similar way to the rest of the building.

The mission observed that the current work has not been based on conservation of the existing fabric, some of which was acknowledged as being in an extremely fragile state during the previous mission in 2010, has not respected the archaeological layers, is not reversible.

Furthermore all these interventions have completely ignored the evidence brought to light by recent archaeological research. This identified the precise place of almost 400 of the original building stones that survived on the site. Of these, only two or three have been placed in their original position as examples.

In the Mission's view the necessary stabilisation of the Cathedral could have been achieved in other less drastic ways and should have been submitted as part of the rehabilitation strategy for discussion.

The second draft of the Rehabilitation Strategy submitted by the State Party attempts to justify the reconstruction now being undertaken and states that the reconstruction will respect and rescue all the original material that existed at the time of inscription. However, the mission noted that only two of the four hundred fallen blocks were being re-used. The covering of the original fabric under a contemporary stone cladding on a reinforced concrete base will irreversibly damage the authenticity of the original structure, and also eliminate any historical evidence of the past interventions that are part of the history of the church.

In order to support the new reinforced concrete dome, excavations have been made in the central part of the church, to install additional sub-foundations for the parametric walls and large reinforced concrete beams have destroyed much of the archaeological layers,

including, it appears, important discoveries of tombs inside the church, as reported in the media.

The overall approach was not considered by the mission to respect the aim to rehabilitate the church in a way that respected its fabric, archaeological layers and overall its Outstanding Universal Value, as had been envisaged by the Committee.

The second draft of the Rehabilitation Strategy states that at the time of inscription the monument was not totally in a ruined condition with parts reconstructed. This was accepted at the time of inscription but it is no justification for a monumental re-building that is being carried out without prior approval either as a strategy or in terms of detail by the Committee.

A detailed appraisal of this second draft Rehabilitation Strategy will be undertaken by ICOMOS and submitted to the State Party.

e) Topological and Archaeological Surveys around Bagrati Cathedral

The State Party report provides details of work undertaken to increase knowledge of the wider archaeological area around the Cathedral. In addition to topographic and cadastral surveys of the site carried out in early 2011, a non-intrusive archaeological survey of the entire Bagrati Cathedral part of the property was undertaken in November-December 2011. The results of this survey revealed a high density of archaeological layers in the survey area, including evidence of fortifications and royal residences.

The mission considered that the resulting data is highly important for understanding the significance of the context of the property. Such evidence could have been used as the basis of a Master Plan for the property and its setting to allow understanding of the way the area has evolved.

f) Gelati Monastery conservation work

The State Party reports that conservation works were continued within the framework of the Gelati Monastery Conservation Master Plan. The mission assessed the on-going works, which focused in 2011 on the Rehabilitation of the palace of Bishop Gabriel.

Through a cooperation agreement between the Restoration Faculty at the State Academy of Fine Arts (NACHPG) and Lugano University, and with the financial support of the Swiss National Science Foundation, international conservation specialists were involved in the stone and wall painting conservation programme during 2010-2011. Within the framework of a complex programme for the systematic conservation and restoration of the interior wall-paintings and mosaics in Gelati Monastery churches. As a result of this co-operation the following works were undertaken:

- Assessment of condition of mural paintings in the St. Marine chapel of the main church of Gelati;
- Stone condition assessment of the St. George church of Gelati and risk mapping;
- Conservation of carved stone frame around the entrance door of the St. George church of Gelati.

With the support of the NACHPG, it is planned to continue the involvement of these international specialists and with their associated students in future stone and wall painting conservation work.

The mission noted that the State Party has made significant progress in implementing the requested corrective measures regarding this component of the property.

A clear institutional coordination mechanism, ensuring that the conservation of the Gelati Monastery receives priority consideration within relevant governmental decision-making processes, has been established. A complex programme for the structural conservation and restoration of the churches in Gelati Monastery is being implemented.

The Gelati Monastery master plan presented in 2010 gives adequate answers to problems relating to the needs of the monastic community, and of the visitors to the monastic complex. The mission confirms that there is a proper organization of the functions inside the monastery grounds, taking into consideration the fact that the property is a living monument.

As already mentioned by the 2010 mission, there is also provision in case of a rising number of the monks, for them to be established in a nearby place, outside of the monastery grounds. The master plan dissociates the visitors' facilities from the monks' life, proposing that the new visitors' buildings be erected outside the monastery grounds, while the visitors would follow an organized route inside the monastic complex.

g) Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

The draft retrospective statement of Outstanding Universal Value submitted by the State Party is still under review by the Advisory Bodies.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the observations of the mission that notwithstanding the agreement between the World Heritage Centre and the State Party in November 2011 that only emergency work might be undertaken to stabilise the building, in reality a full-blown re-construction of the Cathedral is well underway, largely according to the monumental concrete and stone clad plans rejected by the Committee at its 34th session, but with a lighter modern construction at the western end.

The mission also noted that although exemplary investigative work has been undertaken on the monument and its surroundings, no attempt has been made to undertake an archaeological reconstruction using original stones, where they exist, nor to conserve the original fabric, some of which was in a fragile state, and apparently no attempt has been made to protect the archaeological layers where reinforced concrete beams have been installed below ground, and the recently discovered tombs.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note with disappointment that in spite of apparently positive meetings in 2011 between the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies on the basis of a clear understanding that the Reconstruction Strategy should be developed and presented to the Committee for approval before any re-construction work was undertaken, and that such a strategy should acknowledge the need for a careful analysis of the existing fabric, and that some of the recent interventions should be reversed to give maximum exposure of the original stone, this strategic approach has apparently been ignored. Similarly, the Committee's explicit request made at its 35th session, that it approve such a strategy before any commitment to rebuild was not respected.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies also note that after almost complete implementation of the monumental project, the State Party has submitted in May 2012 a second draft of the Rehabilitation Strategy that attempts to justify the work underway without however providing an explanation as to why a solution that respects the original fabric and is reversible has not been developed.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee express deep regret that the opportunity to undertake a careful, reversible reconstruction of the majority of the building based on clear evidence of what previously existed, with sensitive new work introduced where evidence is lacking, which could have allowed the Cathedral to be re-used and valued as part of contemporary society has not been taken.

They consider that the decision to inaugurate a new reconstructed Cathedral of Bagrati in September 2012 has prevailed over the commitment of the State Party to implement the Committee's decisions to allow future removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, as well as over the responsibility to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

While the State Party has made significant progress in implementing the corrective measures regarding the Gelati Monastery, they consider that the work undertaken at Bagrati Cathedral does not respect the Corrective Measures agreed by the Committee nor will it contribute towards achieving the Desired State of Conservation. The new work has overwhelmed the original masonry to such an extent that the authenticity of the Cathedral has been irreversibly destroyed. Bagrati Cathedral can no longer be said to contribute to the criterion for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7A.30

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7A.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decision **35 COM 7A.29**, adopted at its 35th session (UNESCO, 2011),*
3. *Welcomes the progress in the implementation of the rehabilitation programme and the conservation master plan for Gelati Monastery, as well as the progress in the establishment of a clear institutional coordination mechanism within the framework of the State Programme for Cultural Heritage in Georgia, involving all stakeholders concerned;*
4. *Notes with extreme concern that a reconstruction of Bagrati Cathedral is already well advanced, largely in line with plans, rejected by the Committee at its 34th session, for a monumental re-building using reinforced concrete, including a cast concrete cupola, and installing stone facing that covers much of the original stonework;*
5. *Further notes that, notwithstanding exemplary topological and archaeological surveys of the buildings, no attempt has been made to re-use the majority of the surviving fallen stones in their original places, in spite of the precise locations for some 400 stones having been identified;*
6. *Deeply regrets that no conservation of the original stonework has been undertaken, prior to the new work being started and that such work will now be impossible due to the irreversible nature of the recent interventions;*
7. *Expresses its great concern that, notwithstanding the production of a draft Rehabilitation Strategy for Bagrati Cathedral, as requested by the Committee, the subsequent comments by the Advisory Bodies, and the appointment of an international conservation architect, a strategic approach that would have optimised the retention of original stonework and allowed new interventions to be reversible and readily understood, has not been retained, and considers that the opportunity to bring the Bagrati Cathedral back into use, while at the same time sustaining its contribution to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been lost;*
8. *Also considers that the Bagrati Cathedral has been altered to such an extent that its authenticity has been irreversibly compromised and that it no longer contributes to the justification for the criterion for which the property was inscribed;*
9. *Deeply regrets that the decisions of the Committee at its 34th and 35th sessions have failed to protect Bagrati Cathedral;*

10. Requests the State Party to submit, by **1 February 2013**, a request for a major boundary modification for the property to allow Gelati Monastery to justify the criterion on its own;
11. Further encourages the State Party to seek the advice of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in developing the boundary modification;
12. **Decides to retain Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) on the World Heritage List in Danger.**

33. 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
2009 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Lack of a management mechanism;
- b) Privatisation of surrounding land;
- c) Loss of authenticity of some components due to restoration works conducted using unacceptable methods.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger
Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4103>

Corrective measures identified
Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4103>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures
Adopted, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4103>

Previous Committee Decisions
See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/708/documents/>

International Assistance
Total amount granted: USD 131,160
For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/708/assistance/>

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds
N/A

Previous monitoring missions
November 2003, June 2008, March 2010 and April 2012: Joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring missions.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of a management mechanism (issue resolved);
- b) Lack of definition of the property and of the buffer zones (issue resolved);
- c) Insufficient coordination between the Georgian Church and the national authorities (issue resolved);
- d) Privatisation of surrounding land;
- e) Natural erosion of stone;
- f) Loss of authenticity during recent works carried out by the Church;
- g) Inappropriate urban development within a sensitive historical environment.

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/708/>
and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 31 January 2013, the State Party submitted a detailed state of conservation report that addresses the progress made with the implementation of the corrective measures in view of the future removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

a) Boundary issues

The draft Management plan elaborated in 2012 and submitted to the World Heritage Centre in November 2012 envisages a definition of the management area which is also a proposed buffer zone of the property. No minor boundary modification has been submitted yet as the draft management plan is under review by the Advisory Bodies. The National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia plans to continue the topographic and archaeological surface surveys.

b) Management Plan

The elaboration of the draft management plan has been piloted by a Steering Committee and elaborated with the participation of a large number of stakeholders. The authorities envisage signing an agreement between the stakeholders to assign specific responsibilities concerning the implementation of the Management Plan. The State Party underlined in the report that the new government of Georgia, in place since October 2012, considers the possibility of the development of a national law for World Heritage. The State Party also envisages the inclusion of the Management Plan in the respective Georgian legislation and making it a mandatory instrument for management of the World Heritage properties in Georgia.

ICOMOS has provided comments on the Plan which stress the need to clearly identify the attributes of outstanding universal value as the basis for the Plan, as well as the need for legal and planning protection. The plan underlines the importance of the 'natural', 'cultural' and 'urban' environment but, if these are to be protected and sustained, a clearer understanding of their scope and relationship to Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) is needed, and of the proposed legislative and planning tools.

c) Urban development pressure and Urban Land Use Master Plan

The State Party report informs that the developments within the property and its setting have been halted and that different possibilities are explored to mitigate the impact of already implemented interventions. Possibilities are also being explored to stop all development works in the vicinity of the property within the sensitive area of the river Mtkvari bank, between the Svetitskhoveli Cathedral and Jvari church. The system of cultural heritage protection zones, introduced in 2006, was amended on 17 September 2012 by the decree of the Prime Minister of Georgia, to allow controlled developments in certain parts of the town. The State Party also informs that the elaboration of a Land Use Master Plan, which has been temporarily suspended in 2012, will be finalized in 2013.

On 21 February 2013, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre, for review by ICOMOS, an Environmental Impact Assessment for the project of a waste water treatment plant for the town of Mtskheta, proposed to be located in a sensitive area on the right bank of the river Aragvi.

ICOMOS considers that the proposed plant would have a very high negative impact on the whole panorama of the area between Jvari Church and the city of Mtskheta. The plant would be sited in the open flat area, between the Svetitskhoveli church and one of the most respected religious monuments in Georgia, Jvari Church, and the third important monumental element in Mtskheta, namely the Armaztikhe acropolis. If built, the view of it from Jvari church, the highest point of the area, would be practically impossible to conceal,

regardless of its height or of the planned 400 trees, because the tanks would appear directly in the view. The significance of the chosen site is further reinforced by the “*A Heritage and Tourism Master Plan for Mtskheta, Georgia, UNESCO/UNDP Pilot Project, Final report, 2003, Paris*”, which describes the site as significant for its connection between the natural environment and the monumental components of the property, and by the Management Plan.

d) Long-term consolidation, conservation and monitoring measures

Jvari Monastery

The State Party reported that the two year stone conservation programme of this monument was completed in 2012 by ICCROM. The conservation of the stone relief of Jvari main church as well as other important fragments is completed according to highest international standards. The project implied (a) conservation of the relief depicting angels bearing up the Holy Cross above the entrance to the church, (b) conservation work on the hood moulds above the windows on the eastern façade of the church, (c) evaluation of the efficiency of the conservation of the reliefs on the apse of the Church.

Svetitskhoveli Cathedral

The State Party informed that a long term stone conservation programme is planned for Svetitskhoveli Cathedral. In 2012 the preliminary assessment and stone types survey was carried out. The conservation of most urgent parts will take place in 2013 and will continue further according to the set schedule. International experts, including an ICCROM expert, have been contracted to elaborate short and long-term action plans for different conservation issues of the Cathedral. The conclusions of the 2012 preliminary assessment mission were submitted by the State Party, as part of the report. A safety assessment is planned for 2013. The emergency consolidation works of endangered stone parts (the upper part of the Western façade) is planned to be implemented in 2013 by the ICCROM expert.

Armaztsikhe-Bagineti archaeological site

The National Agency for Cultural Heritage Preservation of Georgia, with financial support from the US Ambassadors Fund for Cultural Preservation, implemented conservation and rehabilitation of this archeological site that included: (a) conservation of the “King’s bathhouse”, (b) conservation of the gymnasium, (c) cleaning of the site, (d) development of infrastructure of the site.

e) State Programme for Cultural Heritage in Georgia - towards a strategic World Heritage country programming

The State Party report highlights the interest of the new government to develop, in coordination with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, a “5C” Strategic World Heritage Programme.

f) Other issues

With a view of obtaining Enhanced Protection of Mtskheta in compliance with the Second Protocol to the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, the State authorities also prepared a dossier on the World Heritage property of Mtskheta as part of the project “War Free World Heritage cities” within the programme “Cooperation in Urban Development and Dialogue” (CIUDAD).

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the efforts made by the State Party in the implementation of the corrective measures, including the elaboration of a Management Plan and the implementation of the multi component conservation programme. They take note that the definition of the buffer zone will be put forward for approval, once the Management Plan has been adopted.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies point out that while the State Party has halted the developments within the property and its setting and that different possibilities are

explored to mitigate the impact of already implemented interventions, it should also, in conformity with the adopted corrective measures: (a) Establish clear operating plans and strict limits to development rights and management regulations within the property and its buffer zone to ensure long term protection and conservation of the property; (b) Ensure that development rights on existing private or leased lands are clearly defined and strictly controlled; (c) Adopt and implement the Urban Land-Use Master Plan of the City of Mtskheta, including all aspects of infrastructure rehabilitation, zoning regulations with particular emphasis on the establishment of no-construction zones; (d) Make publicly available the information on land-use for all lands within the property and its buffer zone, in easily accessible format, to ensure transparency in land-use and allocations.

They also note the potential high negative impact of the proposed water treatment plant on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property, and consider that notwithstanding the desirability of building such a plant, a new location needs to be chosen that does not impact on the extremely important links between the religious monuments and the riverside landscape that provides their essential context, as is identified in the Management Plan.

Taking into account that the property is an ensemble of religious monuments within a very sensitive historical environment, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the World Heritage Committee retain the Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) on the List of World Heritage in Danger until the adoption of the Urban Land-Use Master Plan which takes into consideration the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, its specific landscape setting, as well as important views and connection lines.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.33

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **34 COM 7A.27, 35 COM 7A.30 and 36 COM 7A.31**, adopted at its 34th (Brasilia, 2010), 35th (UNESCO, 2011) and 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) sessions respectively,*
3. *Acknowledges the detailed information provided by the State Party on the progress made to implement the corrective measures and urges the State Party to continue its work on all the corrective measures adopted at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010);*
4. *Reiterates its request to the State Party to submit a minor boundary modification proposal for a unified buffer zone of the property to enhance the protection of the property and to allow a clear understanding of the archaeological and visually sensitive areas around the property;*
5. *Notes that a draft Management Plan was submitted by the State Party and encourages the State Party to strengthen the Plan by clearly identifying the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value as the basis for legal protection, planning processes and management;*
6. *Also notes that the State Party has halted inappropriate developments within the property and its setting and also urges the State Party to finalize the Urban Land-Use Master Plan, including zoning regulations with particular emphasis on the establishment of no-construction zones, strict limits to development rights and a conservation master plan and which should take into consideration the Outstanding*

Universal Value of the property, its specific landscape setting, as well as important views and connection lines;

7. *Encourages the State Party to adopt as a matter of urgency the Urban Land-Use Master Plan as a major step towards the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
8. *Notes with concern that the proposed location of the waste water treatment plant would have a highly negative impact on the sensitive river landscape that forms the setting for the monuments, and requests the State Party as a matter of urgency to re-locate the plant to a position that does not impact adversely on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*
9. *Takes note that the State Party plans to develop a national law for World Heritage properties in Georgia, as well as a “5C World Heritage Programming Approach”;*
10. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;*
11. ***Decides to retain the Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

34. Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Serbia) (C 724 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List
2004, extension 2006

Criteria
(ii) (iii) (iv)

Year(s) of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger
2006 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Lack of legal status of the property;
- b) Lack of legislative protection of buffer zones;
- c) Lack of implementation of the Management Plan and of active management;
- d) Difficulties to monitor the property due to political instability, post-conflict situation (visits under the Kosovo Stabilisation Force / United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (KFOR / UNMIK) escort and lack of guards and security);
- e) Unsatisfactory state of conservation and maintenance of the property.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Full and permanent protection of the property in a secure and stable political environment;
- b) Agreed medium-term plan for the restoration of wall paintings (including preventive conservation regime) and conservation and rehabilitation of the property;
- c) Implementation of the Management Plan, and full establishment of buffer zones and boundaries including their legal protection.

Corrective measures identified

Urgent / short-term corrective measures:

- a) Put in place appropriate guarding and security arrangements for the Church of the Virgin of Ljevisa;

- b) Prepare a conservation status report including a condition survey for the wall paintings and the status of the conservation works and take temporary measures where there is an urgent need (for example the lead roof of the west bay of the nave of the Church of Virgin of Ljevisa, that was partly removed);
- c) Prepare a risk preparedness study, in conformity with Paragraph 118 of the Operational Guidelines and Decisions **28 COM 10B.4** and **30 COM 7.2**.

Long-term corrective measures:

- d) Ensure the adequate long-term administrative, regulatory protection and management of the property, in conformity with Paragraph 97 of the Operational Guidelines;
- e) Put in place strong protective regimes for the buffer zones;
- f) Adequately delineate the boundaries (e.g. extend the boundaries of the Patriarchate of Pec to include more of its riverside-valley settings);
- g) Prepare detailed state of conservation reports as a basis for adapted monitoring, preventative conservation measures, and specific conservation projects to reverse decline;
- h) Ensure appropriate and timely implementation of the Management Plan.

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

- a) Urgent / short-term corrective measures to be taken by the State Party, in cooperation with UNESCO programmes, UNMIK and Provisional Institutions of Self Government in Kosovo*;
- b) Regarding the long-term corrective measures to be taken by the State Party, in co-operation with UNESCO programmes, UNMIK and Provisional Institutions of Self Government in Kosovo no specific timeframe can be given at this stage due to the uncertain political situation.

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/724>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

Total amount granted: USD 2,798,348 following the Donors Conference for the Protection and Preservation of Cultural Heritage in Kosovo, May 2005; USD 693,330 by the Italian Government; USD 76,335 by the Czech Government; USD 132,833 by the Greek Government; USD 2,000,000 by the Government of the Russian Federation and USD 45,000 by the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria.

Previous monitoring missions

January 2007: UNESCO intersectoral mission to Kosovo; July 2008: UNESCO Venice Office (BRESCE) mission; January 2009: UNESCO BRESCE mission; August 2009 and July 2010: UNESCO BRESCE mission; July 2012: UNESCO BRESCE mission; January 2013: UNESCO BRESCE mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

See above

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/724> and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

Note: *The Secretariat was informed by the Legal Advisor that “The UNESCO Secretariat follows the practice of the United Nations, which considers that the Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999) continues to be applicable to the territory of Kosovo until a final settlement is achieved”.*

At its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012), the World Heritage Committee decided to adjourn until its 37th ordinary session the debate on the state of conservation of the World Heritage property “Medieval Monuments in Kosovo” (Decision **36 COM 7A.32**). The state of conservation report presented to the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee (see item 32 of Document WHC-12/36.COM/7A.Add) is therefore enclosed as Annex 1 to the

* References to Kosovo shall be understood to be in the context of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999)

present report and is called hereinafter the “2012 SOC Report”. The present report only includes updated information and new elements that had not been addressed in the “2012 SOC Report”. Both reports should be considered jointly.

A report on the state of conservation of the property, providing information on conservation and restoration works in the four components of the serial World Heritage property, was submitted by the Permanent Delegation of Serbia to the World Heritage Centre on 31 January 2013. Additional information on specific issues related to the state of conservation has been submitted by letters or electronic communications.

a) *State of conservation*

Important conservation work took place in 2012 in all four components of the property thanks to the projects funded by the Russian Federation, as well as Bulgaria and Italy for the Virgin of Ljevisha Church, and successfully implemented by UNESCO. The activities implemented under these projects are outlined below, on the basis of information provided in the state of conservation report, as well as in the regular progress reports of UNESCO BRESCE Office on the implementation of the projects and the January 2013 UNESCO BRESCE mission report:

- *Gracanica Monastery*: In the summer of 2012 conservation work has been done in the Southern *parekklesion* for 80 m² of frescos in the lower sections, including cleaning and consolidation of detached layers and filling of cracks and fissures. Conservation works with regard to the exterior of the Holy Annunciation Church started in April 2013 and are scheduled to be completed by the end of June 2013;
- *Decani Monastery*: By the end of 2012, the restoration of the ashlar facades of the Christ Pantokrator Church was completed. Also, conservation work was done on the west narthex portal and west naos portal, on the windows, the blind arcades, as well as in the church interior on the columns and the marble altar screen. Painting and conservation work on frescos was also carried out, following prevention and test works in the previous two seasons, with minimum interventions to the original;
- *Patriarchate of Pec*: Painting, conservation and restoration works were carried out with regard to the frescos of the Holy Virgin Odigitria Church. Complex conservation and restoration work was also carried out on the Virgin’s throne, a precious piece of furniture with intricate woodcarving;
- *The Virgin of Ljevisha Church*: The conservation works comprised cleaning of the frescoes in the west naos section, the central dome and the area underneath the dome, as well as realizing injections in the damaged areas and the replacement of unstable fillings.

b) *Security situation and handover of security responsibility*

In February 2013, the World Heritage Centre was informed of incidents at the Decani Monastery, in protest against a real estate-related court decision in favour of the Decani Monastery. Concerned about the safety, security and overall protection of the property, the World Heritage Centre liaised with the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), which gave assurances that it was working closely with all organizations mandated to maintain security, including the NATO-led Kosovo Force (KFOR), the European Union Rule of Law Mission (EULEX), the Kosovo Police and local authorities, and specifically monitoring all developments which may potentially compromise the security of the property.

As advised by UNMIK and considering that the on-going protection by KFOR of the Decani Monastery and the Patriarchate of Pec is essential for ensuring an adequate level of protection of the World Heritage property, the Director-General of UNESCO requested in April 2013 the Secretary-General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to re-examine the timeline for “unfixing” processes in the Decani Monastery and the Patriarchate of Pec in the light of the reported incidents.

It is to be noted that, further to information provided by UNMIK, KFOR currently ensures the security for the Patriarchate of Pec and the Decani Monastery while the Kosovo Police ensures the security for Gračanica (“unfixed” in 2011) and the Virgin of Ljevisa Church.

The World Heritage Centre also received information from UNMIK that a new Kosovo Police Unit for Protection of Religious and Cultural Heritage was established in December 2012 to provide static security for religious and cultural heritage sites.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.34

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 8B.54, 31 COM 7A.28, 32 COM 7A.27, 33 COM 7A.27, 34 COM 7A.28, 35 COM 7A.31 and 36 COM 7A.32** adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006), 31st (Christchurch, 2007), 32nd (Quebec City, 2008), 33rd (Seville, 2009), 34th (Brasilia, 2010), 35th (UNESCO, 2011) and 36th (Saint-Petersburg, 2012) sessions respectively,*
3. *Acknowledges the information provided by the state of conservation reports of 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 and the results of the missions of the UNESCO Venice Office (BRESCE) to the property;*
4. *Reiterates its request, in cooperation with UNESCO, the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and the Institutions of Kosovo, as well as future European arrangements, to continue to take long-term corrective measures, including: ensuring adequate long-term legislative, regulatory protection and management of the property and strong protective regimes for the monuments and the buffer zones, adequately delineated boundaries and the timely implementation of the Management Plan;*
5. *Also reiterates its requests, in cooperation with UNMIK, to continue efforts in completing the short-term and long-term corrective measures to achieve the Desired state of conservation defined for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger;*
6. *Requests the submission, in cooperation with UNMIK, to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, of an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;*
7. ***Decides to retain the Medieval Monuments in Kosovo on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to continue applying the Reinforced monitoring mechanism until the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2014.***

32. Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Serbia) (C 724 bis)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

2004, extension 2006

Criteria

(ii) (iii) (iv)

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

2006 to present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Lack of legal status of the property;
- b) Lack of legislative protection of buffer zones;
- c) Lack of implementation of the Management Plan and of active management;
- d) Difficulties to monitor the property due to political instability, post-conflict situation (visits under the Kosovo Stabilisation Force / United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (KFOR / UNMIK) escort and lack of guards and security);
- e) Unsatisfactory state of conservation and maintenance of the property.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Full and permanent protection of the property in a secure and stable political environment;
- b) Agreed medium-term plan for the restoration of wall paintings (including preventive conservation regime) and conservation and rehabilitation of the property;
- c) Implementation of the Management Plan, and full establishment of buffer zones and boundaries including their legal protection.

Corrective measures identified

Urgent / short-term corrective measures:

- a) Put in place appropriate guarding and security arrangements for the Church of the Virgin of Ljevisa;
- b) Prepare a conservation status report including a condition survey for the wall paintings and the status of the conservation works and take temporary measures where there is an urgent need (for example the lead roof of the west bay of the nave of the Church of Virgin of Ljevisa, that was partly removed);
- c) Prepare a risk preparedness study, in conformity with Paragraph 118 of the Operational Guidelines and Decisions **28 COM 10B.4** and **30 COM 7.2**.

Long-term corrective measures:

- d) Ensure the adequate long-term administrative, regulatory protection and management of the property, in conformity with Paragraph 97 of the Operational Guidelines;
- e) Put in place strong protective regimes for the buffer zones;
- f) Adequately delineate the boundaries (e.g. extend the boundaries of the Patriarchate of Pec to include more of its riverside-valley settings);
- g) Prepare detailed state of conservation reports as a basis for adapted monitoring, preventative conservation measures, and specific conservation projects to reverse decline;
- h) Ensure appropriate and timely implementation of the Management Plan.

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

- a) Urgent / short-term corrective measures to be taken by the State Party, in cooperation with UNESCO programmes, UNMIK and Provisional Institutions of Self Government in Kosovo*;
- b) Regarding the long-term corrective measures to be taken by the State Party, in co-operation with UNESCO programmes, UNMIK and Provisional Institutions of Self Government in Kosovo no specific timeframe can be given at this stage due to the political situation.

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/724>

International Assistance

N/A

* References to Kosovo shall be understood to be in the context of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999)

UNESCO Extra-budgetary funds

Total amount provided to the property: USD 2,798,348 following the Donors Conference for the Protection and Preservation of Cultural Heritage in Kosovo, May 2005; USD 596,330, by the Italian Government, USD 76,335 by the Czech Government, USD 132,833 by the Greek Government, USD 2,000,000 by the Government of the Russian Federation and USD 45,000 by the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria.

Previous monitoring missions

January 2007: UNESCO intersectoral mission to Kosovo; July 2008: UNESCO Venice Office (BRESCE) mission; January 2009: UNESCO BRESCE mission; August 2009 and July 2010: UNESCO BRESCE mission.

Main threats identified in previous reports

See above

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/724>

Current conservation issues

Note: *The Secretariat was informed by the Legal Advisor that “The UNESCO Secretariat follows the practice of the United Nations, which considers that the Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999) continues to be applicable to the territory of Kosovo until a final settlement is achieved”.*

Reports on the state of conservation of the property, providing information on conservation and restoration works in the four parts of the serial World Heritage property, were submitted by the Permanent Delegation of Serbia to UNESCO on 30 January 2009, 3 February 2010, 31 January 2011 and 30 January 2012. Additional information on specific issues related to the state of conservation has been submitted by letters or electronic communications.

a) *State of conservation*

Since the decision of the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee (Quebec City, 2008) which debated on the state of conservation of the property and recalled that long-term protective measures should continue to be applied, the state of conservation is as follows:

As a follow up to the International Donors Conference (May 2005) and the 2007 Intersectoral mission, and further to the request of the Director-General of UNESCO, the UNESCO Venice Office (BRESCE), in cooperation with the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), organized an expert mission, from 19 to 22 January 2009. The mission visited all four components of the World Heritage property and updated the information about the situation of the property as follows:

- *Gracanica Monastery:* The mission noted changes since the previous mission at the monuments including certain construction activities in the compound of the Monastery. The technical experts noted some damages on the frescoes. In the mission's view, the restoration of the frescoes of the monastery may be proposed for financing through the contribution which the Russian Federation had announced to the Director-General of UNESCO (*the Russian Funds-in-Trust project is currently being implemented*). During a subsequent visit to *Gracanica* by UNESCO BRESCE mission in August 2009, no changes were noted since the January 2009 mission;
- *Decani Monastery:* The mission observed that special attention should be paid to the proposal of the Monastery authorities related to the re-construction of the dormitory-

lodge that was burned down in 1946, as the plan proposed was not cleared by the Institute for Protection of Monuments from Belgrade;

- *Pec Patriarchate*: The mission noted that the facade of the three churches was recently repainted in dark red colour. No information on this development was received by the World Heritage Centre in compliance with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*;
- *Church of the Holy Virgin of Ljevisa, Prizren*: No changes had been noted since the mission in July 2008. Although the keys of the restored monument were supposed to be handed over to the Church representatives, this had not happened. UNESCO has organized activities related to the restoration of the wall paintings. The project should also include restoration of some external elements. Further works on the wall paintings could not be initiated before ensuring the appropriate architectural works and that no frescoes would be endangered by atmospheric influences.

The January 2009 mission concluded that the monitoring of the World Heritage property in Kosovo had to be reinforced and that more frequent reporting could be undertaken as an intermediate solution. In April 2009, the Director-General decided to activate the Reinforced monitoring mechanism after having carefully considered the specific circumstances of this property.

A number of the outstanding issues identified by the mission have been addressed since 2009.

- *Gracanica Monastery*: Urgent interventions have been completed on the frescoes with the worst degradations in the Holy Annunciation Church. Two types of urgent interventions measures have been proposed in order to preserve the property. The first one, funded by the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments, concerns the replacement of 12 sq.m. of the damaged lead roof in 2011 and reparation of damaged areas, while the other one concerns conservation works on the frescos, including measuring dampness of the walls in the Southern parekklesion and preventive measures for the unstable fresco areas and other areas at risk. The latter measures will continue to be applied.
- *Decani Monastery*: Protective archaeological investigations have taken place in view of the reconstruction of the dormitory-lodge in the Monastery yard, in compliance with the project which was approved by the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments of Serbia and the Culture Commission for Cultural Goods of Outstanding Value. These investigations were fully completed in 2010. In 2011, the reconstruction works on the dormitory-lodge continued and the first phase of rough construction was completed by December 2011. On 10 April 2012 the Permanent Delegation of Serbia to UNESCO reported to the World Heritage Centre that graffiti in red had appeared on the wall on 31 March 2012, followed by new black graffiti a few days later, on 2 April 2012. In a letter of 13 April 2012, the World Heritage Centre requested UNMIK to undertake the necessary investigations, provide further details and liaise with the respective authorities to increase security. In a letter of 19 April UNMIK provided information that it maintains contacts with all agencies engaged in providing security around the components of the property. It has therefore contacted the Kosovo Stabilisation Force (KFOR) which, as a consequence, increased patrolling and general visibility around Decani. Further to the request of the World Heritage Centre for details concerning a planned construction of a road close to Decani, UNMIK responded that, to its

knowledge, this local initiative does not have any funding, due to the lack of sustainability.

- *Patriarchate of Pec*: Approvals for new gates and a farmhouse in the Patriarchate of Pec have been issued in 2010. Conservation and restoration works were undertaken on the frescoes of the Virgin Mary Odigitria Church. In 2011, exploratory works and experimental cleaning were done on the frescoes of St Demetrios Church, and the wall dampness was measured (up to 30 cm in depth) showing that the conditions were currently stable. During a meeting with the World Heritage Centre in August 2011 and a letter of 31 August 2011, the Permanent Delegation of Serbia to UNESCO provided information about works concerning a pumping station and a water pool in the immediate vicinity. Further to the request of the World Heritage Centre, UNMIK conducted research and consultations with the local authorities, the Serbian Orthodox Church, the contracted company and the Institute for the Protection of Monuments in Belgrade. It provided information that the pumping station is located outside the buffer zone of the World Heritage property and that the “reservoir does not appear to be visible from the Patriarchate”. Further to the report submitted by the Permanent Delegation of Serbia to UNESCO on 30 January 2012, according to an expert opinion of the Institute for the Development of Water Resources, “the position of the Patriarchate [...] and the inclination of the terrain are such that if, for any reason, water was to flow out of these structures, it would not go towards the Patriarchate [...]”.

- *Holy Virgin of Ljevisa Church in Prizren*: Further to an incident concerning the theft of 20 sq.m. of the roof of the *Church of the Virgin of Ljevisa* which was reported to the World Heritage Centre in April 2011, the damages were inspected by the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments. Due to several months of soaking, the mortar layer in the interior of the church had deteriorated and caused considerable fissures and cracks around the frescoes and it was possible that further detachment of the painted layer, as well as flaking and bubbling would occur in the future. Urgent interventions, identified as necessary by the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments, were undertaken to repair the roof, including change of mortar and placing hydro-isolation as in other sections of the vault. The replacement of the roof was funded by the UNESCO Venice Office, and the works were completed in August 2011. A first phase of conservation and restoration works was carried out in 2011 for 30 sq.m. of the frescoes, further to a UNESCO tender. On 10 April 2012, the Permanent Delegation of Serbia to UNESCO provided information that an explosive device had been found in the church yard and that the Kosovo police had been notified immediately. The device, a signal flare according to information received by UNMIK, was promptly removed by the Kosovo Police together with KFOR. In its letter of 13 April 2012, the World Heritage Centre requested UNMIK to ensure that all respective authorities take the necessary measures to provide the highest level of security to the property, particularly drawing attention to the second phase of restoration works which international experts were scheduled to commence in the end of April 2012. UNMIK's reply of 19 April 2012 informs that the security responsibility for Ljevisa has been transferred to the Kosovo police, which maintains a fixed checkpoint. In addition, KFOR continues to patrol and to provide overall security. UNMIK has also informed the local authorities and EULEX, which monitors and advises Kosovo Police.

b) International cooperation

Since 2009, the respective Assistant Director-Generals for Culture and other officials have met with the staff concerned with Kosovo at the European Commission Offices in Brussels (EC – DG Enlargement) on different occasions, as well as with different officials of the European Union, including the Head of the Liaison Office in Pristina, and with the Special

Representative of the Secretary General and Head of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) to discuss issues related to the safeguarding of the four components of the World Heritage property. In March 2010, the Assistant Director-General for Culture met high representatives of the Serbian Orthodox Church to discuss the protection of the monasteries.

The World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Venice Office are in permanent contact with UNMIK, and all concerned stakeholders, concerning all issues related to the property, including state of conservation and security issues.

c) Handover of security responsibility

The World Heritage Centre was informed in 2010 that the so-called “unfixing” process, which represents in substance the handover of security responsibility for “Properties with Designated Special Status” from the NATO-led Kosovo Force (KFOR) to Kosovo police, started in August 2010 on the basis of a decision of the North Atlantic Council of July 2010. The process is being implemented through a mechanism of regular consultations with the key stakeholders. Further to information provided by UNMIK to the World Heritage Centre, the transfer of guarding responsibilities from KFOR to Kosovo police had been completed with respect to *Gracanica*, before end of January 2011. Kosovo Police also ensures the security for *the Virgin of Ljevisa Church*, while KFOR ensures the security for the *Patriarchate of Pec* and *Decani*.

d) Conservation and Restoration projects

The implementation of the USD 2,000,000 UNESCO/Russian Federation Funds-in-Trust (FiT) project on “Safeguarding of World Heritage Sites in Kosovo” started in 2011, with UNESCO as implementing agency. The main objective of the project is to contribute to the restoration of the monuments and to strengthen the local capacities in this field. After completion of the tender process and the preparatory works of the contracted companies, effective conservation and restoration works are scheduled in all four components of the World Heritage property, in accordance with the identified needs, as from Spring 2012.

Furthermore, UNESCO, with the contributions of Greece, the Czech Republic, Italy and the Russian Federation, continues the works on the restoration of the wall paintings of the *Holy Virgin of Ljevisa Church* in Prizren.

Altogether, since the Donor conference in 2005, conservation and restoration projects amounting to USD 2,798,348 have been implemented, or are in the process of implementation, by UNESCO as implementing agency in all four components of the property. Donor countries include Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Italy and the Russian Federation.

Draft Decision: 36 COM 7A.32

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-12/36.COM/7A.Add,*
2. *Recalling Decisions **30 COM 8B.54, 31 COM 7A.28, 32 COM 7A.27, 33 COM 7A.27, 34 COM 7A.28** and **35 COM 7A.31** adopted at its 30th (Vilnius, 2006), 31st (Christchurch, 2007), 32nd (Quebec City, 2008), 33rd (Seville, 2009), 34th (Brasilia, 2010) and 35th (UNESCO, 2011) sessions respectively,*

3. Acknowledges the information provided by the state of conservation reports of 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 and the results of the mission of the UNESCO Venice Office (BRESCE) to the property in 2009;
4. Reiterates its request, in cooperation with UNESCO, the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and the Institutions of Kosovo, as well as future European arrangements, to continue to take long-term corrective measures, including: ensuring adequate long-term legislative, regulatory protection and management of the property and strong protective regimes for the monuments and the buffer zones, adequately delineated boundaries and the timely implementation of the Management Plan;
5. Also reiterates its requests, in cooperation with UNMIK, to continue efforts in completing the short-term and long-term corrective measures to achieve the Desired state of conservation defined for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger;
6. Requests the submission, in cooperation with UNMIK, to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2013**, of an updated report on the state of conservation of the property, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 37th session in 2013;
7. **Decides to retain the Medieval Monuments in Kosovo on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to continue applying the Reinforced monitoring mechanism until the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2013.**

35. Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (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

2012

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

The proposed development of Liverpool Waters

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

In progress

Corrective measures identified

In progress

Timeframe for the implementation of corrective measures

In progress

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1150/documents/>

International Assistance

N/A

UNESCO extra-budgetary funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

October 2006: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission;

November 2011: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Lack of overall management of new developments;
- b) Lack of analysis and description of the townscape characteristics relevant to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and important views related to the property and its buffer zone;
- c) Lack of clearly established maximum heights for new developments, for the backdrops of the World Heritage areas as well as along the waterfront;
- 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

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1150/gallery/>

and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

On 30 January 2013, the State Party submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property responding to the Decision **36 COM 7B.93** made by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012). On 27 March 2013, updated information on the decision of the Secretary of State was submitted by the State Party.

Proposed development of Liverpool Waters

It should be recalled that Liverpool Waters is a major, large scale development project that is planned to be implemented over a 30-year period in an area of 60 ha covering part of the inscribed property as well as part of its buffer zone. It stretches 2 km along the waterfront from Princes Dock up to Bramley Moore Dock and includes proposals for a cluster of tall buildings within the buffer zone.

In its report, the State Party recalled that the Liverpool City Council granted consent for the Liverpool Waters scheme, and indicated that this decision was referred to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government as a result of English Heritage's objection to the scheme and because of the scale of the proposed development. The State Party also reported that the developer had informed that, in the event that the current proposal is not approved, it may decide to abandon attempts to regenerate the area and continue with current uses that do not require planning consent.

The State Party reported that the application was referred to the Secretary of State in October 2012. At the time of the submission of the State Party's State of Conservation Report, no decision had yet been taken by the Secretary of State. On 27 March 2013, however, the State Party submitted additional information, reporting that the Secretary of State, on 4 March 2013, decided not to call in the case. With the decision not to intervene, there are no further legal obstacles to moving forward with the Liverpool Waters scheme. The Liverpool City Council may now confirm its consent for the development scheme and the developer could then proceed with implementation.

In its Decision **36 COM 7B.93**, the Committee took note of the report of the joint reactive monitoring mission which had concluded that, in terms of visual perception, the redevelopment scheme would fragment and isolate the different dock areas, instead of integrating them into one continuous historic urban landscape. The mission therefore concluded that, if the proposed Liverpool Waters scheme as outlined were to be implemented, the World Heritage property would be irreversibly damaged due to a serious deterioration of its architectural and town-planning coherence, a serious loss of historical authenticity, and an important loss of cultural significance. It also noted that the proposed development in the buffer zone would result in the modification of the functional hierarchy

and morphology expressed by the port circulation system (river – sluices – dock – water basins), as well as by the historical typologies of the port industrial structures and services, thus affecting the conditions of authenticity.

Conclusion

Noting the decision of the Secretary of State not to review the Liverpool Waters scheme at the national level, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recognize that there remains no legal obstacle to moving forward with the development project. They reiterate the findings of the joint reactive monitoring mission of November 2011, as expressed in the opinion of the World Heritage Committee in Decision **36 COM 7B.93**, that the proposed development of Liverpool Waters constitutes a potential threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. They also note that there have been no actions to remove the potential danger as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session. They consider that if the proposed Liverpool Waters development is implemented as currently planned, it would irreversibly damage the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value and the conditions of integrity that warranted inscription, and could lead to the potential deletion of the property from the World Heritage List.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies further draw attention to the fact that the State Party has submitted neither a Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOC), nor a proposal for corrective measures to reach that DSOC, as requested by the World Heritage Committee. In the supplementary information submitted on 27 March 2013, however, the State Party has expressed its willingness to work with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to elaborate a DSOC and corrective measures with a time frame for their implementation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. In April 2013, consultations have been taken up by the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies accordingly. Taking into account the continued threat to the property, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision: **37 COM 7A.35**

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.93**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Also recalling the results of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission of November 2011,*
4. *Notes the information provided by the State Party that the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government decided not to call in the Liverpool Waters development for consideration at the national level, and that the Liverpool City Council had granted consent to the application submitted by the developer;*
5. *Reiterates its serious concern at the potential threat of the proposed Liverpool Waters development on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and also notes that the implementation of the development, as currently planned, would irreversibly damage the attributes and conditions of integrity that warranted inscription, and could lead to the potential deletion of the property from the World Heritage List;*

6. *Therefore, strongly urges the State Party to reconsider the proposed development to ensure the continued coherence of the architectural and town-planning attributes, and the continued safeguarding of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property including the conditions of authenticity and integrity;*
7. *Further notes that the State Party has not yet developed a proposal for the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and a set of corrective measures and requests the State Party to pursue its consultations with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to elaborate a Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger along with a set of corrective measures, and a time frame for their implementation;*
8. ***Decides to retain Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) on the World Heritage List in Danger;***
9. *Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.*

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

36. Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1980

Criteria

(i) (iv)

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

2012 - Present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Fragile state of the property and accelerated degradation by environmental factors, lack of maintenance and limited conservation planning;
- b) Erosion
- c) Lack of established boundaries and buffer zone;
- d) Absence of a conservation and management plan;
- e) Encroachments and urban pressure;
- f) Tourism pressure (particularly at Portobelo)
- g) Insufficient legislation for the preservation of built heritage and regulations combining the two components of the property

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Adopted, see <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4763>

Corrective measures identified

Adopted, see <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4763>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Adopted, see <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4763>

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/135/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount approved: USD 77,188

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/135/assistance/>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

November 2001: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission; March 2010: joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Illustrative material

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/135> and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Also see World Heritage Papers No. 18: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/series/18>

Current conservation issues

In response to the requests made by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012), the State Party submitted a state of conservation report on 31 January 2013. The report provides information on the general state of conservation of the

property and general actions to be implemented, as well as annexes on the work carried out to date at the Santiago Fort in Portobelo and the soil analysis undertaken. No precise data according to the request for reporting is included on the progress made on implementation of the corrective measures that were adopted when the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

On 14 March 2013, the State Party made a presentation on the joint Management Plan for two World Heritage properties in Panama: The Fortifications on the Caribbean side of Panama, Portobelo and San Lorenzo in conjunction with the Archaeological Site of Panama Viejo and Historic District. From the presentation, this would ensure consistency in decision-making and promote larger synergies; however no detailed information has been provided to ascertain the efficacy and adequacy of the proposal.

a) The lack of an Emergency Plan

The State Party report includes synthetic information on the current conditions at the property that resulted from the monitoring carried out. It identifies causes and effects of deterioration, including an assessment of the risks and threats, as well as a list of potential solutions.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that this baseline information could be used to develop the Emergency Plan for the property, as requested by the World Heritage Committee according to the Desired state of conservation and in full coherence with the related corrective measures adopted. The provided assessment of risks and threats and the proposed solutions need to be supported with supplementary information, not provided by the State Party at this stage, such as an assessment of the rate and extent of decay and an assessment of structural and mechanical risks, in order to prioritise interventions within the framework of the Emergency Plan. In addition, this should be articulated in full coherence with the recommendations of the 2010 reactive monitoring mission. Once this is done, a timeframe, phases for implementation and costs would need to be identified as a matter of urgency.

b) Interventions carried out

The State Party reports on the works implemented at the property. These included the railings to secure access and functionality to the fortifications, and the installation of new signage with updated information. The State Party also reports on studies conducted for the implementation of the protection system to prevent mudslides and landslides.

The report includes an annex on the results of the soil investigation which was carried out to determine existing subsoil conditions in the area of landslides. The information provided should be useful for the definition of adequate strategies to prevent further mud and landslides and erosion of slopes that could potentially affect the attributes of the property. In the case of the Santiago Fort, interventions have centred on maintenance works (i.e. general cleaning of debris and trash, vegetation control), on the removal of rocks and boulders from the entrance of the fort, the placement of new soil on entrance, the placement of gravel paths at the entrance and the installation of new signage. The interventions did not involve structural work or repair of the masonry elements.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that, although the interventions improved the conditions of access to the Santiago Fort in Portobelo, substantial efforts are still needed to address the poor state of conservation of most of the built heritage at the property, and that interventions need to be centred on areas potentially at risk of collapsing. During a meeting on 14 March 2013 between the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, the State Party has mentioned studies carried out for the construction of a retaining wall to prevent collapsing and landslides at the Santiago Fort in Portobelo, but further detailed technical information needs to be provided for evaluation on this particular issue prior to any intervention in the area.

c) *Issues not addressed*

Apart from the above-mentioned elements that could constitute a base for an Emergency Plan, the report contains no specific information on the response to the requests made by the Committee within the framework of the Desired State of Conservation. The lack of legal instruments and of a clear budget is particularly worrying.

The related corrective measures expected to be implemented immediately have not been addressed as desired by the Committee. As mentioned previously, a risk assessment has been partially completed and operational management arrangements have been carried out. However, the State Party has provided no information on budgets nor on encroachments and urban pressure control. Moreover, the information provided on the Technical Office in Portobelo does not clarify the role of the institutions in the decision-making for conservation process.

d) *Management system*

The State Party has submitted a joint Management Plan for two World Heritage properties in Panama. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that the joint management system for the two properties needs to clarify the decision-making process for each of the properties in order to respect the specific character, the adequate conservation response according to the state of decay and the related emergencies detected and the way in which each of the properties is properly monitored.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies take note of the efforts made for setting up a coordinated national management system for World Heritage. However, they note the limited progress made by the State Party in the implementation of the Desired state of conservation and of the corrective measures of this property. They recommend that the World Heritage Committee express its concern that a comprehensive Emergency Plan has not yet been developed to identify a clear course of action to address the poor state of conservation of the property.

In addition, they note that no clear information was included on the decision-making process for the properties, nor on the role of the Technical Office in Portobelo in preparing the Emergency Plan. The institutional, legal and financial instruments to address the conservation and management of the property need to be clarified and put into force as a matter of urgency.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.36

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7B.102**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Takes note of the information provided by the State Party on the conditions at the property and the actions implemented and regrets that the report did not specifically relate information to the adopted corrective measures;*
4. *Expresses its serious concern for the limited progress that has been achieved in the execution of the corrective measures and urges the State Party to implement them within the approved timeframe, with particular attention to:*

- a) *Formulation of a budgeted Emergency Plan that includes the identification of priority interventions for stabilization, conservation and protection with timeframes and priority interventions for implementation,*
 - b) *Ensuring that operational conservation arrangements are in place and that budgets have been secured for the implementation of the Emergency Plan,*
 - c) *Identification of measures to address encroachments and urban pressure;*
5. *Requests the State Party to submit comprehensive technical and graphic information on the planned construction of a retaining wall at the Santiago de la Gloria fort in Portobelo by **30 October 2013**, and to halt the interventions until the evaluation of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies is submitted to the State Party;*
 6. *Also requests the State Party to submit clear information on the role of the Patronato de Portobelo for the conservation of the property within the framework of a collective Management Plan for this property and the Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá;*
 7. *Further requests the State Party to invite an advisory mission to support the State Party in providing guidelines to finalize the diagnosis and to prepare a comprehensive conservation Emergency Plan **as soon as possible**,*
 8. *Requests moreover the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;*
 9. ***Decides to retain Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) on the List of World Heritage in Danger.***

37. Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works (Chile) (C 1178)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (supplementary information required)

38. Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) (C 366)

Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1986

Criteria

(i) (iii)

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

1986 - Present

Threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger

- a) Fragile state of conservation of earthen structures and decorated surfaces due to extreme climatic conditions (El Niño phenomena) and other environmental factors;
- b) Inadequate management system in place;
- c) Insufficient capacity and resources for the implementation of conservation measures;
- d) Increase in the levels of the phreatic water table.

Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger

Adopted, See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4647>

Corrective measures identified

Adopted, See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4647>

Timeframe for the implementation of the corrective measures

Adopted, See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/4647>

Previous Committee Decisions

See page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/366/documents/>

International Assistance

Total amount granted: USD 118,700

For details, see page <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/366/assistance>

UNESCO Extra-budgetary Funds

N/A

Previous monitoring missions

1997: ICOMOS mission; February 2007: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS and ICCROM mission; November 2010: Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission.

Factors affecting the property identified in previous reports

- a) Continuous deterioration of earthen architecture structures and decorated surfaces from lack of conservation and maintenance practices;
- b) Illegal occupation of the property;
- c) Unregulated farming activities;
- d) Rising water table levels;
- e) Delay in implementing protective measures (legislation and regulations already passed by the National Authorities).

Illustrative material

See pages <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/366>

and <http://whc.unesco.org/en/soc>

Current conservation issues

The State Party submitted, as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012), a report on the state of conservation of the property on 31 January 2013, and three annexes containing a record of photographs and plans, the analysis of the current state of the Site Museum and a record of the main activities planned and developed in 2012. The report provides information on the progress made on the adopted Desired state of conservation and the related corrective measures.

a) *Management system*

Since 2006, Public Investment Projects have been carried out at the property in accordance with the provisions set forth in the conservation and management plan. The Special Project for the Chan Chan Archaeological Complex has been incorporated into the Ministry of Culture and its institutional structure has been modified, though no further details are given on those institutional changes.

The report includes a table showing the overview of projects with their assigned and modified budget for the biennium 2012-2013. After prioritizing activities around research and restoration, the allocated budget for the implementation of the Master Plan in 2012 was reduced by 10.5%. A budget of 7,034,030 soles (i.e. an increase of 38% since 2012) has been allocated for 2013.

b) Approval of Management Plan and integration with other planning tools

Throughout 2012, meetings have been held with local and regional authorities regarding disaster risk management and the management of the buffer zone. As for the latter, work has continued with the Provincial Municipality of Trujillo for the definition of a final proposal for the regulations of the buffer zone, which is pending approval. No additional information is provided on the type of regulations, the expected timeframe for the completion of the update of the Master Plan, which, along with the Risk and Contingency Management Plan and the Public Use Plan, had to be rescheduled for 2013 given the lack of available budgets.

c) Implementation of conservation and maintenance measures

The State Party reports on several projects that were implemented throughout 2012 which include archaeological research, conservation of perimeter walls, implementation and maintenance of physical delineation of the property (vegetation barriers and perimeter walls) and maintenance activities of the architecture, the existing drainage systems and protective shelters. Work carried out corresponds to priorities identified through condition assessments and preventive measures in response to potential impacts derived from El Niño phenomenon. These priorities are set out in the "Guidelines for an Integral Plan for Risk Prevention in the Chan Chan Archaeological Complex". In addition, monitoring of decorated surfaces that were covered with fibreglass replicas was carried out at the beginning of 2012. Preliminary results indicate that the measure is effective in protecting original surfaces. Still, there is no mention of the monitoring system in place for a systematic monitoring strategy.

The State Party recalls the principle of minimum intervention for a better handling of surfaces. No additional information is provided in this respect so as to ascertain whether it might constitute a feasible conservation alternative for the extensive decorated surfaces at the site. Monitoring of the state of conservation of the property has continued, including the monitoring of water table levels through the 33 control wells and the maintenance of the drains built to address the potential threat of increased water table levels. The State Party also reports on the guidelines for conservation interventions, which are consistent with standards set at the international level. No data is provided however on whether these have been formally adopted. The State Party further reports on the continuous maintenance of physical delineation of the property, including punctual restorations of the vegetation barriers, though no explicit information is provided on the maintenance of the perimeter walls.

In regard to the site museum, it is noted that the assessment has been carried out. A project proposal for the Improvement and Extension of the Public Tourist Service in the Site Museum at Chan Chan is being developed in cooperation with the National Copesco Plan. It is expected the project will be included in the Public Use Plan for the property, although no indication is provided on the timeframe for implementation.

As for solid waste management, two days of cleaning were undertaken and areas along access roads and the northeast sector were cleared. Although these actions are significant, there still needs to be a sustained programme to ensure the frequent cleaning of waste, but most importantly to ensure that people living in adjacent areas do not continue this practice.

d) Legislative and regulatory measures to address illegal occupations

As in past years, the State Party reports that technical and legal actions have continued to ensure the permanent monitoring of the protected archaeological zone and prevent unauthorized agricultural activities or illegal occupation for housing, including police surveillance and legal prosecutions. Surveillance has also been carried out to monitor the transit of vehicles on unauthorized roadways and the disposal of solid waste. As for the

finalization of regulations for Law 28261, Supreme Resolution 019-2012-MC amended the conformation of the Multisectorial Commission that was created for the comprehensive recovery of the Chan Chan Archaeological Complex. Ministerial Resolution 386-2012-MC appointed the Regional Director of Culture of La Libertad, as representative before the Commission and appointed a technical secretary. Other agencies that make up the aforementioned Commission are accrediting their respective representatives. No additional information is provided on the timeframe for achieving the corrective measure, and no explicit description of the decision-making process is provided.

e) *Other issues*

The State Party also reports on the dissemination, awareness raising and capacity building activities. These continue to be part of the programme for social awareness and educational institutions that has been consistently implemented in past years. It would be important to evaluate the impact the sustained carrying out of these activities has had in terms of increased protection and conservation of the property.

As for the securing of long-term funding, as mentioned above, the Government remains the main source of financing at the moment. Nevertheless, the State Party reports on an international intervention, as a result of a partnership with the Italian public institution, Istituto per le Tecnologie Applicate ai Beni Culturali del Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, as well as an intersectorial agreement between national and local authorities concerning the improvement of the tourist infrastructure, under the responsibility of the Provincial Municipality of Trujillo. The execution of the latter is still pending and no further details are provided on it.

Concerning the finalization of the definition of the buffer zone and its regulatory measures, the State Party reports that the work process is continuing, in collaboration with local authorities. The participation of an urban specialist architect in the process is planned for 2013.

Conclusion

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies note the sustained efforts of the State Party in implementing the corrective measures so as to achieve the Desired state of conservation adopted for the property. They consider that significant progress has been made in addressing the state of conservation of the built heritage and the decorated surfaces. However, the updating of the management plan and the adoption of regulatory measures, pending over the last eight years, will continue to be crucial issues in ensuring the long term conservation and protection of the property and for considering the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, where it was inscribed in 1986.

Draft Decision: 37 COM 7A.38

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Having examined Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A,*
2. *Recalling Decision **36 COM 7A.34**, adopted at its 36th session (Saint-Petersburg, 2012),*
3. *Notes the progress made by the State Party in the implementation of the adopted corrective measures and urges to continue its sustained efforts so as to meet the Desired state of conservation within the expected timeframe;*

4. Requests the State Party to submit a report on the conservation strategy for decorated surfaces and its related monitoring strategy;
5. Urges the State Party to approve and enforce the required legislation and regulations for each archaeological component of the property as well as the buffer zone to ensure their adequate protection, including the submission of legal texts and the related strategy for their implementation;
6. Reiterates its request to the State Party to update the Master Plan, including a public use plan and a comprehensive risk preparedness plan for the property by **1 February 2014**;
7. Takes note of the documents “Guidelines for an Integral Plan for Risk Prevention”, “Plan for the Conservation of the Chan Chan Archaeological Complex in View of the El Niño Phenomenon” and “Guidelines for a comprehensive Plan for Risk Prevention in the Chan Chan Archaeological Complex”, and requests the submission, by **30 November 2013**, of respective printed copies to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for evaluation;
8. Also requests that the State Party submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2014**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014;
9. Decides to retain **Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) on the List of World Heritage in Danger**.

39. Coro and its Port (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (C 658)

See Document WHC-13/37.COM/7A.Add (late receipt of the State Party report on the state of conservation of the property)