

II.1 Introduction

(See Section 1 of the current Nomination Form and Section 1, 2 and 3 of the original Nomination Forms)

1a) *State Party:*
USA

1b) *Name of World Heritage property:*
Chaco Culture National Historic Park

1c) *Please provide geographical coordinates for the site to the nearest second. (In the case of large sites, please give three sets of geographical coordinates.)*

Geographical coordinate:

UTM center points for each unit in the property administered by Chaco Culture National Historical Park:

	Zone	Easting	Northing	
Main Unit	13	232425	3995108	Acres - 32,428 (13124 ha)
Kin Bineola:	12	757626	3986836	Acres - 1,126 (456 ha)
Kin Ya'a	12	761364	3951604	Acres - 260 (105 ha)
Pueblo Pintado:	13	258847	3984446	Acres - 160 (65)

UTM center point for Aztec Ruins National Monument:

12 767249 4080614 Acres - 27 (11 ha)

(within the boundaries at the time of 1987 World Heritage listing. 257ac/104 ha total now managed by NPS within the 1988 legislated boundaries of 318ac/129 ha.)

UTM center points for five Chaco Protection Sites managed by Bureau of Land Management:

Casamero	12	767365	3917555	Acres - 160 (65 ha)
Kin Nizhoni	13	247610	3917555	Acres - 640 (259 ha)
Pierre's Site	13	235190	4015048	Acres - 400 162 ha)
Twin Angels	13	326636	4052225	Acres - 40 (16 ha)
Halfway House	13	236385	4030857	Acres: 40 (16 ha)

1d) *Give date of inscription on the World Heritage List.*

date (dd/mm/yyyy): 08/12/1987

1e) *Give date of subsequent extension(s), if any.*

1f) *List organization(s) responsible for the preparation of this site report.*

Organization #1

Organization Name: National Park Service, Chaco Culture National
Historical Park
Last Name: Dubois
First Name: Stephanie
Title: Superintendent
Address: P.O. Box 220
City: Nageezi
State/Prov: New Mexico
Postal Code: 87037
Telephone: 505 786-7014 extension 230
Fax: 505 786-7061
Email: stephanie_dubois@nps.gov

Organization #2

Organization Name: National Park Service, Aztec Ruins National
Monument
Last Name: Carruth
First Name: Dennis
Title: Superintendent
Address: #84 CR2900
City: Aztec
State/Prov: New Mexico
Postal Code: 87410
Telephone: 505 334-6174 extension 22
Fax: 505 334-6372
Email: dennis_carruth@nps.gov

Organization #3

Organization Name: Bureau of Land Management, Farmington Field Office
Last Name: Henke
First Name: Steve
Title: Field Manager
Address: 1235 La Plata Highway
City: Farmington
State/Prov: New Mexico
Postal Code: 87401
Telephone: 505 599-8900
Fax: 505 599-8998
Email: steve_henke@blm.gov

II.2 Statement of Significance (see Section 2 of the current Nomination Form and Section 5 of the original Form)

2a) *When a State Party nominates a property for inscription on the World Heritage List, it describes the heritage values of the property which it believes justifies the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List. Please summarize the justification for inscription as it appears in the original nomination of the property.*

The initial (1984) and amended (1986) justification for inscription focused on the understanding that Chaco was a center of a complex prehistoric culture that administered a socioeconomic and religious network of widespread outlying communities. This centralization and complexity has not been identified anywhere else in this region of the United States either during this time period or in similar environments. The complexity and extent of these community organizations are characteristics unique to Chaco and distinctly separate it from the Mesa Verde region.

The State Party intends to propose a change in the name of the property given in the original nomination. When amended in 1986, the property included important components of the property that include more comprehensive features of this remarkable cultural era. To further express this expanded view of the Chaco prehistory, and to eliminate some confusion over the present name, the State Party will propose the following name modification: "CHACO CULTURE WORLD HERITAGE SITE"

2b) *At the time of initial inscription of a property on the World Heritage List, the World Heritage Committee indicates the property's outstanding universal value(s) (or World Heritage value(s)) by agreeing on the criteria for which the property deserves to be included on the World Heritage List. Please consult the report of the World Heritage Committee meeting when the property was listed and indicate the criteria for which the Committee inscribed the property on the World Heritage List. (Choose one or more boxes.)*

Cultural Criteria

- i
- ii
- iii
- iv
- v
- vi

Natural Criteria

- i
- ii
- iii
- iv

2c) *At the time of initial inscription, did the World Heritage Committee agree upon a Statement of Significance for the WHS? (Consult the report or minutes of the World Heritage Committee meeting when the property was listed.*

NO

2c1) *If YES, please cite it here.*

2c2) *If NO please propose a Statement of Significance for the World Heritage Site based on the consideration given the property by the Committee when it inscribed the property on the World Heritage List. (Note: Following the completion of the Periodic Report exercise, the State Party, in consultation with appropriate authorities, will determine whether to proceed with seeking a Committee decision to approve any proposed Statement of Significance. The Committee must approve any proposed Statement of Significance through a separate, formal process. See 7g.)*

Chaco Culture National Historical Park, along with the associated sites at Aztec Ruins National Monument and five Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites (Chaco Protection Sites) under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, have been identified as outstanding examples of a vast pre-Columbian cultural complex that dominated the Four-Corners region of the Southwestern United States from the mid 9th through the early 13th centuries. Massive, multi-story, masonry 'greathouses' positioned within extensive communities and associated with elaborately constructed roadways are remarkably well preserved remnants of intricate social, political, and economic systems. The architectural and engineering accomplishments of these people, known collectively as the Chaco Anasazi, are particularly extraordinary given the relatively harsh environmental setting and resource limitations of the region.

2d) *Since the original inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, has the World Heritage Committee agreed with a proposal by the State Party that the property be recognized for additional World Heritage values and added additional criteria to the inscription as a result of a re-nomination and/or extension of the property?*

NO

2d1) *If YES, please indicate which new criteria were added and the date.
(dd/mm/yyyy)*

II.3 Statement of Authenticity / Integrity
(See Section 2 of the current Nomination Form and Section 4 of the original Form)

3a) *In addition to meeting one or more of the criteria, which justify inscription on the World Heritage List, a natural or cultural property must meet the appropriate conditions of authenticity and/or integrity, as defined in clauses 24b and 44b of the Operational Guidelines for Implementing the World Heritage Convention. If at the time of inscribing the property on the World Heritage list, the State Party and the International Council on Monuments and Sites, ICOMOS and/or the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, IUCN, evaluated the authenticity and integrity of the property, please cite those evaluations here. (Please quote directly from the nomination, Committee minutes and the Advisory Body's evaluation.)*

The state of preservation, as described in the original and amended nomination, attribute the relatively good condition of the resources to the "quality craftsmanship that has survived the elements through the centuries because of its dry and remote location". The park's enabling legislation provides mandated preservation of the cultural resources, most of which remain in their original context. The nomination cautions that there are external threats to important components of the Chaco system, such as encroaching mining and other fossil fuel extraction development, and encourages acquisition and cooperative preservation efforts for those sites not controlled by the Department of the Interior.

At present, the condition of the resources as a whole has not deteriorated significantly, and, due to long-term preventative treatment at many of the major structures (including partial site reburial, fencing, patrolling, etc.), the rates of deterioration have dramatically slowed. However, external threats have increased. In particular, housing developments with associated utilities and roads, in addition to energy exploration, extraction, and transportation, have increased.

3b) *Have there been significant changes in the authenticity or integrity of the property since inscription?*

YES

3b1) *If YES, please describe the changes to the authenticity or integrity and name the main causes.*

The original 1987 World Heritage nomination for the Chaco Culture NHP unit of this property stated that there were 33,974 acres (13,748 ha) included within the boundaries (described in II.1c above as main unit and the three detached units). At the time of nomination, the National Park Service did not have surface title to all acreage within the park boundaries. The nomination only included those acres which were under National Park Service ownership, but stated that acquisition of the entire amount was being pursued. As of the date of this report, the National Park Service has acquired surface title to 32,854 acres (13,295 ha) in this unit of the property. The National Park Service continues to negotiate for acquisition of the remaining 1,120 acres (453 ha).

At the time of inscription in 1987, the Aztec Ruins unit was only 27 acres (11 ha). In 1988 Congress expanded the park boundaries to include a total of 318 acres (129 ha). As of the date of this report the National Park Service has acquired title to 257 (104 ha) of that total acreage and continues to pursue acquisition of interests in the remaining 61 (25 ha) acres. The additional acreage contains many sites and features of universal value that are critical to understanding the significance of the cultural resources within the original 27-acre (11 ha) boundary.

There have been no changes in the acreage included in the 5 units of property managed by the Bureau of Land Management, and the total amount is still 1,280 (518 ha) acres.

In summary, the land area owned by the National Park Service at the site has expanded to include 34,330 acres (13,893). The National Park Service continues to pursue surface ownership to the additional 1,181 acres (478 ha), and when the entire amount within the legislated boundaries of all units is acquired, the National Park Service will own a total of approximately 35,511 acres (14,371 ha). The State Party may propose an extension of the World Heritage Site boundary to incorporate the additional land acquired since inscription.

II.4 Management

(See Section 4 of the current Nomination Form and Section 2 and 4 of the original Form)

Management Regime

4a) *How can the ownership/management of the property best be described? (Select all that apply.)*

- management under protective legislation
- management under contractual agreement(s) between State Party and a third party
- management under traditional protective measures
- other

Please describe.

Chaco Culture is owned by the United States Government on behalf of the American people. The major portions of the property are managed by the National Park Service (NPS), a federal agency. Another portion is managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), a sister federal agency. The national park areas receive the highest level of conservation protection afforded by the federal law of the United States. The BLM portions of the site are managed for the conservation under internal agency regulations.

4b) *Please indicate under which level of authority the property is managed*

National

Please describe

Chaco Culture is managed by the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management, agencies within the US Department of the Interior, a major division of the Executive Branch of the United States Government.

4c) *Please describe the legal status of the property. For example, is it a national, provincial or territorial park? A national or provincial historic site?*

The portion of the property designated as Chaco Culture National Historical Park is managed by congressional authority. The portion of the property designated as Aztec Ruins National Monument is managed by presidential proclamation and congressional authority. Both of the NPS areas have the same level of protection. The portion of the property designated as BLM Chaco Protection Sites are managed by Public Lands legislation and applicable federal regulations.

4d) *Please provide the full name, address and phone/fax/e-mail of the agency(ies) directly responsible for the management of the property.*

Contact #1

Agency Name: National Park Service, Chaco Culture National Historical Park
First Name: Stephanie
Last Name: Dubois
Address: P.O. Box 220
City: Nageezi
State/Prov: New Mexico
Postal Code: 87037
Telephone: 505 786-7014 extension 230
Fax: 505 786-7061
Email: stephanie_dubois@nps.gov

Contact #2

Agency Name: National Park Service, Aztec Ruins National Monument
First Name: Dennis
Last Name: Carruth
Address: #84 CR 2900
City: Farmington
State/Prov: New Mexico
Postal Code: 87410
Telephone: 505 334-6174 extension 22
Fax: 505 334-6372
Email: dennis_carruth@nps.gov

Contact #3

Agency Name: Bureau of Land Management, Farmington Field Office
First Name: Steve
Last Name: Henke
Address: 1235 La Plata Highway
City: Farmington
State/Prov: New Mexico
Postal Code: 87401
Telephone: 505 599-8900
Fax: 505 599-8998
Email: steve_henke@blm.gov

4e) *Please provide a list of key laws and regulations, which govern the protection and management of the cultural and natural resources of the property.*

PL 96-550 – Establishment of Chaco Culture NHP 1980 and designation of the Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites.

Presidential Proclamation 1650 - Establishment of Aztec Ruins NM 1923

PL 104-11 – Chaco Outliers Protection Act of 1995

PL 100-559 – Boundary Expansion of Aztec Ruins NM

PL 59-209 – Antiquities Act of 1906

PL 89-665 – National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended

PL 91-190 - National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

PL 95-341 – American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978
PL 96-95 – Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, as amended
PL 96-515 – World Heritage Convention, 1980
Executive Order 11593 – Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment, 1971
PL 101-601 – Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990
Executive Order 13007 – Indian Sacred Sites, 1996
General Authorities Act of 1976 (withhold disclosure of site locations)
Historic Sites Act of 1935
Management of Museum Properties Act of 1955
Mining in the Parks Act of 1976
National Park Service Act of 1916 ‘Organic Act’
National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and amendments
Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976
Regulations:
36 CFR 18 (National Historic Preservation Act of 1966)
36 CFR 61 (NHPA, “State and Local Government Historic Preservation Programs”)
36 CFR 68 (NHPA, Secretary fo the Interior’s standards for historic preservation)
36 CFR 79 (NHPA and ARPA, Curation of Federally owned collections)
36 CFR 800 (NHPA, Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties)
43 CFR 3 (Antiquities Act, procedures for permitting excavation or collection)
43 CFR 7, Subparts A & B (Archaeological Resources Protection Act, Uniform Regulations)
43 CFR 10 (NAGPRA, rights of affiliated lineal descendants to human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and object of cultural patrimony)

National Park Service Management Policies

4f) Please describe the administrative and management arrangements that are in place for the property concerned, making special mention of the institutions and organizations that have management authority over the property and the arrangements that are in place for any necessary coordination of their actions. Make special reference, if appropriate, to the role of First Nations in managing the property.

The above-mentioned legislative status of this World Heritage property contained within the boundaries of a National Historical Park, National Monument, and BLM Chaco Protection Sites and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern define the administrative and management arrangements. The above-cited laws and regulations guide the overall and day-to-day management of this property. An advisory organization, known as the Interagency Management Group (IMG), was established through PL 96-550 and is composed of members from all federal, state, tribal, and local governments managing Chaco Protection Sites. This group provides advisory oversight through review of management decisions, sharing of technical expertise, and assistance with necessary legislation, to assure consistent and coordinated management of this property.

The Superintendents of Chaco and Aztec manage their respective parks on a day-to-day basis, and they report to a Regional Director, who reports to the National Park Service Director.

The Field Manager of the Farmington Field Office manages the five areas on a day to day basis. He reports to a State Director, who reports to the Bureau of Land Management Director.

4g) *Please also note whether there have been any significant changes in the ownership, legal status, contractual or traditional protective measures, or management regime for the World Heritage Site since the time of inscription.*

As stated above in II 3b 1, the National Park Service units of this property have expanded their boundaries through legislation to protect and preserve closely associated cultural resources. The acreage within the expanded boundaries is in the process of being acquired. Most of the new lands are now under federal surface title, and ownership of the remaining portions is being pursued. At Chaco Culture NHP unit, there are now 32,854 acres (13,295 ha) under federal ownership and the remaining 1,120 acres (453 ha) will be acquired in the near future. At the Aztec Ruins unit there are 257 (104) acres under NPS management and the remaining 61 acres (25 ha) will be acquired in the future. At BLM units, the surface ownership was all federal and no further acquisitions were necessary and the original boundaries have not changed. The Resource Management Plan for the Chaco unit has been updated to reflect current surface ownership and the General Management Plan is under development at the Aztec unit. General Management and Resource Management Plans, reviewed by the public, provide both broad overviews and detailed descriptions of the resources themselves and the goals to conserve, protect, and understand their values.

The other significant management regime change -- although not a change in ownership -- is that the park now directly manages the Chaco Archaeological Collection which contains some 2 million objects and records. At the time of inscription, the federally owned collection was scattered among several NPS repositories and University Museums. This collection is now reassembled under the management of the park superintendent's staff and housed in an off-site facility on the University of New Mexico campus in Albuquerque, New Mexico. This collection contains scientifically excavated objects and samples, along with records and analytical reports, providing a vital research component to the architectural and cultural landscape resources.

Bureau of Land Management: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) designations have been established to provide a higher level of protection and Resource Management Plans define and direct appropriate non-detrimental uses of the Chaco Protection sites.

4h) *Is there a management plan for the property?*

YES

4h1) If YES, please summarize the plan, indicating if the plan is being implemented and since when, and the URL where the plan can be located, if available. (A copy of the plan should be submitted in December 2004. See Section 8)

Both Chaco Culture National Historical Park and Aztec Ruins National Monument have General Management Plans, required under law. Chaco's General Management Plan was completed in 1984; it is somewhat out-of date and needs major revision to reflect current issues, resource management improvements, and recent legal mandates. The main portion of the plan presents general proposals for how management will acquire and use lands within the boundaries (through exchanges, donations, and purchases) and how these lands will be protected, such as by installing fencing, restricting visitor access, and routine patrolling. The plan defines sustainable levels of visitor use based on 19-year-old visitation records, and some guidance on the need for or expansion of developments that will be proposed or maintained in support of visitor and operational needs. The plan provides some sense of how these management goals can be accomplished, and environmental consequences of these actions. One major goal of the General Management Plan was to clearly delineate the development zone which contains the visitor center, housing, campground, utilities, and other infrastructure. This design has enabled the park to upgrade and add needed visitor facility improvements while limiting the footprint and visual impacts of these modern intrusions. Implemented in 1995, another important resource protection strategy outlined in the plan was to redesign the park entrance road to enable the park to control unauthorized access to fragile resources. The state highway that once traversed the park, and was open day and night, was abandoned and replaced with a one-way interpretive loop road that can be closed at sunset. This road allows easy visitor access to all major interpreted sites and back country trails, but enables the park to secure the area at night and during emergencies. This road redesign has significantly cut down on vandalism to resources, poaching, and other types of unauthorized activities that were damaging resources. Further, once carrying capacities are defined, the park will be able to maintain visitor uses at sustainable levels.

At about the same time the General Management Plan was completed, Chaco developed a Land Protection Plan (1985) that summarized similar topics, but focused more on the purpose and methods for acquisition of inholdings. This is a more comprehensive plan that included the charter for the multi-agency Chaco Protection Sites Program. A more detailed inventory of cultural and natural resources was included, as well as effects of land status on the condition and integrity of the resources. Recommendations to acquire management authority on non-federal portions of the park were made, and objectives defined, once acquisition was complete.

The most current and comprehensive management plan available for Chaco Culture National Historical Park is the Resource Management Plan (2003) which contains detailed information about the cultural and natural resources in the park. Resource needs, such as protection, conservation treatment, assessments, inventory, monitoring, and other evaluations, are identified. The bulk of this plan is the development of project proposals that outline detailed resource actions, such as mapping or documentation projects, research needs, and preservation treatment plans. These proposals identify how the project work can be accomplished through government funding sources, partnerships with universities and other institutions, contracting, collaborative and multi-park efforts, and other innovative solutions.

Aztec Ruins' General Management Plan was signed in 1989. The park has initiated a three-year effort to generate a new plan which will address management of the expanded park boundaries and additional cultural resources. Until then, the park continues to work under the old plan. The 1989 plan called for backfilling, or reburial of certain portions of the standing architecture to promote long term preservation. Backfilling was initiated in 1998 and has progressed on the major standing ruin, the West Ruin. The plan also called for expanded visitor services to include new exhibits and walking trails to the additional lands and cultural sites. The trails and exhibits have not yet been constructed. The Land Protection Plan, which is part of the General Management Plan, prescribes acquisition of interest in parcels within the expanded boundaries through easements or outright purchase. To date, 230 acres have been purchased outright. Per the Land Protection Plan, the National Park Service will purchase interests in the remaining 61 acres with a combination of easements and outright purchase.

The management plans for each of the Chaco Protection Sites under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management have been prepared and are being implemented. Some of the actions completed since inscription include: improved fencing, cultural inventories, preservation treatments, mineral closures, and improved visitor facilities at one of the units. All units have been designated as Off-Highway Vehicle areas. All have been designated Visual Resource Management areas to protect visual integrity.

4h2) *If NO, is a management plan under preparation or is preparation of such a plan foreseen for the future?*

Financial Resources

4i) *What is the annual operating budget for the property in the current fiscal year? (For sites consisting of more than one property provide the budgets of constituent parts.)*

For Fiscal Year '03 (October 2002 through September 2003) the total operating budget for the Chaco World Heritage property was \$ 2,928,770 USD, broken down as follows:

Chaco Culture National Historical Park received \$1,434,000 USD in Fiscal Year '03 to conduct all park operations (Visitor Protection, Interpretation, Facility Maintenance, Administration, Resources Management). In addition, the park received \$355,000 USD in one-time special project funding to conduct conservation treatment on major structures and collections. These special project funds are for a single year and projects must compete with some 90 other national park units under a set of specific critical need criteria. While critically important for the preservation of the resources, these special funds are difficult to acquire and can not be counted on for long-term conservation.

Aztec Ruins National Monument received \$927,570 USD in Fiscal year '03 to conduct all park operations that includes visitor protection, interpretation, facility maintenance, administration, and resources management. In addition, the park received \$202,200 USD in one-time competitive cultural resource preservation project funding (described above) to conduct preservation on major structures.

Bureau of Land Management Farmington District received \$10,000 USD in Fiscal year '03 to conduct management and protection operations at the 5 units.

Sources of Expertise and Training in Conservation and Management Techniques

4k) *Please describe any sources of specialized expertise, training, and services that come from sources off-site (e.g., training centers, museum conservation facilities).*

The Getty Conservation Institute, located in Los Angeles, California, provides Chaco with technical support and guidance in developing and monitoring specialized conservation treatments for fragile architectural remains. In addition, they completed a value analysis case study that assists Chaco in understanding long-term impacts of management options and threats, and sets the basis for future planning.

The Navajo Nation Chaco Protection Sites Program, supported through the Chaco legislation and funding, provides the property with technical expertise in mapping and interpreting the large scale pre-Columbian cultural landscape, and the tangible connections among all of the detached properties included in the World Heritage list.

Chaco permits numerous academic and independent archaeological, architectural, geographical, and other researchers to conduct intensive analyses of the collections and archives, as well as collect new information, using non-destructive methods.

The National Park Service offers a wide array of support training at its national training centers. In addition, there is broad expertise in preservation skills and knowledge available to the sites through National Park Service support offices. The parks and BLM have staff with PhD and Masters-level qualifications in anthropology, with specialities in archeology.

4j) *Please provide information about the number of staff working at the World Heritage Site (enter figures).*

Full Time: 29 (Value must be a number)
Part Time: 8 (Value must be a number)
Seasonal: 16 (Value must be a number)
Other: 7 (Value must be a number)

Please list the job categories of these staff (e.g., Park Superintendent, Historian, Ecologist, Interpreter, General Works/Maintenance Manager) and describe the specialized skills and expertise of the World Heritage Site's staff members.

Administration and General Management: (7) overall administration, management, and supervision of Chaco and Aztec.

Cultural Resource Management: (5 at Aztec, 10 at Chaco, 1 at BLM) manage, preserve, and research cultural resources, including collections, buildings, historic sites.

Natural Resource Management: (1) manage natural resources including geology, hydrology, flora, and fauna.

Education and Interpretation: (5 at Aztec, 5 at Chaco) provide visitor services and educational programs and materials to visitors to the park and people outside the park to help them understand, value, and preserve the resources.

Protection: (3) protect the resources and visitors by monitoring resources, providing emergency medical and other services, and enforcing applicable regulations and laws.

Facility Maintenance: (8) maintain the visitor and staff facilities, such as restrooms, visitor centers, housing, campgrounds, and roads.

Other: (7) Includes cooperating association employees who work in the bookstores. Volunteers provide a variety of tasks and services in any of the areas above, depending on the need.

Visitation

4l) *Are there any visitor statistics for the site?*

YES

4l1) *If YES, please provide the annual visitation for the most recent year it is available, indicating what year that is, a brief summary of the methodology for counting visitors, and briefly describe the trends in visitation. (In describing these trends, please use the year of inscription as a baseline.)*

Visitation for calendar year 2003 for the entire property was 128,800.

At Chaco, visitors statistics are compiled using a formula that includes visitor center tallys, fees collected, and, at one unit, entrance road counters. At Aztec, every visitor enters the visitor center where they are hand counted. For the BLM sites, visitation is determined through written, self-registration.

The combined annual visitation figures show considerable variability but there is a gradual increase in numbers, from about 80,000 in 1987, through the early 1990s when visitation peaked at about 169,000. It has decreased since about 1992 to the present 2002 count, which appears to be similar to calendar year 2003. This reflects a trend, common to many national parks in the Southwest, of experiencing a decrease in visitation over the last decade.

The variability is the result of local and national events which can cause both decreases and increases in visitation. The local events that have slowed visitation in the Southwest include a fatal virus outbreak in the early 1990s and extreme weather conditions such as an extended drought, high summer temperatures, and severe winter conditions. Spikes in visitation, particularly one in 1997, resulted from a large archaeological conference that commemorated a 75th anniversary of excavations in Chaco. National events that affect visitation include gasoline price increases, which tend to lower visitation, and recent terrorism threats which tend to increase domestic -- but decrease international -- visits.

4m) *Please briefly describe the visitor facilities at the property.*

At Chaco Culture NHP and Aztec Ruins NM, there are restrooms, paved parking areas at the visitor center, and picnic tables. Chaco has a campground with restrooms, tent pads, and fire grates. Chaco has a 9 mile paved loop road that leads to parking areas for accessing the major sites and trails. There are no food or lodging accommodations. Detached units of Chaco are reached over dirt roads, maintenance of which is not the park's responsibility. There are no visitor facilities (restrooms, paved parking, campgrounds) at the detached sites.

Four of the five units managed by BLM have limited directional and interpretive signage, and are reached over unmaintained dirt roads. One unit, Casamero is reached via paved roads, and has a parking area. There are no other visitor facilities at the other BLM sites.

4n) *Is there tourism/visitor management plan for the property?*

YES

4n1) *If YES, please briefly summarize the plan, and provide a URL where the plan can be located.*

The visitor use/interpretive plans are contained within the general management plans for the National Park Service managed units, and are contained within the individual site management plans for the BLM units. Aztec Ruins is currently developing a Comprehensive Interpretive Plan, a five-year plan that will identify the primary interpretive themes and visitor services for the park. The plan will be posted on the park's web site, www.nps.gov/azru, by the end of the calendar year.

Scientific Studies

4o) *Please list key scientific studies and research programs that have been conducted concerning the site. (Please use the year of inscription as a baseline.)*

The list of scientific and academic research studies conducted at this property are too numerous to list individually and are contained in a comprehensive bibliography for the sites. Since the year of inscription, the studies have centered on seven basic topics of research: 1) conservation and preservation of precolumbian masonry architecture, 2) production, distribution, and consumption of material goods, 3) social and political organization, 4) economy and ecology, 5) architecture and large-scale cultural landscape analyses, and 6) connections and interaction with other societies in the greater Southwest US and northern Mexico, and 7) visitor use and expectations.

Products from these research topics include numerous technical and popular publications, dissertations and theses, conferences and workshops, exhibits, video productions, graphics and digital modeling, and artistic renderings.

4o1) *Please describe how the results of these studies and research programs have been used in managing the World Heritage Site.*

All permitted research results are archived into the property's museum collections and/or libraries. Much of the independent research, such as dissertations, video productions, and others, are submitted voluntarily to the property by the scholars and producers in order to incorporate their data into the larger Chaco database. This material is frequently referenced and consulted in the preparation of resource management planning and project implementation. The research materials are available for updating and expanding interpretive exhibits and programs.

At Aztec, a year-long visitor survey produced results that will help the park design more responsive visitor services and facilities. Research on preservation applications helped the park plan backfilling activity appropriate for wood remains, original plaster, and special areas in the ruin. Research on the cultural landscapes in the park identified at least two landscapes that will be managed for their values as National Register properties. Research on the architectural features and cultural landscapes at Aztec have strongly altered the information presented in interpretive brochures and publications. It was also a crucial factor in obtaining a listing for a portion of the prehistoric landscape on the New Mexico Cultural Properties List.

Examples of how World Heritage associated research has been incorporated into management of the property include the expanded partnership with the Getty Conservation Institute, and their collaboration on both technical conservation treatment research and on understanding and evaluating the property's values. The joint NPS-GCI backfill testing program has produced numerous important scientific studies that are being applied to similar preservation programs at other World Heritage Sites. Further, the International Colloquium on Reburial of Archaeological Sites that grew out of this testing program resulted in a publication in the Journal of Archaeological Site Management presenting both the technical data and practical guidelines for use throughout the world. The exchange of expertise in conservation, curation, and operations management, with World Heritage sites in other countries such as Copan in Honduras, is another example of the benefits of the World Heritage listing. NPS and BLM recognize that a responsibility that goes along with the World Heritage designation is to assist other related historic properties, whether listed or not, in preserving and appropriately managing these resources and to serve as advocates for increased awareness and support for heritage preservation.

4o2) *What role, if any, has the property's designation as a World Heritage Site played in the design of these scientific studies and research programs? For example, has there been a specific effort in these programs to focus on the recognized World Heritage values of the property?*

The Getty Conservation Institute (GCI) Heritage Values study selected Chaco as one of the four case studies specifically because of the World Heritage designation and the accompanying controversies and challenges that that designation presents. Further, as a result of the GCI study and increasing emphasis on the World Heritage designation, the park is expanding public scoping efforts to recognize that many management decisions are of interest to a much wider audience.

Education, Information and Awareness Building

4p) *Is there a plaque at the property indicating that it is a designated World Heritage Site?*

YES

4q) *Is the World Heritage Convention logo used on all of the publications for the property?*

NO

4r) *Are there educational programs concerning the property's World Heritage values aimed at schools?*

YES

4r1) *If YES, please briefly describe these programs.*

Aztec Ruins offers a written teacher's guide via its web site to all visiting classrooms. The guide tells teachers how to plan their visit, offers background information, and provides about 20 different lesson plans that teachers can adapt for different levels of students. A Children's Writing Project hosts students each year and teaches them how to use the site and its cultural values in their fictional writing.

Although Chaco is not involved in any formal educational outreach programs, the park web site offers access to information that is frequently used in classrooms.

4s) *Are there special events and exhibitions concerning the property's World Heritage values?*

YES

4s1) *If YES, please briefly describe them.*

A traveling photographic and artifact exhibit interprets the World Heritage Convention and the significance of this and other listed properties. This exhibit includes both the Mesa Verde and Chaco Culture World Heritage properties and contains a sample of ceramics, textiles, tools, and other material culture items to enhance the photographs. The exhibit is traveling throughout the Southwestern United States and may eventually include other World Heritage sites such as Grand Canyon, Taos Pueblo, and Carlsbad Caverns.

Interpretive programs frequently include a discussion of the importance of the identified World Heritage values and significance of preservation of these properties.

4t) *Please briefly describe the facilities, visitor center, site museum, trails, guides and information material that are available to visitors to the World Heritage Site.*

At the National Park Service portions of the property, two visitor centers provide visitor services such as information and orientation, museum exhibits, interpretive materials, book stores, and emergency services. Two museums exhibit examples of the material culture of the Chaco people with interpretive text to help educate and interpret the significance of each of the properties. Interpretive literature includes the following: self-guided trail booklets; junior ranger program materials; 16-page handbooks focusing on the stories at the park; free brochures on special interests such as accessibility for disabled visitors, how to plan a visit to the park, and how entrance fees are used to improve the park; and a free unigrid color brochure about the park. The book stores carry some 300 published titles that range from children's stories and workbooks to highly technical manuscripts for scholars. Postcards, posters, T-shirts, patches, magnets, pins, and other gift items are also sold at each park. Park staff provide personal services such as interpretive talks, guided walks, and information through informal contacts while roving at the sites. At Chaco, evening programs are provided during the summer. Each park maintains a web site with information about the resource and opportunities to explore the parks. Both parks offer interpretive audio-visual presentations that orient visitors to park resources.

The major structures that are open for visitation have self guided trails, interpretive guide booklets, and wayside exhibits. At the BLM managed units of the property, walking trails and directional signs are provided. Interpretive signs are also provided at one unit.

4u) *What role, if any, has the property's designation as a World Heritage Site played with respect to the education, information and awareness building activities described above? For example, has the World Heritage designation been used as a marketing, promotional, or educational tool?*

News releases issued by Chaco and Aztec frequently cite the World Heritage designation, reminding readers of this special status and the need for the sites' protection and preservation. Training is given to the site interpreters regarding the World Heritage status and history so that they can pass this information on to visitors. During the continuing process to develop a new general management plan for Aztec, the World Heritage status was conveyed to the public through informal meetings and newsletters.

Because some people in regions of the United States, particularly in the West, mistrust and misunderstand UNESCO World Heritage designation, properties located in this region have been cautious in their advertisement of the World Heritage listing. Only recently have communities become more knowledgeable and receptive to the benefits that World Heritage values can bring to the property.

II.5 Factors Affecting the Property
(See Section 5 of the current Nomination Form)

5) *Please briefly identify factors affecting the property under the following headings: Development Pressures, Environmental Pressures, Natural Disasters and Preparedness, Visitor and Tourism Pressures, Number of Inhabitants Within Property and Buffer Zone and Other - major factors likely to affect the World Heritage values of the property. First discuss those that were identified in the original nomination, in the same order in which they were presented there, then those that have been discussed in reports to the World Heritage Committee since inscription, and then other identified factors.*

This section should provide information on all the factors which are likely to affect a property. It should also relate those threats to measures taken to deal with them, whether by application of the protection described in Section 4e or otherwise.

Not all of the factors suggested in this section are appropriate for all properties. The list provided is indicative and is intended to assist the State Party in identifying the factors that are relevant to each specific property.

(In describing these trends, please use the year of inscription as a baseline.)

*For EACH Factor, please specify the following:
key actions taken to address factor
any plans that have been prepared to deal with factor in the future
whether the impacts of factor appears to be increasing or decreasing, and
the timeframe for which the comparison is being made.*

Development Pressures

5a) Provide information about Development Pressures on the following: demolitions or rebuilding; the adaptation of existing buildings for new uses which would harm their authenticity or integrity; habitat modification or destruction following encroaching agriculture, forestry or grazing, or through poorly managed tourism or other uses; inappropriate or unsustainable natural resource exploitation; damage caused by mining; and the introduction of invasive nonnative species likely to disrupt natural ecological processes, creating new centers of population on or near properties so as to harm them or their settings.

Housing Development: The original nomination did not note a threat of increased housing development near the Chaco sites. Population movement and growth in the American Southwest has placed tremendous demands for new housing in areas that had had relatively stable growth. At Aztec Ruins, a recently proposed 400-unit housing development adjacent to park boundaries will affect the viewshed of visitors, destroy related cultural resources and the landscape that is a part of the Aztec site, and encourage unauthorized visitation and vandalism that will challenge the park's ability to protect the site. The park and this proposed development are within the City of Aztec and the City has recently favored this development. Through the efforts of local concerned citizens, the park was named, in January 2004, to the New Mexico Heritage and Preservation Alliance's list of Most Endangered Places in New Mexico. The nomination cited this proposed housing development and other nearby growth that threatens to adversely affect the site. The park has provided information about the potential impacts of the development to city officials and the developer. The park has emphasized the World Heritage status of this park through discussions, and will continue to do so. The park will continue working with the City of Aztec and local community to identify impacts and collaborate on solutions. In the future, the park expects additional proposed developments adjacent to park boundaries and the cumulative impacts those will bring. Within Aztec boundaries, a proposed housing development on land not yet acquired by the park threatened to destroy cultural resources and cultural landscape. Since funds were not available for the National Park Service to purchase the parcel prior to the development, the National Park Service instead worked with the Archeological Conservancy, a non-profit group dedicated to conserving archeological resources. This group is working with the present landowners to purchase the parcel. At this time, the landowners are agreeable to selling the parcel and not developing. The National Park Service will continue to work with the Archeological Conservancy to effect the purchase.

Chaco and the BLM sites are almost entirely surrounded by Navajo Tribal lands. The Navajo Nation is the largest and fastest growing Native American community in the United States. The demand for new housing and the associated utilities -- water, electric, roads-- has increased dramatically since the nomination in 1987. This type of development is unplanned and uncontrolled. As these support utilities are established, even more unplanned growth is expected. While once a fairly remote area, these developments have exposed Chaco to increasing use from additional park neighbors. New roads provide greater access to once remote portions of the park. Public utilities, such as water systems, roads, and electric lines are now within 5 miles (8 km) of the park where 15 years ago they were some 15-20 miles (24 - 32 km) away. The cultural resources outside park boundaries -- and critical to the understanding of park resources -- are increasingly impacted by these developments. The park has identified this uncontrolled development and its impacts, but there is no plan in place to address it.

Mining and Energy Development: The original nomination noted that mining and energy development were threatening the integrity of the property and the associated outlying Chacoan communities. The San Juan Basin, in which the property is located, contains vast oil and natural gas deposits. Recent federal mandates and decisions encourage energy development on public lands. Within this region, the allowable spacing for well drilling was recently doubled, resulting in a corresponding increase in the amount of associated development (roads, production equipment, pipeline, and other transportation vehicles and facilities). In addition to the petroleum production, the region is underlain by extensive coal beds which are currently being mined using both surface strip and underground operations. Some of these mines are adjacent to large coal-fired electric generating stations, while others transport coal by truck or rail. Additional generating stations that will make use of the coal deposits are proposed or under construction near (within 10 to 20 miles/ 16 -32 km) the property. Associated electrical transmission-line corridors radiate out from the generating plants. Further, there are extensive uranium deposits located under the southern portions of the region; these were active up into the early 1980s when the demand for nuclear energy decreased. All of these extractive industries result in intensive -- but indirect -- impacts to the properties and include increasingly lower air quality, disturbances to the extensive precolumbian cultural landscape, and other visual impacts. The park has identified energy development as the greatest external threat to park resources. The park monitors and comments on proposed developments primarily through the legally mandated public consultation process, but has little impact on the final decisions. The BLM applies, and will continue to apply, laws, regulations, and management guidelines to prevent development and extraction of minerals within Chaco Protection Sites. However, development and extraction can continue immediately adjacent to the unit boundaries. The park will continue to identify and comment on future development.

Within Aztec Ruins are three active gas wells. Because the National Park Service does not own the mineral rights, four additional wells could be drilled within park boundaries. Additional wells would be subject to certain regulations aimed to protect park resources. The park is working with gas well operators to reduce impacts of present operations to cultural resources. If new wells are proposed, the park will work with applicable regulations and well operators to identify and mitigate adverse effects on cultural resources.

Future development is expected to increase due to increased world and national demand for energy and changes in government policies regarding resources extraction.

Environmental Pressures

5b) Environmental pressures can affect all types of property. Air pollution can have a serious effect on stone buildings and monuments as well as on fauna and flora. Desertification can lead to erosion by sand and wind. What is needed in this section is an indication of those pressures which are presenting a current threat to the property, or may do so in the future, rather than a historical account of such pressures in the past.

As stated above, energy exploration, extraction, and generation result in an overall degradation of the precolumbian cultural landscape and existing viewshed. Air pollution levels increase as additional generating stations go on line.

Natural Disasters and Preparedness

5c) *This section should indicate those disasters which present a foreseeable threat to the property and what steps have been taken to draw up contingency plans for dealing with them, whether by physical protection measures or staff training. (In considering physical measures for the protection of monuments and buildings it is important to respect the integrity of the construction.)*

Fire management plans are in draft for several units of the property and preventative measures are in place. A fire management assessment at Aztec Ruins indicates that heavy vegetation on ruins could lead to adverse effects on cultural resources, should a wildland fire occur. The plan will address this concern. In the other units of the property, fire assessments concluded that threats were relatively low and do not present immediate concern.

An extensive study of flood impacts has been completed and erosion control options are being studied. Flood threats, particularly at the Chaco units, are severe for about 500 structures that are located in the 100-year flood plain. Remaining structures within the property are at much lower risk.

Visitor and Tourism Pressures

5d) *In completing this section what is required is an indication of whether the property can absorb the current or likely number of visitors without adverse effects (i.e., its carrying capacity). An indication should also be given of the steps taken to manage visitors and tourists. Possible impacts from visitation that could be considered include the following:*

- i. damage by wear on stone, timber, grass or other ground surfaces ;*
- ii. damage by increases in heat or humidity levels;*
- iii. damage by disturbance to the habitat of living or growing things; and*
- iv. damage by the disruption of traditional cultures or ways of life.*

As stated above, there has been an overall increase in visitation over the past 15 years since inscription. One of the ways the park has been able to improve control and management of increasing visitation is to reroute the entrance road and limit access on the internal interpretive road. The main entrance road originally was open 24 hours a day and was a state highway used as a through road. Traffic entered the park at the far western end approximately 7 miles (11 km) from the visitor center and brought visitors through the core area of the resources. The park was not able to control unauthorized access to the resources, and the incidents of vandalism and poaching were increasing. In 1995 the State highway was abandoned, and the entrance road was routed into the visitor center development. Further, the interpretive loop road, that accesses most of the core resources, was gated so that it can be closed at night. The results of these changes have been dramatic decreases in vandalism and other unauthorized activities.

Although the property has managed to absorb the increased number of visitors and limit their associated impacts on the resources to date, the property needs to both study and establish carrying capacity. Without this vital data, it is impossible to understand cumulative impacts and make management decisions that prevent or limit the resource degradation numerated above (i, ii, iii, and iv).

Number of Inhabitants Within Property and Buffer Zone

5e) Include the best available statistics or estimate of the number of inhabitants, if any, within the property and any buffer zone and describe any activities they undertake which affect the property.

There are no inhabitants within the currently managed property boundaries. No buffer zone has been established (herein, the term 'buffer zone' refers to an area adjoining the World Heritage property in which surface impacts, including direct surface destruction, visual, and audible could be reviewed and managed to limit the impacts to the property). Within a mile of the Aztec site boundary, there are about 4,000 inhabitants. Within a mile of Chaco and BLM managed units, there are fewer than 100 inhabitants.

5f) List Other Factors

Stated above

II.6 Monitoring
(See Section 6 of the current Nomination Form)

Administrative Arrangements for Monitoring Property

6a) *Is there a formal monitoring program established for the site? In this case, "monitoring" means the repeated and systematic observation and collection of data on one or more defined factors or variables over a period of time.*

YES

6a1) *If YES, please describe the monitoring program, indicating what factors or variables are being monitored and which partners, if any, are or will be involved in the program.*

The monitoring programs range from a daily on-site presence at some units to periodic photographic documentation of change. The National Park Service units are able to provide on-site presence at major interpreted structures (about 15 out of the total 4000 sites). This presence provides educational/interpretive services and protection by monitoring visitor use and prohibiting unauthorized activities. The periodic photographic, and simple visual monitoring, serves as a documentation of change and can be used to evaluate the need for additional management and protection actions. Formal condition assessments are conducted on some of the major architectural structures at least once a year; others receive assessments on a 2 to 5-year cycle.

Key Indicators for Measuring State of Conservation

6b) *At the time of inscription of the property on the World Heritage list, or while in the process of reviewing the status of the property at subsequent meetings, have the World Heritage Committee and the State Party identified and agreed upon key indicators for monitoring the state of conservation of the property's World Heritage values?*

NO

6b1) *If YES, please list and describe these key indicators, provide up-to-date data with respect to each of them, and also indicate actions taken by the State Party in response to each indicator.*

6b2) *If NO key indicators were identified by the World Heritage Committee and used so far, please indicate whether the World Heritage Site management authority is developing or plans to develop key indicators for monitoring the state of conservation of the property's World Heritage Values.*

Both the National Park Service and Bureau of Land Management use various types of condition assessments, particularly for the exposed, above-grade architectural structures, as a way of documenting condition, trends in deterioration, and developing conservation treatment alternatives. National standards for historic preservation, and site-specific planning and management documents, help define condition levels and intervention needs. As previously stated, the most critical needs are methods for determining and setting carrying capacities at individual units.

Results of Previous Reporting Exercises

6c) *Please describe briefly the current status of actions the State Party has taken in response to recommendations from the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription or afterwards, through the process known as "reactive reporting." (Note: The answer to this question will be "not applicable" for many sites.)*

N/A

II.7 Conclusions

World Heritage Values

7a) Please summarize the main conclusions regarding the state of the World Heritage values of the property (see items II.2. and II.3. above).

The values for which this property was selected for World Heritage designation have been effectively maintained since nomination and listing in 1987. The staffs managing the property have considerably more specialized and technical training and expertise in conservation, research, and resource management. This increase in on-site capabilities has greatly improved day-to-day and long-term resource protection decisions and management strategies for the property. For these reasons, and due to increased research by the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and independent studies, the values and significance of this property have been more clearly defined and expressed. This increased understanding has led to the expansion of some of the units in order to afford added protection to important associated resources.

Management and Factors Affecting Site

7b) Please summarize the main conclusions regarding the management of and factors affecting the property (see items II.4. and II.5. above).

The management actions and decisions are based on sound conservation, protection and educational principles. External factors such as energy exploration, extraction, and transportation; development of power plants; and housing development are of increasing concern. These actions have, and will continue to severely impact, associated cultural resources, cultural and natural landscapes, and viewsheds that fall outside the boundaries of the sites. If energy exploration occurs within the boundaries of Chaco or Aztec, the development and operations will adversely affect the cultural landscape, viewshed, and possibly cultural resources. The BLM managed units enforce regulations and laws that prevent energy exploration within the top 20 meters of the surface.

Overall, the staff of the Chaco Culture World Heritage Site is managing the factors originating within the designated boundaries to effectively conserve and maintain cultural values of the property. However, the National Park Service and Bureau of Land Management still need to evaluate continued threats to the cultural values and determine methods to gauge condition through carrying-capacity studies. The ability to consistently and successfully manage external threats and their effects on the cultural values is not present.

Proposed Future Action(s)

7c) *Please describe briefly future actions that the State Party has approved to ensure the conservation of the World Heritage values of the property.*

These sample headings can be used as a checklist.

*Modification of legal or administrative structure
Changes to financial arrangements
Increases to staffing level
Provision of training
Modification of visitor facilities
Preparation of a visitor management plan
Studies of public knowledge of the World Heritage Site
Emergency preparedness
Establishment or improvement of a monitoring program.*

As stated above, the legal and administrative structure of site management is sound, and some consideration is built into the system to adapt and adjust to changing external threats. Most units are seeking to acquire remaining non-federal lands within the boundaries to assure continuing protection of resources.

Some minor modifications to visitor facilities are planned and underway. These include improving fire suppression capabilities of the Chaco visitor center to protect museum exhibits and reroofing the structure to eliminate leaks in the visitor-use areas. A very important curation facility for the Chaco Collection is proposed in the next year. Funding for this facility has been authorized and is in the NPS budget authorized by congress (congress still needs to pass an authorization to enable the NPS to spend this money off-site, but that is expected within the year). Once technical requirements are met, construction is expected to take about 1 year; then the 2 million objects/records can be moved in.

An interpretive plan is underway at Aztec Ruins, which will also take into account visitor impacts on the resource and outline visitor services to be offered. A new General Management Plan will identify long range development, research, visitor use, staffing, and preservation needs.

Responsible Implementing Agency(ies)

7d) *Please identify the agency(ies) responsible for implementation of these actions described in 7c, if different from those listed in Section II.4.*

Responsible Implementing Agency #1

Entity Chaco Culture National Historical Park
First Name: Same

Responsible Implementing Agency #2

Entity Aztec Ruins National Monument
First Name: Same
Last Name:
Address:
City:
State/Prov:
Postal Code:
Telephone:
Fax:
Email:

Responsible Implementing Agency #3

Entity Bureau Of Land Management
First Name: Same
Last Name:
Address:
City:
State/Prov:
Postal Code:
Telephone:
Fax:
Email:

Timeframe for Implementation

7e) If known, or predictable, please provide a timeline for the implementation of the actions described in 7c.

Acquisition of one parcel of land within Aztec Ruins' boundary will occur by December 2004. The new curation facility is expected to be completed in 2007. Minor changes in the Aztec Ruins visitor center will conclude by June 2004. The interpretive plan will be completed by December 2004. The General Management Plan will be completed by December 2005.

Needs for International Assistance

7f) Is it anticipated that International Assistance, through the World Heritage Fund, will be requested for any of the planned actions described above?

NO

7f1) *If YES, please state the nature of the request and when it will be requested, if known.*

Potential Decisions for the World Heritage Committee

7g) *Please indicate if the World Heritage Site management authority has preliminarily identified, as a result of this reporting exercise, an apparent need to seek a World Heritage Committee decision to change any of the following:*

(Note: Following completion of the Periodic Report exercise, the State Party, in consultation with appropriate authorities, will determine whether to proceed with seeking a Committee decision on these changes. To request such changes, the State Party will need to follow a separate, formal process, subsequent to submitting the report.)

- change to criteria for inscription
- change to Statement of Significance
- proposed new Statement of Significance, where previously missing
- change boundaries or buffer zone

II.8 Documentation

(See Section 7 of the current Nomination Form and Section 3 of the original Nomination Form)

8a) *Please review the original nomination for the property to determine whether it is necessary or advisable to supply, update or amend any of the following documentation for the World Heritage Site. Indicate what documentation will be supplied to supplement the information found in this report. (This documentation should be supplied at the time the Periodic Report is submitted to the World Heritage Centre, in December 2004.)*

- a) Photographs, slides and, where available, film. This material should be accompanied by a duly signed authorization granting, free of charge to UNESCO, the non-exclusive right for the legal term of copyright to reproduce and use it in accordance with the terms of the authorization attached.
- b) Topographic or other map or site plan which locates the WHS and its boundaries, showing scale, orientation, projection, datum, site name, date and graticule.
- c) A copy of the property management plan.
- d) A Bibliography consisting of references to all the main published sources on the World Heritage Site, compiled to international standards.

8b) *Do you have a digital map of the WHS, showing its location and boundaries?*

NO

8bi) *If yes, in what format(s) is the map?*

8bii) *Is it published on a publicly-accessible website?*

NO

8biii) *If yes, please provide the URL of the site where the map can be found. Must be a valid URL.*