

Maritime Greenwich

1. World Heritage Property Data

1.1 - Name of World Heritage property

Maritime Greenwich

1.2 - World Heritage property details

1.3 - Geographic information table

Name	Coordinates	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Maritime Greenwich	51.481 / -0.004	109.5	174.85	284.35	1997
Total (ha)		109.5	174.85	284.35	

1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Buffer Zones and Zones of Legal Protection	1997	

Comment

The World Heritage Centre identified in December 2022 that they did not hold an up-to-date clear map of the Maritime Greenwich WHS which showed the delimitation of the property. The property is in the process of producing the requested map in line with the World Heritage Centre's technical requirements, with support from Historic England. It will be submitted for the approval of the World Heritage Committee in advance of 46COM along with others from the UK State Party.

1.5 - Web and Social Media data of the property (if applicable)

1. [Maritime Greenwich - a World Heritage Site](#)
2. [1, 2 and 3 above should be deleted. The official Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site website is at: https://www.greenwichworldheritage.org/ Information and photos can also be found at: https://www.visitgreenwich.org.uk/ideas-and-inspiration/unesco-world-heritage](#)

2. Other Conventions/Programmes under which the World Heritage property is protected (if applicable)

2.1 - Records indicate that your World Heritage property (in whole or in part) is designated and/or protected under the Conventions/programmes shown in the prefilled table below. Please check and amend as necessary.

		The World Heritage property (in whole or in part) <u>is</u> designated and/or protected under this convention/programme	The World Heritage property (in whole or in part) <u>is not</u> designated and/or protected under this convention/programme
2.1.1	International Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection (1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict)		✕
2.1.2	List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection (Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict)		✕
2.1.3	The List of Wetlands of International Importance (The Ramsar List) (Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention))		✕
2.1.4	World Network of Biosphere Reserves Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme		✕
2.1.5	Global Geoparks Network UNESCO Global Geoparks		✕

2.2 - Please provide comments on 2.1 if necessary

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

No

2.4 - Do your national authorities intend to designate whole or part of the World Heritage property for inclusion in the List of Wetlands of International Importance (The Ramsar List), if relevant, in the next three years?

No

2.5 - Do your national authorities intend to designate whole or part of the World Heritage property as a Man and Biosphere Reserve (if relevant) in the next three years?

No

2.6 - Do your national authorities intend to apply for whole or part of World Heritage property to be designated as a UNESCO Global Geopark (if relevant) in the next three years?

No

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

2.7.1	1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.2	Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar Convention)	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	
2.7.5	UNESCO Global Geoparks	
2.7.1	There is no contact with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	✕
2.7.2	The World Heritage Site Manager occasionally communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.3	The World Heritage Site Manager regularly communicates with the Focal Point(s) of this designation/programme.	
2.7.4	The World Heritage Site Manager also manages this designation/programme.	

2.8 - Please add any further comments on cooperation with the other designation(s)/programme(s)

The Property is protected by Conservation Area (CA) designation (Greenwich Park CA). The 3 CAs of East Greenwich, West Greenwich and Blackheath form the property's Buffer Zone. Greenwich Palace was awarded Scheduled Monument status by the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport in March 2013.

2.9 - Are you aware of any elements associated with the World Heritage property that have been inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage?

No

2.10 - Please list any elements associated with the World Heritage property inscribed under the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of which you are aware

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

No

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

3. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

3.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property as adopted by the World Heritage Committee

Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief synthesis

Symmetrically arranged alongside the River Thames, the ensemble of the 17th century Queen's House, part of the last Royal Palace at Greenwich, the palatial Baroque complex of the Royal Hospital for Seamen, and the Royal Observatory founded in 1675 and surrounded by the Royal Park laid out in the 1660s by André Le Nôtre, reflects two centuries of Royal patronage and represents a high point of the work of the architects Inigo Jones (1573-1652) and Christopher Wren (1632-1723), and more widely European architecture at an important stage in its evolution. It also symbolises English artistic and scientific endeavour in the 17th and 18th centuries.

Greenwich town, which grew up at the gates of the Royal Palace, provides, with its villas and formal stuccoed terraces set around St Alphege's church rebuilt to Hawksmoor's designs in 1712-14, a setting and approach for the main ensemble.

Inigo Jones' Queen's House was the first Palladian building in Britain, and also the direct inspiration for classical houses and villas all over the country in the two centuries after it was built.

The Royal Hospital, laid out to a master plan developed by Christopher Wren in the late 17th century and built over many decades by him and other leading architects, including Nicholas Hawksmoor, is among the most outstanding group of Baroque buildings in England.

The Royal Park is a masterpiece of the application of symmetrical landscape design to irregular terrain by André Le Nôtre. It is well loved and used by residents as well as visitors to the Observatory, Old Royal Naval College and the Maritime Museum.

The Royal Observatory's astronomical work, particularly of the scientist Robert Hooke, and John Flamsteed, the first Astronomer Royal, permitted the accurate measurement of the earth's movement and also contributed to the development of global navigation. The Observatory is now the base-line for the world's time zone system and for the measurement of longitude around the globe.

Criterion (i): The public and private buildings and the Royal Park at Greenwich form an exceptional ensemble that bears witness to human artistic and creative endeavour of the highest quality.

Criterion (ii): Maritime Greenwich bears witness to European architecture at an important stage of its evolution, exemplified by the work of great architects such as Inigo Jones and Christopher Wren who, inspired by developments on the continent of Europe, each shaped the architectural development of subsequent generations, while the Park exemplifies the interaction of people and nature over two centuries.

Criterion (iv): The Palace, Royal Naval College and Royal Park demonstrate the power, patronage and influence of the Crown in the 17th and 18th centuries and its illustration through the ability to plan and integrate culture and nature into a harmonious whole.

Criterion (vi): Greenwich is associated with outstanding architectural and artistic achievements as well as with scientific endeavour of the highest quality through the development of navigation and astronomy at the Royal Observatory, leading to the establishment of the Greenwich Meridian and Greenwich Mean Time as world standards.

Integrity

The boundary of the property encompasses the Old Royal Naval College, the Queen's House, Observatory, the Royal Park and buildings which fringe it, and the town centre buildings that form the approach to the formal ensemble. All the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value are included within the boundary of the property.

The main threats facing the property are from development pressures within the town that could impact adversely on its urban grain and from tall buildings, in the setting, which may have the potential to impact adversely on its visual integrity.

Authenticity

The ensemble of buildings and landscapes that comprise the property preserve a remarkably high degree of authenticity.

The Old Royal Naval College complex, in particular the Painted Hall and Chapel, retains well its original form, design and materials. The Royal Observatory retains its original machinery and its associations with astronomical work. The management of the Old Royal Naval College as a single entity now allows for coordinated conservation of the buildings and surrounding spaces. The Observatory, Queen's House and its associated high-quality 19th century buildings are all managed as elements of the National Maritime Museum.

The landscape of the Royal Park retains its planned form and design to a degree with some ancient trees still surviving.

The stuccoed slate roofed terraces of the town that form the approach to the formal buildings and the Park retain their function as a commercial and residential centre. The coherence and conservation of buildings within the town is good, although there is a need for some refurbishment and to repair the urban pattern within the property, where it was disrupted by World War II bombing and subsequent reinstatement.

Protection and management requirements

The UK Government protects World Heritage properties in England in two ways. Firstly, individual buildings, monuments, gardens and landscapes are designated under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act and secondly through the UK Spatial Planning system under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Government guidance on protecting the Historic Environment and World Heritage is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and Circular 07/09. Policies to protect, promote, conserve and enhance World Heritage properties, their settings and buffer zones can be found in statutory planning documents.

The Mayor's *London Plan* provides a strategic social, economic, transport and environmental framework for London and its future development over a period of 20-25 years and is reviewed regularly. It contains policies to protect and enhance the historic environment including World Heritage properties. Further guidance is set out in *London's World Heritage Sites – Guidance on Setting* and *The London View Management Framework Supplementary Planning Guidance* which protects important designated views, some of which focus on the property. The London Borough of Greenwich Unitary Development Plan (UDP) contains guidance to protect and promote the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage property which have been saved and will remain in place until the UDP is replaced by the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF). There are also policies to protect the setting of the World Heritage property included in the current statutory plans for the neighbouring London Boroughs of Lewisham and Tower Hamlets.

The property is protected by a variety of statutory designations: the hospital, Queen's House and observatory buildings are Grade 1 listed buildings ; statues, railings and other buildings are of all grades; and the surrounding residential buildings of Greenwich town centre lie within a Conservation Area. There are a number of scheduled monuments in the Park which is itself a Grade 1 registered park and garden, and elements of the park are considered important for nature conservation.

The Royal Park is owned, managed and administered by The Royal Parks, a Crown agency. The Queen's House and associated 19th-century buildings and the

Royal Observatory is in the custodianship of the Trustees of the National Maritime Museum. The Old Royal Naval College is in the freehold of Greenwich Hospital, which remains a Crown Naval charity. The buildings are leased to the Greenwich Foundation for the Old Royal Naval College, also a registered charity whose objectives are to conserve, maintain and interpret the buildings for the public. The Royal Courts are leased to Greenwich University and Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance to form the Maritime Greenwich University Campus. Greenwich Foundation also retains and maintains a number of key buildings. Commercial activities in the town centre are coordinated by a town centre manager.

The management of the property is guided by a Management Plan approved by all the key partners which is regularly reviewed. A World Heritage Coordinator is responsible for development and implementation of the Management Plan and overall coordination for the whole property; this post reports to a World Heritage Executive Committee made up of key owners and managers within the property. A World Heritage Site Steering Group made up of key local stakeholders and national organisations monitors implementation of the Management Plan.

The history, value and significance of the property is now explained to visitors through Discover Greenwich, a recently opened state-of-the-art visitor centre which helps orientate visitors before entering the property.

The Royal Park, like any designed landscape evolving over time, is vulnerable to erosion of detail and its maintenance and conservation form part of a detailed plan that sets out the design history of the Royal Park, and the rationale for its ongoing maintenance and future restoration of the historic landscape, in particular, the way in which avenues and trees are managed and re-planted.

A number of high-profile annual events are held within the Royal Park, some of which have several millions of spectators worldwide. For all events, appropriate safeguards are put in place to ensure there is no adverse impact on the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, in particular on the Royal Park trees, on underground archaeology or on the surrounding buildings. The events generate worldwide interest in, and publicity for the World Heritage property.

Comment

There are a number of factual updates to the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value that can be provided separately.

3.2 - Please list the key attributes of Outstanding Universal Value of your property and give an assessment of their condition. As a guideline, it is suggested to focus on approximately five key attributes (no more than 15 overall).

	Brief identification of attribute	Preserved	Compromised	Seriously compromised	Lost
3.2.1	Architecture: architectural ensemble of the Queen's House, the Royal Observatory, the Royal Hospital and the Royal Park	✕			
3.2.2	Masterplan of buildings and designed landscape: a scheme to become a Royal Hospital starting with the Queen's House and formal planting behind it, and a range of courts extending the north/south axial symmetry of the site he including majestic domes.	✕			
3.2.3	The Grand Axis		✕		
3.2.4	The Royal Observatory	✕			
3.2.5	Town Centre and St Alfege Church	✕			
3.2.6	Royal Patronage	✕			
3.2.7	Relationship with the River Thames	✕			
3.2.8	Silhouettes	✕			
3.2.9					
3.2.10					
3.2.11					
3.2.12					
3.2.13					
3.2.14					
3.2.15					

3.3 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

A retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was agreed by the World Heritage Committee in June 2013 Attribute 3 - The Grand Axis: The composition at Greenwich was extended by Hawksmoor across the River Thames to the north as far as the tower of St Anne's at Limehouse. Visibility of this monumental piece of civic design has been lost. Despite the early buildings of Canary Wharf being located 'off-axis', later buildings obscure the vista of St Anne's - no new landmark introduced.

4. Factors Affecting the Property

4.1. Buildings and Development

4.1.1 - Housing

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Outside

✕ Relevant	Not relevant			
	Impact	Origin	Trend of impact	

Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕		✕				
 Negative ✕		✕		✕			

4.1.2 - Commercial development

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Outside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕		✕		✕			
 Negative ✕	✕	✕		✕			

4.1.3 - Industrial areas

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.1.4 - Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Potential, Inside, Outside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			
 Negative							

4.1.5 - Interpretative and visitation facilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕				
 Negative							

4.1.6 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.1 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Rolling property maintenance and improvement programmes, inward investment, placemaking and award winning new architecture are contributing to a vast improvement within Maritime Greenwich WHS. Tall buildings in the neighbouring Boroughs of Tower Hamlets and Lewisham continue to pose challenges to London's skyline and protected views and vistas of the WHS. The WHS Management Plan is referenced in the Tower Hamlets Local Plan and is a material consideration in tall building planning applications

4.2. Transportation Infrastructure

4.2.1 - Ground transport infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕		✕	✕				
 Negative ✕	✕		✕				

4.2.2 - Underground transport infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
➕ Positive ✕		✕	✕				📈
➖ Negative ✕	✕		✕		📉		

4.2.3 - Air transport infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Potential, Outside

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.2.4 - Marine transport infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Potential, Outside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
➕ Positive ✕		✕	✕	✕			📈
➖ Negative ✕	✕					➡	

4.2.5 - Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside, Outside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
➕ Positive ✕		✕	✕	✕			📈
➖ Negative ✕	✕				📉		

4.2.6 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.2 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Improvements in traffic movement in the town centre are being addressed as part of Transport for London's Liveable Neighbourhood Scheme and a variety of Council led pavement widening schemes with air quality and the safety and wellbeing of pedestrians and cyclists at their core. Improvements are being made to infrastructure and visual presentation at Cutty Sark DLR station and an upgrade of Greenwich Pier is planned. Plans for a Cruise Terminal outside the buffer zone have been abandoned.

4.3. Services Infrastructures

4.3.1 - Water infrastructure

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.3.2 - Renewable energy facilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Potential, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
➕ Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕				📈
➖ Negative							

4.3.3 - Non-renewable energy facilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.3.4 - Localised utilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.3.5 - Major linear utilities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.3.6 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.3 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Renewable energy sources are constantly being sourced as part of new building or refurbishment projects in consultation with the local authority and where appropriate, the Greater London Authority (GLA).

4.4. Pollution

4.4.1 - Pollution of marine waters

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.2 - Ground water pollution

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.3 - Surface water pollution

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.4 - Air pollution

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant		Not relevant					
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔋 Potential	📍 Inside	🌳 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕	✕		✕	✕		➡	

4.4.5 - Solid waste

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.6 - Input of excess energy

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.4.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.4 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Particulates from standing traffic and buses discolour historic residential and commercial buildings in the town centre. This is mitigated by routine maintenance and exterior cleaning and decoration. Potential improvements in traffic management through a variety of traffic initiatives are expected to address the problem to a large extent.

4.5. Biological resource use/modification

4.5.1 - Fishing/collecting aquatic resources

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.2 - Aquaculture

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.3 - Land conversion

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.4 - Livestock farming/Grazing of domesticated animals

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.5 - Crop production

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.6 - Commercial wild plant collection

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.7 - Subsistence wild plant collection

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.8 - Commercial hunting

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.9 - Subsistence hunting

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.10 - Forestry/Wood production

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant

✕ Not relevant

4.5.11 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.5 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.6. Physical resource extraction

4.6.1 - Mining

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	☒ Not relevant
----------	--

4.6.2 - Quarrying

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	☒ Not relevant
----------	--

4.6.3 - Oil and gas

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	☒ Not relevant
----------	--

4.6.4 - Water (extraction)

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	☒ Not relevant
----------	--

4.6.5 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.6 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.7. Local conditions affecting physical fabric

4.7.1 - Wind

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	☒ Not relevant
----------	--

4.7.2 - Relative humidity

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	☒ Not relevant
----------	--

4.7.3 - Temperature

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	☒ Not relevant
----------	--

4.7.4 - Radiation/Light

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	☒ Not relevant
----------	--

4.7.5 - Dust

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	☒ Not relevant
----------	--

4.7.6 - Water (rain/water table)

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	☒ Not relevant
----------	--

4.7.7 - Pests

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.8 - Micro-organisms

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.7.9 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.7 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.8. Social/Cultural uses of heritage

4.8.1 - Ritual/Spiritual/Religious and associative uses

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕						
 Negative							

4.8.2 - Society's valuing of heritage

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.8.3 - Indigenous hunting, gathering and collecting

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.8.4 - Changes in traditional ways of life and knowledge system

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

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

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.8.6 - Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Negative, Current, Potential, Inside

✕ Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕				
 Negative ✕		✕					

4.8.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.8 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

Tourist activity and visitor spend have a significant and positive impact on the WHS, particularly in terms of maintenance and presentation of the site. Detailed work on way finding by the Old Royal Naval College and Royal Museums Greenwich has been undertaken to facilitate and manage large numbers of visitors (approx. 10 million p.a. pre Covid)

4.9. Other human activities

4.9.1 - Illegal activities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.9.2 - Deliberate destruction of heritage

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.9.3 - Military training

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.9.4 - War

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.9.5 - Terrorism

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕		✕					📈

4.9.6 - Civil unrest

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.9.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.9 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

The threat of terrorism at iconic heritage sites in London is ever present. Counter terrorism measures at Maritime Greenwich are developed, reviewed, revised and promulgated by a WHS Counter Terrorism Working Group in line with government guidance and in consultation with the Metropolitan Police.

4.10. Climate change and severe weather events

4.10.1 - Storms

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕		✕	✕			➡	

4.10.2 - Flooding

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕		✕	✕			→	

4.10.3 - Drought

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕		✕	✕				

4.10.4 - Desertification

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.10.5 - Changes to oceanic waters

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.10.6 - Temperature change

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Potential, Inside

✕ Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔥 Current	🔥 Potential	📍 Inside	📍 Outside	↘ Decreasing	→ Stable	↗ Increasing
🟢 Positive							
🔴 Negative ✕		✕	✕			→	

4.10.7 - Other climate change impacts

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.10.8 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.10 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

The rise in temperatures and protracted absence of rainfall in recent years impacts on the green landscape elements of the WHS during summer months, for example on the lawns of the Upper and Lower Squares of the Old Royal Naval College and on Greenwich Park.

4.11. Sudden ecological or geological events

4.11.1 - Volcanic eruption

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.11.2 - Earthquake

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.11.3 - Tsunami/Tidal wave

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.11.4 - Avalanche/Landslide

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.11.5 - Erosion and siltation/Deposition

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.11.6 - Fire (wildfire)

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.11.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.11 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.12. Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species

4.12.1 - Translocated species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.12.2 - Invasive/Alien terrestrial species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Negative, Current, Inside, Outside

✕ Relevant		Not relevant					
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive							
 Negative ✕	✕		✕	✕			

4.12.3 - Invasive/Alien freshwater species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.12.4 - Invasive/Alien marine species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.12.5 - Hyper-abundant species

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.12.6 - Modified genetic material

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

Relevant	✕ Not relevant
----------	----------------

4.12.7 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.12 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

4.13. Management and institutional factors

4.13.1 - Management system/Management plan

✕ Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕		➡	
🔴 Negative							

4.13.2 - Legal framework

✕ Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			📈
🔴 Negative							

4.13.3 - Governance

✕ Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕		➡	
🔴 Negative							

4.13.4 - Management activities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside

✕ Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive ✕	✕	✕	✕	✕			📈
🔴 Negative							

4.13.5 - Financial resources

✕ Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	🔴 Current	🟡 Potential	🟢 Inside	🟢 Outside	📉 Decreasing	➡ Stable	📈 Increasing
🟢 Positive ✕	✕		✕			➡	
🔴 Negative							

4.13.6 - Human resources

✕ Relevant	Not relevant						
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		

Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive 							
 Negative 							

4.13.7 - Low impact research/monitoring activities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Relevant, Positive, Current, Inside

 Relevant				Not relevant			
	Impact		Origin		Trend of impact		
Impact	 Current	 Potential	 Inside	 Outside	 Decreasing	 Stable	 Increasing
 Positive 							
 Negative							

4.13.8 - High impact research/monitoring activities

Previous answer Cycle 2 (30/07/2013):

- Not relevant

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

4.13.9 - Please comment as necessary on how the factors selected as relevant in 4.13 are affecting the property either negatively or positively

A WHS partnership acts as Steering group, supported by an Executive Group of 9 partner organisations responsible for the management of the property. Governance arrangements are set out in an agreed Constitution. A Management Plan (under revision) is in place along with an Action Plan. Specific initiatives are delivered by working groups convened on a task and deliver basis. A WHS Coordinator is in place on a part-time basis. The WHS works closely with Government and heritage agencies in the UK.

4.14. Other factor(s)

4.14.1 - Other factor(s)

World Heritage Sites and their settings are protected through the spatial planning system operated by local planning authorities and statutory designation. The Government's objectives for the protection of World Heritage Sites and the principles that underpin them are now set out in the National Planning Policy Framework Revised 2021 (NPPF). https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf

4.15. Factors Summary Table

4.15.1 - Factors Summary Table

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.1 Buildings and Development						
4.1.1 Housing						
						
4.1.2 Commercial development						
						
4.1.4 Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure						
4.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities						
4.2 Transportation Infrastructure						
4.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure						
						
4.2.2 Underground transport infrastructure						
						
4.2.4 Marine transport infrastructure						
						
4.2.5 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure						

4.3 Services Infrastructures						
4.3.2 Renewable energy facilities						
4.4 Pollution						
4.4.4 Air pollution						
4.8 Social/Cultural uses of heritage						
4.8.1 Ritual/Spiritual/Religious and associative uses						
4.8.6 Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation						
4.9 Other human activities						
4.9.5 Terrorism						
4.10 Climate change and severe weather events						
4.10.1 Storms						
4.10.2 Flooding						
4.10.3 Drought						
4.10.6 Temperature change						
4.12 Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species						
4.12.2 Invasive/Alien terrestrial species						
4.13 Management and institutional factors						
4.13.1 Management system/Management plan						
4.13.2 Legal framework						
4.13.3 Governance						
4.13.4 Management activities						
4.13.5 Financial resources						
4.13.6 Human resources						
4.13.7 Low impact research/monitoring activities						
Legend Current Potential Negative Positive Inside Outside						

4.16. Assessment of current and potential positive and negative factors

4.16.1 - Assessment of current and potential negative and positive factors

4.1 Buildings and Development

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.1.1 Housing	 		
	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
☒	Restricted
☐	Localised
☐	Extensive
☐	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
☐	One off or rare
☒	Intermittent or sporadic
☐	Frequent
☐	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
☐	Insignificant
☒	Minor
☐	Significant
☐	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
☐	High capacity
☐	Medium capacity
☒	Low capacity
☐	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
☐	Decreasing
☐	Static
☒	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.1.2 Commercial development	 		
	  		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
☒	Restricted
☐	Localised
☐	Extensive
☐	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	

	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.1.4 Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	  	 	

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
✕	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
✕	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	

	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.1.5 Interpretative and visitation facilities	  		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor

✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact

✕	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes

	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond

	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years

	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

4.2 Transportation Infrastructure

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.2.1 Ground transport infrastructure	  		
	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor

	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.2.2 Underground transport infrastructure						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
✕	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity

	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.2.4 Marine transport infrastructure	  	 	
	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
✕	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.2.5 Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	  	 	
	 		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

4.3 Services Infrastructures

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.3.2 Renewable energy facilities						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
✕	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
✕	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity

	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

4.4 Pollution

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.4.4 Air pollution			
	 	 	

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor			
	Restricted		
✕	Localised		
	Extensive		
	Widespread		
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact			
	One off or rare		
✕	Intermittent or sporadic		
	Frequent		
	On-going		
Impact - Impact on the attributes			
	Insignificant		
✕	Minor		
	Significant		
	Major		
Management response - Capacity of management to respond			
	High capacity		
✕	Medium capacity		
	Low capacity		
	No capacity and / or resources		
Trend - Development over the last 6 years			
	Decreasing		
	Static		
✕	Increasing		

4.8 Social/Cultural uses of heritage

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.8.1 Ritual/Spiritual/Religious and associative uses	 		
Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor			

✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
✕	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.8.6 Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation						
						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
✕	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

4.9 Other human activities

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.9.5 Terrorism						
	⊖		📢			↗

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
✕	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

4.10 Climate change and severe weather events

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
------	--------	--------	-------

4.10.1 Storms						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor

	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurence of the impact

	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes

	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond

	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years

	Decreasing
	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.10.2 Flooding						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor

	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurence of the impact

	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes

	Insignificant
--	---------------

✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.10.3 Drought						
	⊖		📢	🌱		

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
✕	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.10.6 Temperature change						

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
☒	Restricted
☐	Localised
☐	Extensive
☐	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
☒	One off or rare
☐	Intermittent or sporadic
☐	Frequent
☐	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
☒	Insignificant
☐	Minor
☐	Significant
☐	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
☐	High capacity
☒	Medium capacity
☐	Low capacity
☐	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
☐	Decreasing
☐	Static
☒	Increasing

4.12 Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.12.2 Invasive/Alien terrestrial species	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
☐	Restricted
☒	Localised
☐	Extensive
☐	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
☐	One off or rare
☒	Intermittent or sporadic
☐	Frequent
☐	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
-----------------------------------	--

	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

4.13 Management and institutional factors

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.1 Management system/Management plan	  	 	

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
	Localised
✕	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
✕	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.2 Legal framework	  	 	

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor

	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
✕	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact

	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
✕	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes

	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major

Management response - Capacity of management to respond

	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources

Trend - Development over the last 6 years

	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.3 Governance	  	 	

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor

	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
✕	Widespread

Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact

	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
✕	Frequent
	On-going

Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name	Impact	Origin	Trend
4.13.4 Management activities	+ ⬇️ ⬆️	🌐 🔄	↗️

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
	Restricted
✕	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
✕	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
	Insignificant
	Minor
✕	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
✕	High capacity
	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
	Static
✕	Increasing

Name		Impact			Origin		Trend
4.13.5 Financial resources							
Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor							
☒	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
	Widespread						
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact							
	One off or rare						
☒	Intermittent or sporadic						
	Frequent						
	On-going						
Impact - Impact on the attributes							
	Insignificant						
☒	Minor						
	Significant						
	Major						
Management response - Capacity of management to respond							
	High capacity						
☒	Medium capacity						
	Low capacity						
	No capacity and / or resources						
Trend - Development over the last 6 years							
	Decreasing						
☒	Static						
	Increasing						

Name		Impact			Origin		Trend
4.13.6 Human resources							
Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor							
☒	Restricted						
	Localised						
	Extensive						
	Widespread						
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact							
	One off or rare						
☒	Intermittent or sporadic						
	Frequent						
	On-going						
Impact - Impact on the attributes							

	Insignificant
✕	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
	Medium capacity
✕	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

Name	Impact			Origin		Trend
4.13.7 Low impact research/monitoring activities						

Spatial scale - Area affected by the factor	
✕	Restricted
	Localised
	Extensive
	Widespread
Temporal scale - Occurrence of the impact	
✕	One off or rare
	Intermittent or sporadic
	Frequent
	On-going
Impact - Impact on the attributes	
✕	Insignificant
	Minor
	Significant
	Major
Management response - Capacity of management to respond	
	High capacity
✕	Medium capacity
	Low capacity
	No capacity and / or resources
Trend - Development over the last 6 years	
	Decreasing
✕	Static
	Increasing

4.17. Serial inscriptions (national or transnational)

4.17.1 - If your property is a serial inscription (national or transnational) please identify which components of the property are impacted by each factor

4.18. Prediction of the state of conservation at next cycle of Periodic Reporting.

4.18.1 - Please predict what the state of conservation of each attribute will be approximately 6 years from now (at the time of the next cycle of Periodic Reporting)

	Attribute	Preserved	Compromised	Seriously compromised	Lost
4.18.1.1	Architecture	×			
4.18.1.2	Masterplan	×			
4.18.1.3	The Grand Axis		×		
4.18.1.4	Royal Observatory Greenwich	×			
4.18.1.5	Town Centre and St Alfege Church	×			

5. Protection and Management of the Property

5.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

5.1.1 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries are **adequate to maintain** the property's Outstanding Universal Value

5.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known and recognised?

The boundaries **are known by both** the management authority and local communities/landowners

5.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The buffer zones are **adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

5.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the buffer zones known and recognised?

The buffer zones of the World Heritage property **are known and recognised by both** the management authority and local communities/landowners

5.1.5 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

The boundaries and buffer zone of the World Heritage Property are adequate to maintain its Outstanding Universal Value.

5.2. Protective Measures

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

Greater London Authority (GLA) produced "London View Management Framework", part of the London Plan 2011 as well as Supplementary Planning guidance on the settings of World Heritage Sites in London.

Royal Greenwich Core Strategy Proposed Submission version February 2013 for adoption in 2013. Greenwich Palace Scheduled as an Ancient monument, March 2013.

The site is entirely located within Conservation Areas designated according to the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. In these, protection is exercised by the London Borough of Greenwich and monitored by English Heritage, the national agency for heritage protection and management in England (set up under the National Heritage Act 1983). All the public monuments and most of the buildings in the town centre and around the park are protected by being included on the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest, established under the terms of the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953. Authorization must be obtained for any works that affect the exteriors (and in certain cases the interiors also) of these properties. The Royal Park is registered as a Grade I landscape in the English Heritage Register of Parks and contains a number of archaeological sites, including a group of Bronze Age burial mounds, and these are protected as ancient monuments (as defined in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979), the control of which (but not their management) is vested in English Heritage. The view from the Park over the buildings of the Museum and College towards St Paul's Cathedral in the City of London is protected as a Strategic View, monitored by the relevant intermediate local administrations. There are more than a hundred private owners of properties within the nominated area. The public monuments and the Royal Park are owned directly by the Crown.

Source: Advisory Body Evaluation; Periodic Reporting Cycle 2

Comment

Please refer to the State Party's Section 1 questionnaire for a list of national legislation relevant to UK World Heritage Sites. Greater London Authority (GLA) produced "London View Management Framework", part of the London Plan 2011 as well as Supplementary Planning guidance on the settings of World Heritage Sites in London. Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies was adopted 30 July 2014. Greenwich Palace Scheduled monument, March 2013. The site is entirely located within Conservation Areas designated according to the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. In these, protection is exercised by the London Borough of Greenwich and monitored by Historic England, the national agency for heritage protection and management in England (set up under the National Heritage Act 1983). All the public monuments and most of the buildings in the town centre and around the park are protected by being included on the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest, established under the terms of the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953. Authorization must be obtained for any works that affect the exteriors (and in certain cases the interiors also) of these properties. The Royal Park is registered as a Grade I landscape in the Historic England Register of Parks and contains a number of archaeological sites, including a group of Bronze Age burial mounds, and these are protected as scheduled monuments (as defined in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979), the control of which (but not their management) is vested in the Secretary of State for Culture, Media & Sport as advised by Historic England. The view from the Park over the buildings of the Museum and College towards St Paul's Cathedral in the City of London is protected as a Strategic View, monitored by the relevant intermediate local administrations. There are more than a hundred private owners of properties within the nominated area. The public monuments and the Royal Park are owned

directly by the Crown.

5.2.2 - Please list any legislation and other measures (regulatory -including spatial planning- contractual, institutional or traditional) not included in 5.2.1 and indicate the category

2021 / London Plan / Yes / https://www.london.gov.uk/programmes-strategies/planning/london-plan/new-london-plan/london-plan-2021
2012 / London View Management Framework / Yes / https://www.london.gov.uk/programmes-strategies/planning/implementing-london-plan/london-plan-guidance-and-spgs/london-view-management
2014 / Local Plan: Royal Borough of Greenwich Core Strategy / Yes / https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/info/200191/planning_policy_and_strategy/869/local_development_framework/2
2020 / London Borough of Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031: Managing Growth and Sharing Benefits / Yes / https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ignl/planning_and_building_control/planning_policy_guidance/Local_plan/local_plan.aspx
2011 / Local Plan: London Borough of Lewisham. Lewisham's new Local Plan 2023 is currently out for consultation and will set out a shared vision for the future of the borough along with the planning and investment framework to deliver this vision through to 2040. / Yes / https://lewisham.gov.uk/myservices/planning/policy/planning/about-the-lewisham-local-plan
2014 / Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site Management Plan: Third Review / Yes / https://www.greenwichworldheritage.org/assets/ugc/docs/Maritime_Greenwich_Management_Plan_2014.pdf
2017 / Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site Action Plan / Yes / https://www.greenwichworldheritage.org/assets/ugc/docs/FINAL_ACTION_PLAN_071216.pdf
1970 / Greenwich Park Conservation Area / Yes / https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/downloads/file/1979/greenwich_park_conservation_area_appraisal_2010
1968 / West Greenwich Conservation Area / Yes / https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/downloads/file/1984/west_greenwich_conservation_area_appraisal_2013
1968 / Blackheath Conservation Area / Yes / https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/downloads/download/566/blackheath_conservation_area_map_and_appraisal
1992 / East Greenwich Conservation Area / Yes / https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/downloads/download/570/east_greenwich_conservation_area_map_and_appraisal
2002 / Westcombe Park Conservation Area / Yes / https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/downloads/download/15/westcombe_park_conservation_area_map_and_appraisal
1980 / Ashburnham Triangle Conservation Area / Yes / https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/downloads/download/9/ashburnham_triangle_conservation_area_map_and_appraisal
2017 / West Greenwich Conservation Area Greenwich Town Centre Article 4 Direction Colour Guidance Note / Yes / https://www.greenwichworldheritage.org/assets/ugc/docs/Greenwich_Town_Centre_Colour_Guidance_Note_December_2016.pdf
2012 / London's World Heritage Sites - Guidance on Settings / Yes / https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/gla_migrate_files_destination/World%20Heritage%20Sites%20SPG%20March%202012%20lowres_0.pdf
2023 / Neighbourhood Plans / Community-led neighbourhood planning Neighbourhood planning is a process intended to give local residents more say in the planning of their neighbourhoods. It is a government initiative that was introduced under the Localism Act. / https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/info/200191/planning_policy_and_strategy/1620/neighbourhood_planning

5.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and/or regulation including spatial planning) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and/or Authenticity of the property?

The **legal framework** for maintaining of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and/or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides an **adequate basis for effective management and protection**

5.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and/or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and/or Authenticity of the property?

The **legal framework** in the buffer zone for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and/or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides an **adequate basis for effective management and protection**

5.2.5 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and/or regulation) in the broader setting of the World Heritage property adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and/or Authenticity of the property?

The **legal framework** for the broader setting of the World Heritage property provides an **adequate basis for** effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and/or Integrity

5.2.6 - Can the legal framework (i.e. legislation and/or regulation) be enforced?

There is **adequate capacity/resources** to enforce legislation and/or regulation in the World Heritage property

5.2.7 - Please provide a short summary of how the legislation, including spatial planning and other regulation, works in practice

Maritime Greenwich WHS, its setting and buffer zone is protected through a regulatory spatial planning system operated through the local planning authority and statutory designation. This has two principle components: legal designation at national level (of sites of archaeological interest, buildings of special architectural or historic interest, parks and gardens and conservation areas) and a 'plan-led' development management system operated by the the Royal Borough of Greenwich.

5.2.8 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations about the information related to the measures taken to protect the World Heritage property

Statutory protection for UK World Heritage Sites is currently being considered under proposed legislation passing through Parliament, the Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill. Should the Bill be enacted without specific amendments to clauses relating to World Heritage Sites in the UK, for the first time UK WHSs will be afforded protection on a statutory basis.

5.3. Management System/Management Plan

5.3.1 - Please check the box which most closely match the character of the governance and management system of the property

Charitable management (e.g. by NGO)

If 'Other', please specify

5.3.2 - Management System: Please indicate which of the various management tools listed below are used to help protect the property.

Other forms of statutory or non-statutory plans (e.g. strategic plans)
Governance mechanisms that foster and respect traditional practices, knowledge and uses of the property
A management plan
A disaster, climate or conflict risk management plan
A visitor/visitation management plan
An environmental management framework

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

The WHS is governed by a Partnership and managed by a core executive sub-group of the Partnership, working to the site Management Plan. WHS Coordinator supports the Partnership and Executive. The Partnership works to uphold OUV and promote the WHS at local, national and international levels. The Executive works under separate terms of reference and is responsible for the overall management of the WHS and implementing decisions of the Partnership which also sets the policy framework for the Site.

5.3.4 - Management Documents

Title	Status	Available	Date	Link to source
Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site. Management Plan. March 1998	N/A	Available	1998	
Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site Management Plan. First review: December 2004. 2004-2009.	N/A	Available	2004	
Management Plan 2012-2017 for Maritime Greenwich - Third Review 2014	N/A	Available	2014	

5.3.5 - Has any use been made of the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape in developing policies and best practices for the protection of this property?

No use has been made of the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape

5.3.6 - If the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation has been used at this property, please describe briefly what has been done.

5.3.7 - Has any use been made of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties at the property?

No use has been made of the World Heritage Policy for Climate Change

5.3.8 - If the Climate Change policy has been used, please briefly describe what has been done along with any research on the impacts of Climate Change on the property:

5.3.9 - Has any use been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties at the property ?

Some use has been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties

5.3.10 - If the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties has been used, please briefly describe what has been done

The Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at WHS Properties was used to inform the Risk Preparedness section of the Maritime Greenwich WHS Management Plan, 3rd Review 2014.

5.3.11 - Rate the coordination between the various levels of administration (i.e. national/federal; regional/provincial/state; local/municipal etc.) involved in the management of the World Heritage property

There is **adequate coordination** between all bodies/levels involved in the management of the property

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

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

5.3.13 - Is the management system being implemented?

The management system is being **fully implemented and monitored**

5.3.14 - Is there an annual work/action plan and is it being implemented?

An annual work/action plan **exists and many of its activities are being implemented**

5.3.15 - Does the management system include formal mechanisms and procedures that ensure participation and contribution of the following groups, living within or near the World Heritage property and/or buffer zone in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property?

		Not applicable	No mechanisms for participation	Some participation	Direct participation	Transformative participation in all relevant decision processes
--	--	----------------	---------------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	---

5.3.15.1	Local communities				×	
5.3.15.2	Local authorities					×
5.3.15.3	Landowners in the property and the buffer zone					×
5.3.15.4	Indigenous peoples	×				
5.3.15.5	Women			×		
5.3.15.6	Other specific groups	×				
	If you selected, 'Other specific groups' please specify					

5.3.16 - Please rate the cooperation/relationship between the World Heritage property managers/coordinators/staff and the following groups

		Not applicable	Non-existent	Poor	Fair	Good
5.3.16.1	Local communities					×
5.3.16.2	Local/Municipal authorities				×	
5.3.16.3	Indigenous peoples	×				
5.3.16.4	Landowners					×
5.3.16.5	Women					×
5.3.16.6	Youth/Children				×	
5.3.16.7	Researchers					×
5.3.16.8	Local Visitors/Tourists					×
5.3.16.9	National/International tourists					×
5.3.16.10	Tourism Industry					×
5.3.16.11	Local businesses and industries				×	
5.3.16.12	NGOs				×	
5.3.16.13	Other specific groups				×	
	If you selected 'Other specific groups', please specify	Local Amenity Groups				

5.3.17 - Please rate the extent to which the management system of your property contributes towards achieving the objectives of the World Heritage Committee's Policy for the Integration of a Sustainable Development Perspective into the Processes of the *World Heritage Convention*

		Not applicable	No contribution	Limited	Significant	Full achievement
5.3.17.1	The management system of the property contributes to gender equality				×	
5.3.17.2	The management system of the property provides ecosystem services/benefits to the local community (e.g. fresh air, water, food, medicinal plants)			×		
5.3.17.3	The management system of the property contributes to social inclusion and equity, improving opportunities for all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status				×	
5.3.17.4	The management system of the property integrates a human rights-based approach			×		
5.3.17.5	The management system of the property contributes to fostering inclusive local economic development, and to enhancing livelihood				×	
5.3.17.6	The management system of the property contributes to conflict prevention, including respect for cultural diversity within and around the World Heritage property				×	

5.3.18 - Please provide further details on the ratings of the management system given in the table above

The Maritime Greenwich WHS Management Plan sets out a framework for the protection, conservation and management of the WHS and brings together the policies and aspirations of a number of stakeholders and their willingness to work together for its implementation. The Management Plan, as part of a wider national, regional and local framework for protection addresses all aspects of the Management System set out in Q 5.3.17.1 to Q 5.3.17.6 to a greater degree.

5.3.19 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the management system/plan

6. Financial and Human Resources

6.1. Funding

6.1.1 - If your funding sources do not exactly fit those shown, put the relevant amounts against the funding type that most closely represents your situation, and use the comment box below to provide more details.

		Project costs	Running costs
6.1.1.1	Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc.)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.2	Bilateral international funding	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.3	World Heritage Fund (International Assistance)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.4	Contribution from other conventions and programmes	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.5	International donations (NGOs, foundations, etc.)	0 %	%
6.1.1.6	Governmental (national/federal)	56 %	10 %
6.1.1.7	Governmental (regional/provincial/state)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.8	Governmental (local/municipal)	0 %	0 %
6.1.1.9	In-country donations (NGOs, foundations, etc.)	20 %	20 %
6.1.1.10	Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, toilets, parking, camping fees, etc.)	11 %	10 %
6.1.1.11	Commercial activities (e.g. merchandising and catering, filming permit, concessions, etc.)	13 %	60 %
6.1.1.12	Other	%	%
		Total 100 %	Total 100 %

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

The data above has been calculated on a best estimate basis with reference to Annual Accounts and Financial Statements of the three principle partner organisations with a vested interest in the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site: Old Royal Naval College, Royal Museums Greenwich and Greenwich Park. A broad estimate of % expenditure attributed to running and project costs against the various funding categories has been applied to represent the WHS as a whole.

6.1.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?

The available **budget is adequate** for effective management of the World Heritage property

6.1.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?

The existing sources of funding are **secure over both the medium- and long-term**

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

Each has its own corporate strategy, objects and income and expenditure streams running into millions of GBP. These financial resources are not specifically allocated for the WHS but the individual conservation, management and investment programmes undertaken under the auspices of the Management Plan fulfil the aspirations of the World Heritage Convention. Major capital projects are undertaken by partners on an ongoing basis which contribute to the enhancement and presentation of the WHS.

6.1.6 - Estimate the distribution of men and women involved in the management, conservation, interpretation of the World Heritage properties and the extent to which they are drawn from local communities.

		From local communities %	From elsewhere %
6.1.6.1	Men	38 %	39 %
6.1.6.2	Women	62 %	61 %
		Total 100 %	Total 100 %

6.1.7 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?

Human resources are **adequate** for management needs

6.1.8 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines

Conservation	Good
Environmental sustainability	Fair
Community participation and inclusion	Fair
Risk preparedness	Good
Capacity development and education	Good
Administration	Fair
Research and monitoring	Fair
Awareness raising and public information/communication	Good
Marketing and promotion	Good

Interpretation	Fair
Visitor management/tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Fair

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

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

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

No use has been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building

6.1.11 - If the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Building has been used, please briefly describe what has been done.

Workforce development at the WHS is a priority with training and capacity-building a significant part of the reward quadrant (working environment; personal development; job satisfaction; pay and benefits). The approach to capacity building programme comprises individual comprehensive programmes at each of the WHS partner organisations for staff training and development, and ensuring that professional expertise more than adequately meets the requirements for conservation and management.

6.1.12 - Are there site-specific capacity building plans or programmes that develop local expertise and that contribute to the transfer of skills for the conservation and management of the World Heritage property?

A site-based capacity building plan or programme is in place and fully implemented; **all technical skills are being transferred** to those managing the property locally

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

Whilst no specific WHS capacity building plan (for consideration at next Management Plan review) individual WHS partner organisations have a range of professional training programmes which address the knowledge, skills and experience required to manage the WHS effectively. Internal and external training is provided and information disseminated across the WHS through a range of WHS based Working and Steering Groups.

7. Scientific Studies and Research Projects

7.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values and attributes of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Knowledge about the values and attributes of the World Heritage property is **adequate**

7.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and/or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?

There is **considerable research** but it is **not directed towards management needs and/or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value**

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

Research results **are shared with local communities and some national agencies**

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

Comprehensive scientific and research projects undertaken by individual organisations across the WHS, particularly at Royal Museums Greenwich, Old Royal Naval College and University of Greenwich. Many of these touch on but do not specifically address OUV or the management of the property. However, there are some WHS wide projects underway such as a detailed scanning exercise by a dedicated research group based on new and emerging technology, scanning techniques and equipment.

8. Education, Information and Awareness Building

8.1 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities	Fair
-------------------	------

Local/municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Fair
Landowners	Fair
Women	Fair
Youth/children	Poor
Researchers	Good
Local visitors	Fair
National/international tourists	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Local businesses and industries	Fair
NGOs	Good
Other specific groups	Good
If you selected 'Other specific groups', please describe	Local amenity groups and historical societies for example The Greenwich Society, see https://greenwichsociety.org.uk/

8.2 - Does the property have a heritage education programme(s) for children and/or youth, that can contribute to a better understanding of heritage, promote diversity and foster intercultural dialogue?

There is a **planned and effective education and awareness programme** for children and youth that contributes to the protection of the World Heritage property

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

Local communities
Youth/children
Local Visitors
National/international tourists
Tourism industry

8.4 - Please rate the adequacy of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property for education, information, interpretation and awareness building

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

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

Ambitious learning and public programme continue from strength to strength; whether through volunteering initiatives or events or being a central place within the local community there are meaningful opportunities for diverse audiences to share in the significance of the history, buildings and grounds of the WHS. Schools and Community programmes offer creative and outreach workshops, Black Greenwich Pensioner exhibition workshops and a revival of the Greenwich Citizenship Awards.

9. Visitor Management

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

7000000 / 2000000 / 1000000 / 10000000 / 6000000 /
--

9.2 - What information sources are used to collect visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries

Accommodation establishments
Transportation services
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys

9.3 - What is the average length stay of a visitor to the World Heritage property?

One to three hours

9.4 - Please provide the source of information

Marketing campaign evaluation surveys; exit and visitor surveys

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

9 / 25 / 15 / 6 / 6 / 15 /

9.6 - Please provide the source of information

Scarborough Tourism Economic Activity Monitor (STEAM): Global Tourism Solutions Model

9.7 - Does the management system/plan for the World Heritage property include a strategy with an action plan to manage visitors, tourism activity and its derived economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts?

There is a planned and **effective strategy** to manage visitors, tourism activity and its derived impacts on the World Heritage property

9.8 - Please provide any comments relating to the answer provided above in question 9.7

Visitor management strategies for Maritime Greenwich are enshrined in the Management Plan, 3rd Review, Action Plan and the Visit Greenwich Destination Management Plans, 2019-23 and 2023-28

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

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is **effectively managed and does not impact its Outstanding Universal Value**

9.10 - Is the effectiveness of tourism management regularly monitored?

Yes, using a different system

If a different system, please specify

Monitoring of delivery via the Destination and World Heritage Management Plans, cultural organisation Strategic Plans, Local Authority Core Strategy, Greenwich Events Strategy Group and meetings of the WHS Executive.

9.11 - How does the tourism industry cooperate with the site management to improve visitor experiences and maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property?

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

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

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

9.13 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?

In **many locations**, but **not easily visible** to visitors

9.14 - How does visitor/tourism revenue (e.g. entry charges, permits) contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

Fees are collected, and make **some contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

9.15 - Are there locally driven sustainable tourism initiatives?

Yes

If 'Yes', please specify

Local Authority driven 'Shop Local' Scheme; local supply chains; promotion of public transport for arrival/departure; strategies to improve dwell time

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

Yes

If 'Yes', please specify

Festivals; entertainment; late night opening of attractions; local discount cards; investment in transport and infrastructure

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

Following the Pandemic in 2020, international tourism and revenue in Maritime Greenwich plummeted. With the support of the WHS, the local authority and the Destination management company, Visit Greenwich, implemented a series of strategic and ongoing recovery plans with marketing as a key element. Visitor numbers are now approaching pre-2019 levels with a particular emphasis on local and regional visitors.

10. Monitoring

10.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property directed towards management needs and/or towards improving the understanding of the Outstanding Universal Value?

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme of monitoring**, which is relevant to management needs and/or improving understanding of the Outstanding

10.2 - Is necessary information available in order to define key indicators for measuring the state of conservation and are they used in monitoring how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is being maintained?

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is **adequate and key indicators have been defined** for measuring the state of conservation and **are being used in monitoring** of how the Outstanding Universal value of the property is being maintained

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

	Extend of indicators	Not applicable	No indicators	Indicators have been defined but are not yet in use	Indicators are in place and in use since the last Periodic Reporting cycle
10.3.1	State of conservation				×
10.3.2	Effectiveness of the management system				×
10.3.3	Character of governance				×
10.3.4	Appropriate synergy with other conservation designations	×			
10.3.5	Contribution to sustainable development				×
10.3.6	Capacity development			×	

10.4 - Please provide information on relevant key indicators adopted at the property

A strategic Action Plan aligned with the Periodic Reporting cycle underpins the WHS Management Plan. This sets out actions recognised as being essential to successful management of the WHS in tabular form. The WHS Executive formally monitors programme and project activity completed, planned or in progress on a quarterly basis in the context of cost and delivery deadline. We are reviewing key indicators as part of a revision of the Management Plan.

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

World Heritage managers/coordinators and staff	Good
Local/municipal authorities	Good
Local communities	Poor
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Poor
Women	Not applicable
Researchers	Fair
Tourism industry	Good
Local businesses and industry	Good
NGOs	Good
Other specific groups	Not applicable
If you selected 'Other specific groups', please specify	

10.6 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?

No relevant Committee recommendations to implement

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

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

The Vision for Maritime Greenwich is: manage the site effectively and in a sustainable manner, conserving, enhance and promote OUV; balance the requirements of protection and conservation against the need for access and the interests of the local community; deliver benefits to the local community; develop opportunities for education and learning; add value to the local economy. An Action Plan maps objectives thematically, in tabular format, and progress made is monitored on an ongoing basis.

11. Identification of Priority Management Needs

11.1 - Identification of Priority Management Needs

5.3	Management System/Management Plan	
5.3.5	No use has been made of the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation to develop policies and best practices for the protection of the property	×
5.3.7	No use has been made of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties at the property	×
5.3.9	Some use has been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties at the property	×

5.3.17	• In a limited manner, the management system of the World Heritage property does provide ecosystem services/benefits to the local community (e.g. fresh air, water, food, medicinal plants) • In a limited manner, the management system of the World Heritage property does integrate a human rights-based approach	✕
6.1	Funding	
6.1.10	No use has been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Development at the World Heritage property	✕
7	Scientific Studies and Research Projects	
7.2	There is considerable research in the World Heritage property but it is not directed towards management needs and/or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value	✕
9	Visitor Management	
9.12	The presentation and interpretation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is acceptable but improvements could be made	✕
Please select 0 more issues.		
☒ Please save this question to reflect changes		

12. Summary and Conclusions

12.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property

12.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property

4.1	Buildings and Development						
4.1.1	Housing	Criterion (ii) Attribute: Masterplan of buildings and designed landscape.	A World Heritage Site tall buildings important views paper was published in 2006. We have have worked with neighbouring local planning authorities in Tower Hamlets and Lewisham on their tall buildings strategies to influence planning decisions.	We closely monitor potential tall building development and regularly respond to planning consultation. The WHS Management Plan is material consideration in Local Plans.	Ongoing	Royal Borough of Greenwich	None
4.1.2	Commercial development	Criterion (ii) Attribute: Greenwich Town Centre and St Alfege Church	Responses made to planning applications.	Greenwich Hospital/WHS Executive	Ongoing	Royal Borough of Greenwich and WHS Executive	None
4.2	Transportation Infrastructure						
4.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	Criterion (i) Attribute: Town Centre and St Alfege Church	RBG working with Transport for London under auspices of Mayor of London's Liveable Neighbourhood Scheme on traffic management scheme, town centre gyratory traffic system changes and pavement widening schemes	WHS Executive	2020-2024	Royal Borough of Greenwich, Transport for London	None
4.2.2	Underground transport infrastructure	Criterion (i): Attribute: Town Centre and St Alfege Church	WHS Executive working with Transport for London on the enhancement of the Curry Sark Docklands Light Railway station. Potential upgrade to Greenwich Pier planned.	WHS Executive	Cutty Sark DLR - 2022-2023 Greenwich Pier refurbishment/upgrade - timescales not known	Transport of London, Port of London Authority	None
4.2.4	Marine transport infrastructure	Criterion (i) Attribute: Town Centre and St Alfege Church	We have developed a close relationship with the Port of London Authority and contributed to the development of their current Strategy, Thames Vision 2050. This encompasses passenger transport levels, river use, culture, recreation and environment.	WHS Executive	Ongoing	Port of London Authority	None

4.2.5	Effects arising from use of transportation infrastructure	Criterion (ii) Attribute: Town Centre and St Alfege Church	Visitor movement and adequacy of transportation infrastructure kept under close scrutiny by the WHS Executive. Borough-wide strategic framework for a safe a beneficial cycling environment developed. Wayfinding kept under review.	WHS Executive	Ongoing	WHS Executive; Transport for London; Port of London Authority, Thames Clippers	None
4.4	Pollution						
4.4.4	Air pollution	Criterion (i) Attribute: Town Centre and St Alfege Church	Air quality monitoring undertaken; rolling programme of cleaning town centre historic buildings with removal of particulant build-up on external fabric due to vehicle emissions.	WHS Executive , Royal Borough of Greenwich; Greenwich Hospital.	Ongoing; 5-year rolling programme of building cleaning in Greenwich Town Centre	Royal Borough of Greenwich; Greenwich Hospital.	None
4.8	Social/Cultural uses of heritage						
4.8.6	Impacts of tourism/Visitation/Recreation	Criterion (i) Attribute: Town Centre and St Alfege Church	Wayfinding and Visitor Management strategies in place.	Visit Greenwich Destination Management Company/WHS Executive	Ongoing	Visit Greenwich	None
4.9	Other human activities						
4.9.5	Terrorism	Criterion (ii) Attribute: Architecture	Counter Terrorism Security Group established. Biannual CT Security Group meetings held. Preparations in place to meet requirements of draft Terrorism (Protection of Premises) Bill which aims at better protection in public accessible locations	WHS Executive; CT Security Group; Metropolitan Police	Ongoing	Metropolitan Police/WHS Executive	None
4.13	Management and institutional factors						
4.13.6	Human resources	Criterion (vi) Attributes: Architecture; Masterplan of buildings and designed landscape; The Grand Axis;The Royal Observatory; Town Centre and St Alfege Church	Human resources requirement kept under review. Task and deliver groups formed to undertake specific projects or drive initiatives such as re-opening Wren's Grand Axis Crossing between the Old Royal Naval College and Royal Museums Greenwich.	WHS Executive	Ongoing	WHS Executive	None

Summary - Factors affecting the Property **completed**

12.2. Summary - Management Needs

12.2.1 - Summary - Management Needs

5.3	Management System/Management Plan				
		Actions	Timeframe	Lead agency (and others involved)	More info / comment
5.3.5	No use has been made of the Historic Urban Landscape Recommendation to develop policies and best practices for the protection of the property	To consider as part of the next revision of the Management Plan	Ongoing	WHS Executive; Historic England	None
5.3.7	No use has been made of the Policy Document on the Impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage Properties at the property	To consider as part of the next revision of the Management Plan	Ongoing	WHS Executive; Historic England	None

5.3.9	Some use has been made of the Strategy for Reducing Risks from Disasters at World Heritage Properties at the property	To review as part of the next revision of the Management Plan	Ongoing	WHS Executive	None
5.3.17	- In a limited manner, the management system of the World Heritage property does provide ecosystem services/benefits to the local community (e.g. fresh air, water, food, medicinal plants) - In a limited manner, the management system of the World Heritage property does integrate a human rights-based approach	To consider as part of the next revision of the Management Plan	Ongoing	WHS Executive	None

6.1	Funding				
6.1.10	No use has been made of the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity Development at the World Heritage property	To consider as part of the next revision of the Management Plan	Ongoing	WHS Executive	None

7	Scientific Studies and Research Projects				
7.2	There is considerable research in the World Heritage property but it is not directed towards management needs and/or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value	To consider as part of the next revision of the Management Plan	Ongoing	WHS Executive	None

9	Visitor Management				
9.12	The presentation and interpretation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is acceptable but improvements could be made	To consider as part of the next revision of the Management Plan	Ongoing	WHS Executive	None

Summary - Management Needs completed

12.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

12.3.1 - Following the analysis undertaken for this report, what is the current state of Authenticity of the World Heritage property?

The Authenticity of the World Heritage property has been preserved

12.3.2 - Following the analysis undertaken for this report, what is the current state of Integrity of the World Heritage property?

The Integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

12.3.3 - Following the analysis undertaken for this report, what is the current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **maintained**.

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

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

12.3.5 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the state of conservation of the property.

Maritime Greenwich WHS is one of the best conserved and managed World Heritage properties in the UK accruing benefits for visitors and local communities alike. The combination of WHS partners encompassing key cultural organisations, Local Planning Authority and Destination management company enables the governing body to meet UNESCO's aspirations for the cultural and natural heritage as set out in the World Heritage Convention, 1972.

13. Impact of World Heritage Status

13.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas

Conservation	Very positive
Research and monitoring	Positive
Management effectiveness	Very positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Very positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Positive
International cooperation	No impact
Political support for conservation	Very positive
Legal/Policy framework	Positive
Advocacy	Very positive
Institutional coordination	Very positive
Security	Very positive
Gender equality	Positive
Provision of ecosystem services/ benefits to local communities	Positive
Social inclusion and equity, and improvement of opportunities for all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, ethnicity, origin, religion, or economic or other status	Positive
Fostering inclusive local economic development and enhancing livelihood	Very positive
Contributing to conflict prevention, including respect for cultural diversity within and around heritage properties	Positive
Other	Not applicable
If 'Other', please specify	

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

World Heritage status provides a framework for partners vested in the property to work together to protect the fabric of the site, ensure its effective and ongoing conservation, and acts as a catalyst to enhance and lend weight to a range of external funding applications.

14. Good Practice in the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention

14.1 - Example of good practice in World Heritage protection, identification, conservation or management at the property level

The governance and management framework for the property is an exemplar. The partnership of key stakeholder organisations takes great pride in the property and through its governance is committed to ensuring that Maritime Greenwich is well looked after, well managed and accessible to all. We welcome the widest possible range of people, share our deep pride with them and enrich the visitor experience by interpreting the Site's significance and exciting interest in its history. We also seek to foster the contribution of Maritime Greenwich to local and London economies and to the social and economic evolution of the developing Greenwich Peninsula. Balancing the competing priorities of visitor management and conservation of the fabric is a particular strength of the governing body.

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

State of Conservation
Management

15. Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise

15.1. Relevance of Periodic Reporting

15.1.1 - Has the Periodic Reporting process improved the understanding of the following?

The World Heritage Convention

The property's Outstanding Universal Value

Management effectiveness to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value

Monitoring and reporting

15.1.2 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities

State Party	Fair
Site Managers	Fair
UNESCO World Heritage Centre	Fair
Advisory Bodies (ICOMOS, IUCN, ICCROM)	Poor

15.2. Use of Data

15.2.1 - How do the authorities in charge of the property plan to use the data recorded from this cycle of Periodic Reporting?

Revision of priorities/strategies/policies for the protection, management and conservation of heritage

Update of management plans

Awareness raising

Advocacy

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

Whilst a report and action plan encompassing the entire Europe and North American region will be interesting, an analysis of the key challenges and learning points at national level would be very helpful. Data collected and collated at UNESCO regional level may be too diluted to reach meaningful conclusions given the differences and disparities between World Heritage properties across one particular region.

15.3. Timing and resources

15.3.1 - Entities involved in the filling out of this online questionnaire (tick as many boxes as applicable)

Governmental institutions responsible for cultural and natural heritage

Site Manager/Coordinator World Heritage property staff

Staff from other World Heritage properties

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

Gender balance has **not been explicitly** considered or implemented in the process.

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

Yes

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

30 / 25 / 65 /

15.3.5 - Did you mobilise any additional resources to fill out this questionnaire?

	Additional resources	No	Yes
15.3.5.1	Human resources		×
15.3.5.2	Financial resources for organizing consultation meetings/ training	×	

15.4. Format and content of the Periodic Report

15.4.1 - How accessible was the information required to complete this questionnaire?

All required information was accessible.

15.4.2 - Was the questionnaire easy to use and clear to understand?

		Very Difficult	Difficult	Easy	Very easy
15.4.2.1	Ease of use of questionnaire			×	

15.4.3 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

Some questions could be more focussed and tailored to meet the specificity of differing sites i.e. single or multi-ownership/managed sites. Some of the questions relating to funding and human resources are far too generic and therefore the assumption is that conclusions drawn from a final analysis based on a range of vastly different World Heritage properties may be meaningless.

15.5. Training and Guidance

15.5.1 - Please rate the level of support in terms of training and guidance from the following entities in completing this questionnaire

UNESCO World Heritage Centre	Good
UNESCO (other sectors/field offices)	No support
UNESCO National Commission	No support
ICOMOS International	No support
IUCN International	Not applicable
ICCROM international/regional	No support
ICOMOS national/regional	No support
IUCN national/regional	Not applicable

15.5.2 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Reporting questionnaire from the following entities

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

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

Yes

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

15.6. Actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

15.6.1 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

- **Map(s)**

Reason for update: The World Heritage Centre identified in December 2022 that they did not hold an up-to-date clear map of the Maritime Greenwich WHS which showed the delimitation of the property. The property is in the process of producing the requested map in line with the World Heritage Centre's technical requirements, with support from Historic England. It will be submitted for the approval of the World Heritage Committee in advance of 46COM along with others from the UK State Party.

- **Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the property as adopted by the World Heritage Committee**

Reason for update: There are a number of factual updates to the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value that can be provided separately.

Changes to these items will need to go through the proper processes.

15.7. Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise

15.7.1 - Comments, conclusions and/or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting Exercise

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