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Site description:

Situated near the southern margin of the Red River Delta, the Trang An Landscape Complex is a spectacular landscape of limestone karst peaks permeated with valleys, many of them partly submerged and surrounded by steep, almost vertical cliffs. Exploration of caves at different altitudes has revealed archaeological traces of human activity over a continuous period of more than 30,000 years. They illustrate the occupation of these mountains by seasonal hunter-gatherers and how they adapted to major climatic and environmental changes, especially the repeated inundation of the landscape by the sea after the last ice age. The story of human occupation continues through the Neolithic and Bronze Ages to the historical era. Hoa Lu, the ancient capital of Viet Nam, was strategically established here in the 10th and 11th centuries AD. The property also contains temples, pagodas, paddy-fields and small villages. © UNESCO
IUCN World Heritage Outlook: https://worldheritageoutlook.iucn.org
Trang An Landscape Complex - 2017 Conservation Outlook Assessment
The IUCN evaluation of the Trang An Landscape Complex, which was inscribed in 2014, concluded positively on the potential natural World Heritage values of this relatively small site under criteria (vii) and (viii). The property has been described as “a relatively small but exquisite geological property that displays more clearly than any other on the World Heritage List the end stages of karst landscape evolution near sea level in a humid tropical environment” (IUCN Evaluation, 2014). However, the property’s small size in the face of a number of current and potentially significant threats raises serious concern. Its values are in good condition, but of great concern is the threat of rapidly increasing tourism pressure on the site in the absence of articulated measures to mitigate the negative consequences of overcrowding within the property’s tourism areas. In parallel with the increasing tourism pressure is the planned urbanization of the property’s rural aesthetics to facilitate the resettlement of an undisclosed portion of the local populace and to establish a university with some 20,000 residents within the buffer zone.

In response to the World Heritage committees concern as to the threat posed by development, human activities and increasing tourism to the property’s values the State Party presented a proposed revision of the boundary and a revised management plan for consideration by the 40th Session of the Committee in 2016. At that Session the Committee approved the boundary revision but concluded that the revised plan did not include adequate measures concerning the management of tourism. The State Party was consequently requested to address a number of concerns about this weakness in the revised plan, in order to give assurances that values will be protected in the future (WH Committee
Decision 40 COM 7B.67).

Overall THREATS

High Threat

The landscaping transformation in and around the buffer zone to resettle displaced residents together with a planned university increasing the buffer zone population by 20,000 pose a high threat to the scenic amenity of an extraordinarily beautiful and awe-inspiring tower karst landscape. The present cultural landscape of paddy fields and rural dwellings provides an appropriate aesthetic landscape foreground to the dramatic and precipitous fengcong and fenglin landscape elements, however the proposed urbanization of the landscape is a high threat to these rural and natural values. The forecast increase in tourism from the present 1 million to 2 million by 2020 is both dramatic and desirable, yet highly alarming if it is inadequately planned and managed. This potential tourism growth along with its increased infrastructure support and service provision developments poses a high threat to the Trang An OUV.

Overall PROTECTION and MANAGEMENT

Some Concern

Trang An has a reasonably effective protection and management regime in place however, a weakness in its capacity to plan and manage for rapidly increasing tourism demand raises significant concern (IUCN Evaluation Mission, 2013; IUCN Evaluation, 2014).
FULL ASSESSMENT

Description of values

Values

World Heritage values

► Extraordinarily beautiful and awe-inspiring tower karst landscape
   Criterion:(vii)
   The tower karst landscape of Trang An is a spectacular system of forest-mantled limestone rock towers up to 200m-high. The property incorporates a footcave enclosed depression (cockpit) landscape that is considered by experts to be the best in the world. The cockpit landscape is characterized by sharp ridges enclosing deep depressions filled by waterways that are interconnected by a myriad of subterranean cave passages, all contributing to a multi-sensory visitor experience. As Trang An is a mixed site blending with the forests are extensive rice paddy fields bordering streams, with local farmers and fisher folk engaged in their traditional way of life. The dramatic mountains, secretive caves and sacred places in Trang An have inspired people through countless generations. (IUCN Evaluation, 2014; WHC 38COM Decision, 2014).

► An exceptional geological site showcasing the final stages of tower karst landscape evolution in a humid tropical environment
   Criterion:(viii)
   The property demonstrates a series of classical karst landforms, including towers, cones, enclosed depressions (cockpits), interior-draining valleys (poljes), foot caves and subterranean cave passages with speleothems. These landforms are a result of the deep dissection of an uplifted limestone massif over a period of five million years. Trang An is unusual in being an
autogenic (rainfed only) karst system. The presence of transitional forms between ‘fengcong’ karst with ridges connecting towers, and ‘fenglin’ karst where towers stand isolated on alluvial plains is an extremely significant feature of the property. Former fluctuations of sea level are evidenced by a series erosion notches in cliffs, with associated caves, wave-cut platforms, beach deposits and marine shell layers. (WHC 38COM Decision, 2014).

Other important biodiversity values

▶ Significant biodiversity values related to scenic amenity and karst landform development processes.

There are natural biological values that contribute to the scenery and aesthetics of the property and to the evolutionary processes that underpin the development of the property’s complex karst systems. The natural rainforest cover of the landscape ensures that natural karst processes are ongoing. The property is also home to the “near threatened” native Chinese Serow (Capricornis milneedwardsi). (IUCN Evaluation Mission, 2013)

Assessment information

Threats

Current Threats

High Threat

The relatively large resident population at the time of nomination combined with the relocation of an unspecified number of them to ‘transformed’ landscapes in and around the buffer zone (IUCN Evaluation, 2014) had already raised some concern, and which, when combined with the projected Bai Dinh university population 20,000 people within the buffer zone (WHC 40 COM Decision 7B.67, 2016) elevates the threat of residential and commercial development to landscape values from ‘Low’ to ‘High’. Other concerns stem from active dredging work being undertaken for
maintenance purposes and the impact of domestic goats on the property’s values.

► **Mining/ Quarrying**  
  **Low Threat**  
  **Outside site**

Limestone mining for cement or for ornamental sculptures is a local industry based on the local high quality Lower Triassic limestone karst exposures. Quarrying areas have been excluded from the property and a larger cement facility was excluded from the buffer zone prior to inscription. Pollution impacts from limestone mining to the south of the property’s buffer zone are considered to be minimal due to prevailing winds that carry any dust and pollutants away from the property. Blasting associated with the mining will be heard at some distance and within the property (IUCN Evaluation, 2014)

► **Dams/ Water Management or Use**  
  **High Threat**  
  **Inside site**

Active dredging work is undertaken within the property for maintenance purposes. The State Party contends that this does not impact the natural water flow regimes, water quality or water levels. Nonetheless dredging could be undertaken to improve footcave access so has the potential to adversely impact OUV and needs to be the subject of a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment. (IUCN Evaluation Mission, 2013; SP Nomination Supplementary Report, 2014)

► **Invasive Non-Native/ Alien Species**  
  **Data Deficient**  
  **Inside site**  
  **Outside site**

Two introduced animal species have been identified in the property: one a species of snail, the other being semi-wild goats. Natural karst evolutionary processes are dependent on naturally functioning ecosystems including intact biodiversity. These processes may be impacted by introduced species. Domestic goats in particular are considered to be a threat to natural catchment processes in addition to potentially impacting the near-threatened
Chinese Serow (Capricornis milneedwardsii). The SP reports that some local farmers allow cattle to stray onto the property. (SP Nomination, 2013) (IUCN Evaluation, 2014)

**Housing/ Urban Areas**

- **High Threat**
- **Inside site, scattered (5-15%)**

At the time of its inscription some 14,000 people lived within the property (SP Nomination, 2013) and areas near the Trang An visitor centre and between Ninh Binh city and the property are being urbanized for resettlement of an unspecified number of people displaced from elsewhere within the property. (IUCN Evaluation, 2014)

Furthermore the World Heritage Committee noted with concern that the revised Management Plan (submitted in 2015 as requested at the time of inscription) refers to a proposed university area in Bai Dinh which will result in a population growth of 20,000 people within the buffer zone by 2030. Consequently the State Party was requested to submit for review by the World Heritage Centre detailed information on proposed development within the property and its buffer zone prior to any decisions being taken that could be difficult to reverse.

In addition to submitting such information to the WHC the State Party is requested to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment for development of the buffer zone, taking into account potential impacts on the OUV of the property prior to allowing any such development to take place. (WHC 40 COM Decision 7B.67, 2016)

**Potential Threats**

- **High Threat**

The management of impacts by the projected increase in tourism – from 1 million to 2 million with a potential peak of 50,000 in a single day – is not adequately addressed in the revised management plan (WHC40 Decision 7B.67) and inadequately planned tourism poses a significant threat to OUV of the property.

**Tourism/ Recreation Areas**

- **Very High Threat**
Inside site, widespread (15-50%)

Visitation to Trang An is forecast to double to 2 million people per year over the period 2011 to 2020 raising concerns about the potentially serious impacts this could have on the property’s OUV (IUCN Evaluation, 2014), and the State Party was requested to address these concerns in a revised management plan to be submitted for consideration by the 40th session of the Committee in 2016. (WHC 38.Decision 8B.14).

However, after a review of the revised Plan the Committee has found that it does not include adequate measures concerning the management of tourism and has requested the State Party to:

• ensure that measures are in place to limit overcrowding
• establish clearly justified maximum daily quotas for peak and normal visitation days
• undertake an assessment of the facilities and services required to adequately service the anticipated increase in visitation, including the extrapolated festival-day peaks of up to 50,000 people
• clarify whether or not any additional recreational activities are to be encouraged, where they will be permitted, what facilities will be provided and identify the potential impacts on OUV and how they will be addressed.
• provide an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above issue for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd session in 2018 (WHC40 Decision 7B.67)

Protection and management

Assessing Protection and Management

▶ Relationships with local people
   Mostly Effective

In February 2012, there were 14,383 residents in the property and 21,109 in the buffer zone, many of whom live in small villages and hamlets. There appear to have been commendable efforts to consult with local people during the nomination process with a view to securing broad based support for the site to become World Heritage. This included awareness raising campaigns, meetings and surveys to ascertain local support. Some local people were also
involved in the development of the Management Plan for the Landscape Complex (IUCN Evaluation Mission, 2013)

▶ Legal framework and enforcement

Mostly Effective

Trang An Landscape Complex is largely secured within three statutory protected areas (the An-Tam Coc-Bich Dong Scenic Landscape, Hoa Lu Special Use Forest and the Hoa Lu Ancient Capital) owned by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam and controlled by the Ninh Binh Provincial People’s Committee. It has been accorded the highest legal status for protection available in Viet Nam.

Management of the property is delegated to an independent agency, the Trang An Landscape Complex Management Board, which has extensive decision-making powers, responsibilities and resources. The Board has close functional links to Government ministries, research institutes, and commercial and community stakeholders. It is guided by a Government-approved and legally binding management plan which is modelled on the highest international standards to address all important factors affecting the property. (WHC 38COM Decision, 2014)

A concern raised by IUCN in its evaluation report relates to the delegation of protection and management responsibility in the context of tourism development through the granting of a 70 year private sector lease over the 3,000 hectare Trang An – Tam Coc – Bich Dong Scenic Landscape. The lease is for the management of protection, conservation, tourist and promotional activities and delegates the management of the tourism services to this private sector interest. There are also four other private resort operations within the property. Concerns stem from this poorly defined protection regime and the latitude afforded by current laws in permitting tourism and other infrastructure development (IUCN Evaluation Mission, 2013) (WHC 38COM Decision, 2014).

▶ Enforcement

Data Deficient

The property is well protected within a national and provincial legislative framework based on four primary national legal statutes applying to
protection and use of the property. They include extensive measures for identification, recognition, protection, preservation, management, research, monitoring, reporting, and promotion of the cultural and natural values and attributes of the property. Importantly they include enforcement measures for specifying violations and illegal activities and for the discipline and prosecution of offences. Data however, is unavailable to assess the effectiveness of enforcement measures (TALC Management Plan 2015).

▶ Integration into regional and national planning systems

Some Concern

Most of the property is secured within three statutory national protected areas and regulations concerning management, protection and promotion of heritage values have been developed at both central and provincial government level (SP Nomination, 2013; SP Nomination supplementary report, 2014). Provincial aspirations clearly support tourism development and its potential benefits so it is essential that management of the property be planned in an integrated way with regional and indeed national tourism development planning. However, the revised management plan, which includes a section referred to as the ‘tourism management plan’ does not adequately address management of the potential for the projected increase in tourism to impact on the OUV of the property (WH Committee Decision 40 COM 7B.67).

▶ Management system

Some Concern

A management plan was included in the documentation presented as the nomination of Trang An Landscape Complex for inclusion on the World Heritage List and in response to concerns expressed by the World Heritage Committee at the time of inscription, the State Party revised the management plan for the property in consultation with the property’s many stakeholders. This revised plan was presented at the 40th session of the Committee which noted some concern in regard to its content and has asked the State Party to amend some aspects of the plan, particularly in regard to management of potential overcrowding by tourism growth (WH Committee Decision 40 COM
Management effectiveness

Mostly Effective

The management plan provides a vision for management of the property through to the year 2030 and addresses all foreseen issues affecting the property by providing a background explanation of the issue, the objectives of management in regard to the issue, actions required to achieve the objectives and the evaluation measures required to ascertain the effectiveness of management.

Annexed to the management plan is a detailed Action Plan for the period 2016 to 2020.

The management plan is, overall, a highly effective tool (TALC Management Plan, 2015), however, it fails to adequately address the potential threat posed by increased visitation.

Implementation of Committee decisions and recommendations

Highly Effective

At the 38th session of the WH Committee the State Party was requested to:
(1) submit a revised management plan and zoning plan which includes a tourism management plan;
(2) provide continued support for archaeological research;
(3) update the archaeological management plan as new information becomes available;
(4) ensure effective implementation of the tourism section of the management plan including its measures for preventing overcrowding and environmental impacts; and
(5) modify the boundary of the property to better reflect the areas and attributes of Outstanding Universal Value and ensure an appropriate surrounding buffer zone.

The State Party submitted its response to these requests to the World Heritage Centre in December 2015 and at its 40th Session the Committee acknowledged the progress made in addressing concerns regarding the boundaries of the property and revision of management plan as well as the steps taken to support ongoing archaeological and palaeo-environmental research.
Additional requests made by the Committee at that meeting are not due for response until December 2017 (WH Committee Decision 40 COM 7B.67).

**Boundaries**  
**Highly Effective**

All of the key elements of a fengcong and fenglin Karst landscape are present within the inscribed property and the natural processes of Karst development are on-going. However, whilst the property was of sufficient size to include all of the values that underpin World Heritage criteria (vii) and (viii), the boundary as selected was not the most appropriate in relation to natural criteria, as it included developed areas and infrastructure which detracted from the OUV (IUCN Evaluation, 2014).

In its December 2015 response to the World Heritage Centre the State Party proposed minor boundary changes to resolve this concern and the proposed changes were approved by the Committee in 2016 (WH Committee Decision 40 COM 8B.36).

**Sustainable finance**  
**Highly Effective**

The 2013 IUCN Evaluation report cites that the average annual funding for development and management of the property is an adequate USD500,000, with capital investment funding in the order of some US$7 million in recent years while the management plan notes spending of VND3000 Billion since year 2000 and details an action plan for 2016-2020 with a funding requirement of around VND2,300 Billion to be spent on investment, repair, restoration, resettlement, research, infrastructure improvement etc.

The bulk of this is anticipated to be provided by international and national research donors with an annual input of VND 100-130 billion sourced from tourism revenue; project funding from national and international sources as well as voluntary contributions. While the action plan could well be regarded as ambitious, failure to complete the plan in its entirety is not likely to threaten the property’s OUV (TALC Management Plan 2015).

**Staff training and development**  
**Mostly Effective**
The Trang An Landscape Complex Management Board has primary responsibility for all aspects of day-to-day management of the property. As at December 2015 the Board had a staff of 84 persons including an executive of 3, administration support (12), researchers (10), project management and infrastructure maintenance (14), Promotion and International Cooperation (6), Environmental Management (7) and a group of 32 responsible for ticket sales, security and guiding services. The plan specifically noted that there was a need to increase staff in the areas of researcher and international cooperation.

The plan provides for staff training and capacity building but focuses specifically on cultural heritage management along with educational programs and interpretation. It does not mention any need for training in regard to geodiversity and /or karst management, biodiversity or, significantly given the forecast growth in visitation, tourism management.

The plan acknowledges that there would be much to be gained from the ability of the Board to call on support and expert advice from external sources and it proposes to establish a Management and Scientific Advisory Committee (TALC Management Plan 2015).

▶ Sustainable use

Some Concern

At the time of nomination of the property the State Party reported that: (1) the great majority of residents residing in the property were subsistence gardeners and fishing folk who, along with some townships and four small resorts, with their limited associated transport and utilities infrastructure, had no detrimental impact on the cultural and natural values of the property; and (2) the property’s policies of sustainable use and management of resources are fully aligned with well recognized and accepted policies and principles for the sustainable development and management of protected areas (SP Nomination supplementary report, 2014). However, concerns were noted regarding a development as opposed to conservation emphasis within the Management Plan and the potential impact of unplanned tourism was also noted (IUCN Evaluation, 2014), and the State Party was asked to address these issues in a revised management plan which was reviewed by the Committee at its 40th session in July 2016.

The Committee had significant concern that the revised plan did not include
adequate measures concerning the management of tourism and cultural heritage, and further noted, with concern, that the revised plan referred a projected buffer zone population growth of 20,000 people associated with a new urban university development. Consequentially the State Party was requested to comprehensively address these threats to the sustainable use of the property in an updated report on the state of conservation of the property for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd session in 2018 (WH Committee Decision 40 COM 7B.67).

▶ Education and interpretation programs

Data Deficient

The revised management plan acknowledges the important role of interpretation has raising awareness of and respect for the property’s OUV and notes the Boards intent to develop and implement a comprehensive interpretation plan to help orient visitors to the property, influence their behaviour and enhance their experience. However, in the absence of any data on progress on the interpretation plan and its implementation an assessment of effectiveness is not possible (TALC Management Plan 2015).

▶ Tourism and interpretation

Serious Concern

Concerns regarding the capacity of management to cope with a projected increase in tourism to 2m p.a. by 2020 resulted in the State Party being requested to submit a revised management plan for consideration by the 40th Session of the Committee in 2016. The tourism management section of the revised plan includes provision for visitor centres, site interpretation, promotion and marketing, visitor safety and access to and within the property. It includes a detailed consideration of overcrowding and the need to ensure that environmental, social and management carrying capacity are not exceeded and infers that overcrowding can be controlled by limiting the number of boats available to transport visitors to points of interest within the property. The analysis provided to support this is based on the premise that boats are only able to make two trips in a day, but during a workshop in 2015 it was observed that there are days when boats do as many as four trips in a day. The ‘conclusion’
is lacking in that the stated maximum of 3,000 boats will be adjusted if there is any evidence that visitor numbers are exceeding the desired conditions and carrying capacity, but no attempt is made to identify the desired conditions nor to quantify a carrying capacity (TALC Management Plan 2015). The WH Committee has noted this weakness and requested the State Party to address it (WH Committee Decision 40 COM 7B.67).

突安文化遗产景观——2017年保护展望评估

▶ 监测
数据不足

修订计划承认监测的重要性，并提供了一个全面的问题描述，需要在整个计划的各个方面进行监测（TALC管理计划2015），不过没有数据可用评估任何监测要求的实施。

▶ 研究
数据不足

在委员会要求继续支持正在进行的考古研究和出版的请求下，国家委员会建议，在2015年6月，管理委员会与剑桥大学和贝尔法斯特女王大学在英国签订了合作计划，为期五年（2015-2020）。为了支持这一点，修订计划在考古学和古环境研究方面有很强的焦点，一个次要的评论指出需要研究旅游的影响，以及一个对继续研究该财产生物价值的简单评论（TALC管理计划2015）。在没有数据的情况下，对研究计划的有效性进行评论是不可能的。

综合评估

部分担忧

突安文化遗产景观有一个相当有效的保护和管理机制，但其在规划和管理迅速增加的旅游需求方面的能力不足，引发了极大担忧（IUCN评估团，等）。

突安文化遗产景观——2017年保护展望评估
Assessment of the effectiveness of protection and management in addressing threats outside the site

Some Concern

The main threat to the OUV of the property is the external pressure from both national and provincial governments on the management authority - the Board - to not just accept a rapid growth in visitor arrivals but for the Board to actively pursue a 100% growth in visitation over the 5 year life of the plan; and, while it does acknowledge concerns about overcrowding the capacity of management to deal with the projected/targeted growth is untested and inadequately addressed in the plan (TALC Management Plan 2015).

Best practice examples

The State Party's response to the requests made by the Committee at the time of the site's inscription has been rapid and effective, in particular in addressing concerns raised about the boundary design of the site. The process of modifying these boundaries has included the participation of a wide range of stakeholders, and has benefited from advice provided by the Committee's advisory bodies (IUCN and ICOMOS) at the request and initiative of the State Party.

State and trend of values

Assessing the current state and trend of values

World Heritage values

Extraordinarily beautiful and awe-inspiring tower karst landscape

High Concern

Trend: Data Deficient

The Trang An Landscape Complex contains a relatively undisturbed “core area” of superlative natural phenomena and of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance which is quite confined in its total area. (IUCN Evaluation mission, 2013). Whilst the site's natural values remain intact,
significant concerns relate to the adverse impacts of a large and rapid tourism growth which is considered a significant threat to the values of Trang An given it’s relatively small area (IUCN Evaluation, 2014). As this is a new World Heritage site data on trends is unavailable, although the recent use of the property as a movie set and promotion of a village constructed on site for that purpose has created a ‘theme-park’ mentality within the tourism industry and which is cited as the cause of increased tourist numbers in the province (vietnamtravel.indochinacharm.com - blog Apr 20, 2017).

**An exceptional geological site showcasing the final stages of tower karst landscape evolution in a humid tropical environment**

*Low Concern*

*Trend: Data Deficient*

The property displays a natural area of fengcong dominated karst in the inner part and protects an overall diverse karst landscape. The karst values of Trang An are again substantially intact, however, are equally threatened by areas of development and human activity and by the potential impact from growing tourism (IUCN Evaluation, 2014). Potential dredging impacts and potential alteration to the footcaves, including the adverse provision of utilities (cave lighting) are of concern.

**Summary of the Values**

**Assessment of the current state and trend of World Heritage values**

*High Concern*

*Trend: Data Deficient*

In response to the World Heritage committees concern as to the threat posed by development, human activities and increasing tourism to the property’s values the State Party presented a proposed revision of the boundary and a revised management plan for consideration by the 40th Session of the Committee in 2016. At that Session the Committee approved the boundary revision but concluded that the revised plan did not include adequate measures concerning the management of tourism. The State Party was consequently requested to address a number of concerns about this weakness in the revised plan, in order to give assurances that values will be
protected in the future (WH Committee Decision 40 COM 7B.67).

► **Assessment of the current state and trend of other important biodiversity values**

**Low Concern**

**Trend: Data Deficient**

The forest cover and associated fauna are an integral part of the natural Karst landform development process at Trang An and the management of these values, their condition and change in condition and threats such as the presence of semi-wild domestic goats, are acknowledged and monitoring of their numbers and any impacts on the property's OUV is provided for in the revised plan (TALC Management Plan, 2015).

### Additional information

#### Benefits

**Understanding Benefits**

► **Outdoor recreation and tourism**

Eco-tourism contributes substantially to the local economy. The further promotion of sustainable tourism may increase employment and strengthen it further. It is hoped that the growth in tourism may contribute to a reduction in poverty for the residents, whilst fostering an optimal use of resources. (SP Nomination supplementary report, 2014)

► **History and tradition**

There has been a remarkably long and continuous cultural history at the site for around 30,000 years and traditional festivals and cultural events are commonplace. (SP Nomination, 2013) (IUCN Evaluation, 2014)

► **Fishing areas and conservation of fish stocks, Traditional agriculture**
Traditional landholders undertake agriculture that includes growing rice, raising livestock (ducks) and fishing. (IUCN, Evaluation mission, 2013)

**Summary of benefits**

Benefits are derived from some 14,000 residents living within property and another 21,000 or so inhabitants in the buffer zone, which encircles the property. Tràng An is claimed by the State Party to be a unique example in South east Asia of human-environment interaction where local people live and work following traditional subsistence practices, and have been present for 30,000 years. (SP Nomination, 2013)

**Projects**

**Compilation of active conservation projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Organization/ individuals</th>
<th>Project duration</th>
<th>Brief description of Active Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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