



IUCN WORLD HERITAGE EVALUATION PROCESS

FIELD MISSION REPORT TO THE IUCN WORLD HERITAGE PANEL

Reporting format for field evaluators including explanatory notes

Please complete this form in English.

Where missions are undertaken by two evaluators, a single joint mission report must be provided.

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL, INTERNAL TO IUCN

This report does not represent the formal or final view of IUCN, and is one element of IUCN's World Heritage evaluation process.

This mission report is one of several components of the IUCN evaluation process of World Heritage nominations made under the natural World Heritage criteria (criteria vii, viii, ix and x). The report presents the findings and recommendations of the field evaluator(s) based on a site visit. The IUCN World Heritage Panel will subsequently consider this report in addition to the nomination document, a comparative analysis undertaken by UNEP-WCMC, independent desktop reviews from members of IUCN networks and other relevant information, including possible supplementary information that is provided by the nominating State Party. Based on all these elements, the IUCN Panel will elaborate IUCN's recommendation to the World Heritage Committee. The role of the field evaluator(s) is to inform the IUCN World Heritage Panel. However, given the multiple sources of information considered by the IUCN Panel, the final IUCN evaluation report may differ from the technical field mission report in terms of conclusions and recommendations.

Please note that this report is internal and is a report to the IUCN World Heritage Panel from the IUCN evaluation team only. It is to be retained as strictly confidential to the IUCN World Heritage Panel, and when completed the evaluator should provide this to IUCN only. The views within it may not be shared except with the other IUCN evaluator, and with the World Heritage Programme of IUCN. The report will be retained as a confidential document by IUCN, so the evaluators are free to express their views in full and no information will be released on their views outside of the World Heritage Panel.

Further notes:

- Not all questions might be relevant to each nomination. In this instance, questions can be skipped.
- The suggested amount of words is in fact a suggestion; feel free to write more or less, but keeping in mind that this new form encourages brevity.
- Some sections requires a bit more writing than other; understand that your efforts will not be vain as we may use parts of your text in the IUCN evaluation report to the World Heritage Committee.

1. Basic information on the nomination and evaluation mission

1A. Summary information on the nomination

Nominating State Party/ies (and lead state party for transnational nominations)		
Full name of nomination (English name/French name)		
UNESCO ID number		
Criterion / criteria under which the site is nominated		
Area of nominated property (ha):		
Area of buffer zones (ha):		
Mixed nomination	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Cultural landscape nomination	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Serial nomination (list number of component parts)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> (number of component parts:)	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Transboundary nomination	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Dates of field mission (itinerary to be annexed)		
Summary of stakeholders met on mission (full list of people met to be annexed)		
Additional information officially requested		
IUCN Evaluator(s) (please also note name(s) of ICOMOS representative(s) if applicable)		
Date of submission of report		

1B. Past consideration by the World Heritage Committee (if applicable)

1B1. Previous nominations related to this site (e.g. past referral/deferral/extensions).

Please provide details here.

1B2. Previous Committee decisions (eg if this nomination has previously been recommended or encouraged by the Committee).

Please provide details here.

2. Evaluators overview of natural values of the nominated property

2A. Summary description

*This section should summarise the natural values of the nominated property, and should also briefly described the other important values of the property. It introduces the nominated property and sets the stage for the subsequent evaluation in detail. Please extract the **key information** contained in the nomination document while **adding your own observations** whenever applicable. It should provide a description of the main natural values and features of the property, and, as relevant, the landscape(s) within which it is located. This should briefly convey the context for the natural values, including significant cultural values of the property and its surroundings.*

The following information should be included:

- *The full name of the nominated property and, in the case of serial sites, the full names of all components in the form of a simple table;*
- *In the case of transboundary or transnational nominations, a table showing the area by country in addition to the total area;*
- *The general location and size of the nominated property and, if applicable, all its components, including any buffer zone(s) that are proposed to protect the nominated property (note that buffer zones are not included in the nominated property but are additional areas that are designed to protect it;*
- *Buffer zones can be added but do not have to be part of the nominated property. It should be clearly stated whether a State Party has included a buffer zone as part of the property or not;*
- *The IUCN Protected Area category/ies of the property if applicable.*

Evaluator comments here (suggested word length: 750 words). Please add your personal input and thoughts and do not simply copy-paste the text from the nomination dossier.

2B: Evaluators comments on the adequacy of the nomination document:

Please clearly state if the information provided in the nomination dossier is adequate to support the assessment of the nomination, and indicate the extent to which it is insufficient, incorrect or inaccurate in your view.

Strengths of the dossier:

Weaknesses of the dossier:

In your opinion, did the nomination dossier and / or the field mission include “adequate” or “excessive” use of resources?

Are you aware of any other recent property evaluations (and associated recommendations) of similar properties or properties with similar values that might play into the current property evaluation?

3. Mission conclusions relevant to Outstanding Universal Value

Important note to evaluators.

The Operational Guidelines define Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) as a value “so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity” (paragraph 49). The Guidelines also note explicitly that the World Heritage List is “not intended to protect all properties of great interest, importance or value, but only for a select list of the most outstanding of these from an international viewpoint” (Paragraph 52).

*It is important to note that the Operational Guidelines clearly state that OUV is not restricted to meeting World Heritage criteria (the criteria are outlined in Paragraph 77 of the OG. The OG also note that: “To be deemed of Outstanding Universal Value, a property must also meet the conditions of integrity (...) and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding” (paragraph 78). The IUCN evaluation process uses desk reviews and comparative analysis to consider the question of values, and it is essential for field evaluators to note that a comprehensive conclusion on the nomination is not the primary purpose of the field mission (this is the role of the World Heritage Panel). Consequently, when commenting on OUV the role of field evaluators is primarily to provide their assessment on its integrity, protection and management. IUCN is also interested in comments from the field mission on the conservation value of the property at an international level, but **the assessment of whether the nomination meets the World Heritage criteria is not the primary focus of the mission.***

3A. Conservation values from a global perspective (suggested word limit: 300-400 words per criterion)

Building upon the Context and Overview of Natural Values, this section invites evaluators to provide their considered judgment, based on the nomination and other information, about whether the site meet the natural World Heritage criteria for which it has been nominated (one or more of criteria vii, viii, ix and x).

*For the purpose of the evaluation process it may be helpful to differentiate different levels of conservation importance: **Global Significance, Regional Significance, National Significance, Sub-national Significance.** Only nominated properties of global significance can be considered as promising candidates for recognition as World Heritage Sites. This judgment requires a careful review of the comparative analysis documented in the nomination dossier but more importantly it requires the evaluators to use all available information, including but not limited to thematic studies, to make their own global comparative analysis. This is among the most demanding tasks of the evaluation process. Tables can be very useful in demonstrating quantitative and qualitative comparisons.*

If evaluators do not feel in a position to make a decisive assessment, this is fully acceptable, and evaluators may also wish to pose key issues that the panel may wish to consider in reaching its judgement in relation to the different criteria. It should be noted that the views of the field evaluation should be provided in relation to each of the different criteria for which the site is nominated, and evaluators may also wish to comment on additional criteria that are not part of the nomination. They are particularly welcome for sites nominated in relation to criterion vii, since the values in relation to “superlative phenomena and aesthetic values” are more subjective than those in relation to other criteria, and first hand experience is extremely valuable in relation to such criteria.

Did you find the Global Comparative Analysis presented in the dossier to be complete,

accurate, and comprehensive?
Did the Global Comparative Analysis treat all of the values or attributes that were described in the dossier?
Evaluators' comments on significance of values of the property: please make a separate comment for each applicable nominated natural criterion and if you consider the property also meets other natural criteria please also comment upon those.
Evaluator comment on criterion (vii):
Evaluator comment on criterion (viii):
Evaluator comment on criterion (ix):
Evaluator comment on criterion (x):

3B. Meeting conditions of integrity (suggested word limit per question: 500 words)

3B1: Evaluation of current integrity

Integrity is defined in paragraphs 87-95 of the Operational Guidelines as “a measure of wholeness and intactness of the property”. The evaluation should assess whether the nominated property: a) includes all elements necessary to express its Outstanding Universal Value; b) is of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and processes which convey the property’s significance; c) suffers from adverse effects of development and/or neglect. Evaluators should review the required conditions of integrity for each criterion in the Operational Guidelines (paragraphs. 90-95) and provide information on how the property does or does not meet the conditions of integrity. If the conditions are not met in the view of the evaluator(s), they are asked to state what would be necessary for the conditions to be met.

3B1a. Are all the elements and processes necessary to express the property’s OUV included in the nomination?

Evaluators comment on 3B1a here.

3B1b. Is the property of sufficient size, and is the protected area design (boundaries, zonation and buffer zones) sufficient to sustain its conservation values? Please include specific comments on:

- Adequacy of property boundaries:
- Adequacy of buffer zone arrangements, including boundaries
- Adequacy of any zonation scheme for the property and its surrounding landscape
- Adequacy of the connectivity of the property with its surrounding landscape and with related protected areas.

Evaluators comment on 3B1b here.

3B1c. Has the property suffered from past development and/or neglect, and is it possible to remediate this?

Evaluators comment on 3B1c here.

3B2. Evaluation of Current Threats to the Property

Issues of the property suffering from past development and/or neglect, or deficiencies in

management and protection, should be covered under the integrity and protection and management sections above. This section is intended to provide information on the current and potential future threats to the property in addition to any issues noted previously.

Current or potential threats are diverse and may include mining, dams, encroachment, disturbance, energy and transportation infrastructure, pollution, excessive resource use, invasive species, climate change, security, unregulated or excessive public use, and others. The threats should be assessed against the conservation values of the property, impact on stakeholders and the willingness, capacity and options to deal with them. Where threats need to be tackled, the report should indicate at what level they should be addressed (noting that some threats are beyond the control of site managers and may require action by other actors, including at the national level). This section requires the evaluator(s) to use a wide range of information sources. There are many considerations here, partially overlapping with integrity and management/protection questions.

It is now the case that most nominations come with the anticipation of tourism generation to each nominated property, if inscribed. Please therefore make a specific reference in this section to the degree to which tourism is a current or potential threat to the property, and what difference you consider World Heritage inscription may make to the property, and the preparedness of the property to cope with any increased tourism pressure resulting from World Heritage listing.

Evaluator comment on threats. (Suggested word limit: 750 words) Please add your thoughts and do not simply copy-paste the text from the nomination dossier.

3C. Protection and Management (Suggested word limit per question: 400 words)

Evaluators are asked to provide their judgment if the nominated property has adequate long-term legislative, regulatory, formal institutional and/or traditional protection and management in place to ensure that the values and the integrity are maintained. Paragraphs 99 - 119 of the Operational Guidelines provide useful guidance on the various dimensions of management and protection, including management systems, participation and sustainable use.

Please also consider paragraphs 134 - 136 of the Operational Guidelines for transboundary nominations and paragraphs 137 - 139 for serial nominations.

3C1. Presence and adequacy of legal protection and management framework and/or traditional management of the nominated property, and its application, including consideration of interactions with the wider landscape and connectivity.

Evaluator comments here.

3C2. Land tenure and resource use (please state explicitly whether parts of the nominated property (including any buffer zones) are under traditional ownership or private ownership).

Evaluator comments here.

3C3. Adequacy of governance (decision-making, co-management arrangements, stakeholder involvement in management (within and outside the property, and including involvement of owners of the nominated property and/or buffer zone), conflict management).

Evaluator comments here.

--

3C4. Management organisation and capacity, including capacity for enforcement of legal or customary protection of the property, and the delivery of the management necessary for the property, including that specified in the management plan. Please also comment on the effectiveness of the wider protection of the property, outside its boundaries including the presence of threats and the degree to which they are being addressed. Please note the current scale and skill-levels of staffing and resources for the property, and comment on its adequacy in relation to the needs of the property.
<i>Evaluator comments here.</i>

3C5. Management planning, including monitoring and the tracking and improvement of management effectiveness. Please note if the property has an adequate documented management plan or management system, including in relation to its protection from wider threats outside of its boundaries.
<i>Evaluator comments here.</i>

3C6. Current situation, trend and prospects of conservation financing. Please note the current budgets for the property, and comment on their adequacy, and the degree to which they are guaranteed in the longer term.
<i>Evaluator comments here.</i>

3C7. Adequacy of transboundary management and protection (if applicable)
<i>Evaluator comments here.</i>

3C8. Considerations for serial nominations (if applicable). Please comment on each of the three questions below.
3C8a What is the justification for the serial approach?
<i>Evaluator comments on 3C8a here.</i>
3C8b Are the separate component parts of the nominated property functionally linked in relation to the requirements of the Operational Guidelines?
<i>Evaluator comments on 3C8b here.</i>
3C8c Is there an effective overall management framework for all the component parts of the nominated property?
<i>Evaluator comments on 3C8c here.</i>

3C9. Significance of interactions of natural and cultural values in the nominated site, including considerations for mixed sites and for sites also nominated as cultural landscapes (if applicable). Please note your view of the significant cultural values of the property, the degree to which these depend on and interact with natural values, and any implications in relation to the integrity, protection, governance and management of the property.
<i>Evaluator comments here.</i>

3D. COMMUNITY

Field evaluations allow to verify information and further document the kinds of issues raised by the State Party, NGOs and others. Documenting such issues will need to ensure accuracy, objectivity, transparency and credibility. If community and rights issues are being raised during the field evaluation, the evaluator is requested to as far as possible seek impartiality and reflecting all views allowing for both community voice and State Party responses. This may also involve to:

- Encounter indigenous and community organizations independently
- Encounter relevant human rights organizations independently
- Only quote public documents
- Not cite individuals for the sake of protection
- Double check findings
- Ensure that interpreters are independent and ideally familiar with local languages

The aim here is not a final assessment, but rather a working tool that allows to make as best use as possible of the brief field mission. For each thematic row the evaluation teams seeks to assess the quality and extent to which the nomination project is considered to have an impact. Such impacts may be deemed positive, negative or “no-change” depending on the specific nomination process. The evaluator may also find that information was not available on a given tenure or livelihood matter. Please provide your comments in Table 3D below.

Note: The consultation with local communities can be very different depending on the form of government and governance. To help you understand the limitations on eliciting community consultation, please refer to the “Governance of Protected Areas: From understanding to action” Best Practices manual, available

here: http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/gpap_home/gpap_capacity2/gpap_bpg/?13678/Governance-of-Protected-Areas-From-understanding-to-action

Table 3D: Score of impacts on communities and rights.

Degree of impact	Score	Evaluator comments in relation to score, and recommended follow up if any.
Positive impact	<i>PI</i>	
No change	<i>NC</i>	
Negative impact	<i>NI</i>	
No (or inadequate) information available	<i>N.A.</i>	
Rights to information, consultation and consent		
Tenure Rights		
Management and decision-making rights		
Livelihood and benefit-sharing rights		

Degree of impact	Score	Evaluator comments in relation to score, and recommended follow up if any.
<i>Positive impact</i>	<i>PI</i>	
<i>No change</i>	<i>NC</i>	
<i>Negative impact</i>	<i>NI</i>	
<i>No (or inadequate) information available</i>	<i>N.A.</i>	
Cultural rights		

3E: Other Relevant Information

3E1. Other information. Please add here any other comments you consider relevant that are not covered above, regarding any aspect of the nominated site.
<i>Evaluator comments here.</i>

4. Evaluation mission recommendations to IUCN World Heritage Panel

This section synthesizes the above sections to provide concise recommendations from the field evaluators to the IUCN World Heritage Panel. Please fill out all sections.

4A. Criteria

Please mark one box with an “X” providing your judgment for each nominated natural criterion.

	Strong evidence that the site meets this criterion	Strong evidence the site does not meet this criterion	Uncertain regarding if the site this meets criterion
Criterion vii			
Criterion viii			
Criterion ix			
Criterion x			

Explanatory note regarding evaluators judgments on criteria in table above (please make a separate comment for each nominated criterion). Please state clearly why you consider the property meets or does not meet relevant criteria. Where you consider a property meets a criterion, please set out a short paragraph on the values that you consider meet this criterion.

Criterion vii:

Criterion viii:

Criterion ix:

Criterion x:

Comment on potential under criteria not considered.

Evaluator comment here on any natural criteria that may be met by the site, but for which it has not been nominated.

4B. Conditions of integrity

Does the evaluator consider the conditions of integrity are met by the site?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evaluator please add an explanatory note here on your judgment on integrity.</i>		

4C. Requirements for Protection and Management

Does the evaluator consider the requirements for protection and management are met by the site?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evaluator please add an explanatory note here on your judgment on protection and management.</i>		

4D. Recommendation on potential for inscription

Based on the above conclusions please note the evaluator(s) consideration of the merits of the different options available to the IUCN World Heritage Panel, as set out in the table below. Please indicate those options that you consider could be a credible response, and

those which are not, and provide reasoning for your recommendation. The IUCN World Heritage Panel will make an eventual decision taking into account a range of lines of evidence, not only the evaluators report, and indicating more than one option is encouraged where relevant. If you wish please indicate one option as your recommended preferred option.

Table 4D. Recommendation on inscription. Please mark one box with an “X”

	Preferred Option	Possible Option	Not recommended
Inscription			
Referral			
Deferral			
Non inscription			
Reasoning for recommendation. Evaluator please add an explanatory note on your recommendation on options related to inscription of the property. If inscription is recommended please propose key elements that should be included in the integrity, protection and management sections of the draft “Statement of Outstanding Universal Value” that would be recommended to the World Heritage Committee as an official statement of long-term expectations to the State Party if the site is inscribed.			
<i>Evaluator comment here on reasoning for recommendation on inscription.</i>			

4E. Technical recommendation(s) to improve integrity, protection and management, for possible recommendation to nominating State Party by the World Heritage Committee. Please note below any recommendations that you consider should be made, in order of priority with the highest priorities first.

Evaluator comment here on recommendations to be considered to strengthen the integrity, protection and management of the property. Please set out in a list.

4F. Additional comments. In this section the evaluator can provide his/her views on other values, such as cultural values, that are important to highlight. This section can also include views on important projects taking place in the site and that are supportive of its conservation and management and/or information on emerging options (projects, new financing schemes) that could contribute to enhance the conservation and management of the site.

Evaluator comment here.

4G. Key issues with regard to the nomination in the view of the evaluator(s). Please fill out this section and summarise the key issues you consider should be considered by the IUCN World Heritage Panel in relation to this nomination.

Evaluator comment here on key issues.

4H. Recommendations for further information to be sought from the nominating State Party before IUCN completes its evaluation process, and reasoning for each request. Please indicate clearly in a numbered list each piece of information requested, and be precise regarding what would be required.

Evaluator comment here on further information recommended to be sought from the State Party.

4I. Please indicate any other information recommended to be sought to inform the

**decision of the Panel (including any points to confirm with ICOMOS or WH Centre?).
Additional follow-up recommended with other local stakeholders (communities,
Indigenous representatives, researchers).**

Evaluator comment here on other information to be sought.

5. Annexes

Please provide all of the following in 3 annexes to this report. Please also submit separately the requested photographs of the nominated site.

ANNEX 5.1. SUMMARY OF MISSION AGENDA AS UNDERTAKEN, NOT WHAT WAS PROPOSED

ANNEX 5.2: LIST OF PEOPLE MET DURING THE MISSION

ANNEX 5.3: REFERENCES.

Please put these in alphabetical order, arranged by author surname, and in the Harvard format for academic references

(see: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parenthetical_referencing)

LIST OF REFERENCES
Reference 1
Reference 2
Etc.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ESSENTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE EVALUATION OF THIS NOMINATION.