

<b>Name of nomination and country(ies)</b>	
<b>Name</b>	
<b>Affiliation</b>	
<b>Email address</b>	
<b>Nationality</b>	
<b>What is your knowledge of the site (have you been onsite or do you only know the site through literature?)</b>	
<b>Have you been involved in any way in contributing or reviewing to the nomination document for this site? Please provide details.</b>	

The purpose of this desk review is to assist IUCN's work to make global assessment of the degree to which the nomination makes a strong or weak claim for Outstanding Universal Value, which is seen as a highly selective approach to global significance, as defined in the World Heritage Convention's Operational Guidelines.

Reviewers are requested to not simply repeat information already included in the nomination document in their review, but rather to complement the nomination with their own global knowledge. References to published papers that support the points made in the review are highly useful, and should be included at the end of the review.

**WORLD HERITAGE CRITERIA – PLEASE READ SECTION 3 OF THE NOMINATION BEFORE COMPLETING THIS SECTION. For each question please comment on EACH CRITERION included in the nomination.**

1. What do you regard as the strongest claims for outstanding global significance made in this nomination (please note that the very restricted nature of the World Heritage list means that these values must be of the highest global significance?)
  
2. What weaknesses, if any, do you see in the claims made for outstanding universal value?
  
3. How would you rate the quality of the global comparative analysis in the nomination? Is it rigorous? Is it convincing? What do you see as its strengths and weaknesses?
  
4. Are any natural criteria that were not proposed of possible relevance to this nomination?
  
5. From your knowledge are there other areas containing similar natural values at the national, regional and global level, that are either of equivalent or greater conservation significance than the nominated site. Please provide details, and explain the comparisons you would make with those areas?

**INTEGRITY – PLEASE READ SECTION 3 OF THE NOMINATION BEFORE COMPLETING THIS SECTION.**

6. Does the nominated property meet the conditions of integrity and, if not, what is necessary for the conditions to be met? Are, for example, the design of boundaries and buffer zones adequate?

**PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT – PLEASE READ SECTION 5 OF THE NOMINATION BEFORE COMPLETING THIS SECTION.**

7. Does the nominated property have adequate long-term legislative, regulatory, institutional and/or traditional protection in place to ensure that the outstanding universal value and the conditions of integrity are maintained?

**Additional comments on the nomination file**

**References used**

**Suggestions for improvement of this guidance**

**Please note:**

Please refer to <http://whc.unesco.org> and <http://www.iucn.org/worldheritage/> for a wealth of information on the Convention and World Heritage properties.